

R E P O R T

FROM THE

SELECT COMMITTEE

ON

CONTAGIOUS DISEASES (ANIMALS);

TOGETHER WITH THE

PROCEEDINGS OF THE COMMITTEE,

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE,

AND APPENDIX.

*Ordered, by The House of Commons, to be Printed,
25 July 1873.*

Friday, 14th February 1873.

Ordered, THAT a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the operations of the Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act, 1869, and the Cattle Diseases Acts (Ireland), and the constitution of the Veterinary Departments of Great Britain and Ireland.

Friday, 28th February 1873.

Ordered, THAT the Committee do consist of Nineteen Members.

Committee nominated of—

Mr. William Edward Forster.
Lord Robert Montagu.
Mr. Monsell.
Mr. Ridley.
Mr. Dodson.
Sir Henry Selwin-Elbbetson.
Mr. Jacob Bright.
Mr. Polk.
Mr. James Barclay.
Mr. Kavanagh.

Mr. Dent.
Mr. Cawley.
Mr. Callan.
Mr. Tipping.
Mr. Lusk.
Mr. William Johnston.
Mr. O'Connor.
Mr. Norwood.
Mr. Clare Rend.

Ordered, THAT the Committee have power to send for Persons, Papers, and Records.

Ordered, THAT FIVE be the Quorum of the Committee.

Tuesday, 4th March 1873.

Ordered, THAT Mr. Norwood be discharged from further attendance on the Committee.

Ordered, THAT Mr. Clay be added to the Committee.

Monday, 17th March 1873.

Ordered, THAT the Petition of the Marquess of Salisbury and others, for measures for Prevention of Cattle Disease, be referred to the Committee.

Friday, 25th July 1873.

Ordered, THAT the Committee have power to Report their Observations, together with the Minutes of Evidence taken before them, to The House.

REPORT	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	p. 12
PROCEEDINGS OF THE COMMITTEE	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	p. vii
MINUTES OF EVIDENCE	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	p. 1
APPENDIX	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	p. 567

R E P O R T.

THE SELECT COMMITTEE appointed to inquire into the operations of the CONTAGIOUS DISEASES (ANIMALS) Act, 1869, and the CATTLE DISEASES ACTS (IRELAND), and the Constitution of the VETERINARY DEPARTMENTS of *Great Britain and Ireland*;—HAVE considered the matters to them referred, and have agreed to the following REPORT:

YOUR Committee, having been appointed in February last, has been occupied for 26 sittings in their inquiry, during which they have examined 47 witnesses, including the officials connected with the veterinary departments both in England and Ireland, and many landowners, farmers, veterinary surgeons, cattle importers, cattle dealers, and butchers from different parts of England, Scotland, and Ireland.

Much of the time of your Committee was occupied in considering the provisions in The Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act, 1869, as regards the import of foreign animals, and also the regulations issued by the Privy Council for carrying out such provisions.

Some of the witnesses representing the agricultural interest have urged that all fat animals imported from abroad should be slaughtered at the port of landing, and that foreign store animals should either be thus slaughtered or subjected to a long quarantine. On the other hand, strong representations have been made by butchers and dealers, that such an enactment would discourage importation, and tend to raise the price of meat, especially in the inland towns.

Your Committee have come to the conclusion that no change should be made in the Act so far as it relates to foreign animals, but they recommend that the Privy Council should continue to order the slaughter at the landing-places of all foreign animals imported from countries in which cattle plague exists, or from which there is reason to fear it might be introduced.

Evidence has been given to your Committee which convinces them that the outbreak last year of cattle plague in the East Riding of Yorkshire, was due to a cargo containing diseased animals arriving from Russia in the port of Hull; and the facts connected with this case, together with other evidence, induce them to recommend that the Privy Council, in exercising the power conferred upon them by Part III. of the English Act, should limit the ports at which foreign animals are allowed to be landed, to those at which satisfactory provisions have been made for their lairage, isolation, and slaughter, and for the disposal of their carcasses.

As regards the operation of the Acts, and of the Orders of the Privy Council upon contagious and infectious diseases in the United Kingdom, your Committee, after careful investigation, make the following recommendations:—

1. Cattle Plague.

- (a.) That Section 66 of the English Act which gives a local authority power, if they think fit, to order the slaughter of any animal which has been in contact with an animal affected with cattle plague, should be so far altered as to make it the duty of the local authority to order such slaughter.
- (b.) That

(b.) That discretion should be given to the local authority to order the slaughter of any animals on any premises adjoining those in which the disease exists, upon a certificate of an inspector, being at the same time a duly qualified veterinary surgeon, that such slaughter is necessary to prevent the spread of the disease.

(c.) That compensation should be extended for any animal so slaughtered.

2. *Pleuro-Pneumonia.*

(a.) That the slaughter of all cattle affected with this disease should be compulsory, and that there should be compensation for cattle so slaughtered.

(b.) That the Rules in the 7th Schedule of the English Act should be so altered as to provide that cattle which have been in the same shed, or which have been herded with diseased animals, may be moved under regulations for isolation for two months.

(c.) That the power given by Section 54 of the English Act to an inspector to apply the pleuro-pneumonia rules to any premises in which he finds that disease to exist, should be extended to any premises in which he finds that it has existed within 28 days.

(d.) That the time during which the pleuro-pneumonia rules should be applied to any premises in which the disease has been discovered should be extended from 30 days to two months.

3. *Sheep Pox.*

That the slaughter of all sheep affected with sheep pox should be compulsory, with compensation.

4. *Glanders.*

That the slaughter of horses affected with glanders should be compulsory, but that payment should be made to the owner for the value of the carcasses.

5. *Foot and Mouth Disease.*

Many witnesses have been examined with regard to this disease, especially as to its recent prevalence both in Great Britain and Ireland, and their opinions have been conflicting, both as regards the amount of loss it causes, and the measures which should be adopted for its diminution.

Some agriculturists have recommended very stringent measures, such as the stoppage of all fairs and markets, and of the movement of animals, except by license, as during the prevalence of the cattle plague.

On the other hand, there has been evidence of much weight, both by agriculturists and by professional witnesses, tending to show that such enactments would meet with strong opposition, and would be difficult, if not impossible, to carry out.

Your Committee have come to the conclusion that it is hopeless to attempt to extirpate, or even materially to check, this disease unless the above-mentioned stringent measures are strictly enforced; and they also believe that such enforcement would require a costly and numerous staff of inspectors, an amount of supervision by the central authority which would excite much local opposition, at any rate in Great Britain, and such an interference with the home trade in animals as would much affect prices, and would induce not only the consumer but the producer to consider the remedy to be worse than the disease.

Your Committee are confirmed in this opinion by finding themselves obliged to believe that the efforts which have been made in many counties in Great Britain to check the disease under permissive orders from the Privy Council, have been of little or no effect; and that a like failure has been experienced in Ireland where it has been attempted to carry out a general order by the help of the constabulary.

Your

Your Committee, however, consider that the sale in a public place or carriage of animals affected with this disease ought not to be permitted.

They therefore recommend,—

(a.) That the Privy Council should cease to issue orders for the check of this disease.

(b.) That Section 57 of the English Act which makes the exposure or carriage of animals affected with a contagious disease an offence, should continue to apply to foot and mouth disease, but owners shall be relieved from the necessity of giving notice to the police of the existence of this disease among their stock.

(c.) But that power should be given to the Privy Council to allow the movement, under proper precautions, of animals so affected, for slaughter, food, or shelter, inconvenience having been found to result from the absence of such power.

All the witnesses who have expressed an opinion on the subject agree that the compensation provided by the Act is insufficient. It has been urged that it is of the greatest importance for dealing successfully and economically with the suppression of disease to have early discovery of its existence; that this is practically impossible by any system of inspection, particularly as regards pleuro-pneumonia, and that local authorities must trust very much to the co-operation of stock owners, who however cannot be expected to report disease unless fairly and liberally compensated for their loss.

The witnesses concur in the belief that a higher rate of compensation would not induce fraud or recklessness; on these grounds, that, inasmuch as the compensation is paid out of local rates, the local authority would exercise sufficient vigilance to prevent excessive claims; and that, if farmers were compensated to the extent of even the full value of the animals slaughtered, their indirect loss would still be considerable.

Your Committee concur generally in these opinions, and recommend that whatever compensation is paid should bear a certain proportion to the owner's loss rather than to the value of the animal; and that local authorities should be empowered to grant such compensation to an extent not exceeding three-fourths of the loss sustained by the owner, provided that it does not exceed 25 *l.* for any animal.

Many witnesses have insisted upon the ill effect resulting from a want of uniform action by the different local authorities, both in England and Scotland, and your Committee agree with them in the belief that the regulations with regard to the stoppage of disease should cease to be varying or permissive, and should be uniform throughout Great Britain, as they are at present in Ireland.

Many witnesses have strongly represented that a reduction in the number of local authorities would result in greater efficiency and economy in carrying out the provisions of the Act, and it has been suggested that the authorities for counties or ridings should include the boroughs within them, provision being made in the constitution of the local authorities for the due representation of the boroughs.

In the case of, at least, two important counties in Scotland, the county and burgh authorities have amalgamated—so far as practicable under the Act, and the union has proved satisfactory.

Your Committee are of opinion that amalgamation is desirable, and recommend that in Scotland, where the local authorities are differently constituted from what they are in England, there should be only one local authority for each county, the burghs being duly represented at the general board; and that the general expenses be levied over the whole district, and the cost attending the slaughter of cattle exclusively over the burgh or landward part of the county wherein the slaughter takes place.

Your Committee recommend that the power of entry given by Section 32 of the English Act to the inspector or other officer of the local authority, when he has

reason

reason to suspect the existence of cattle plague, pleuro-pneumonia, or sheep pox, should be extended to all contagious diseases except foot and mouth disease.

Many complaints have been made to your Committee by English and Scotch farmers with regard to the Irish import, alleging that it has caused an increase both of pleuro-pneumonia and of foot and mouth disease.

Without, however, attempting to estimate how far this has been the case, or whether disease has been more prevalent in Irish or in British animals, your Committee recommend—

(a.) That the regulations in Great Britain and Ireland, with regard to contagious diseases, should be similar.

(b.) That such regulations should be carefully enforced at the landing places both in Great Britain and Ireland.

(c.) That the Irish Government should take steps by inspection at Irish ports to prevent the shipment to Great Britain of any diseased or infected animals.

Your Committee believe that these precautionary measures would be of advantage not only to the English cattle-buyers, but also to the Irish cattle breeders.

The Orders of Council relating to the transit of animals, both as regards disinfection and the prevention of cruelty and suffering, appear to be well adapted for their purpose; but your Committee are of opinion that such Orders cannot be satisfactorily carried out without inspection from time to time by the officers of the central authority, of the vessels engaged in the Irish and coasting as well as in the foreign trades, and also of railways, lairs, markets, and fairs; and that a sufficient number of travelling inspectors should be appointed and employed by the central authority to give effect to such Orders.

Your Committee recommend that annual reports should be prepared by the secretary and inspectors, and laid before Parliament early in each year.

As regards the constitution of the Veterinary Departments of Great Britain and Ireland, your Committee recommend no change.

25 July 1873.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE COMMITTEE.

Thursday, 6th March 1873.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mr. William Edward Forster.	Mr. James Barclay.
Mr. Kavanagh.	Mr. Cawley.
Mr. Clay.	Mr. Callan.
Mr. Jacob Bright.	Mr. Tipping.
Mr. Clare Read.	Mr. William Johnston.
Mr. Dodson.	Mr. O'Connor.
Mr. Ridley.	Mr. Dent.
Mr. Pell.	

MR. WILLIAM EDWARD FORSTER was called to the Chair.

The Committee deliberated.

[Adjourned till Monday next, at Twelve o'clock.

Monday, 10th March 1873.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

MR. WILLIAM EDWARD FORSTER in the Chair.

Mr. Dent.	Mr. Kavanagh.
Mr. James Barclay.	Mr. William Johnston.
Mr. Tipping.	Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson.
Mr. Ridley.	Lord Robert Montagu.
Mr. O'Connor.	Mr. Monseil.
Mr. Pell.	Mr. Clay.
Mr. Clare Read.	Mr. Cawley.
Mr. Dodson.	

MR. ALEXANDER WILLIAMS was examined.

[Adjourned till Thursday next, at Twelve o'clock.

Thursday, 13th March 1873.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mr. Clare Read.	Mr. Jacob Bright.
Mr. Dent.	Mr. Lusk.
Mr. James Barclay.	Mr. Cawley.
Mr. Tipping.	Mr. Callan.
Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson.	Mr. Dodson.
Mr. Kavanagh.	Mr. Clay.
Mr. William Johnston.	Mr. William Edward Forster.
Mr. O'Connor.	Mr. Monseil.

In the absence of Mr. William Edward Forster, Mr. Clare Read was called to the Chair; afterwards, Mr. William Edward Forster in the Chair.

MR. ALEXANDER WILLIAMS was further examined.

[Adjourned till Thursday next, at Twelve o'clock.

Thursday, 20th March 1873.

MEMBERS PRESENT :

Mr. Dent.
Lord Robert Montagu.
Mr. Kavanagh.
Mr. William Johnson.
Mr. O'Connor.
Mr. James Barclay.
Mr. Monseil.
Mr. Lusk.

Mr. Jacob Bright.
Mr. Clay.
Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson.
Mr. Ridley.
Mr. William Edward Forster.
Mr. Callan.
Mr. Cowley.
Mr. Dodson.

In the absence of Mr. William Edward Forster, Lord Robert Montagu was called to the Chair; afterwards, Mr. William Edward Forster in the Chair.

Mr. Alexander Williams was further examined.

Professor George Thomas Brown was examined.

[Adjourned till Monday next, at Twelve o'clock.

Monday, 24th March 1873.

MEMBERS PRESENT :

Mr. WILLIAM EDWARD FORSTER in the Chair.

Mr. Dent.
Mr. Clare Read.
Mr. James Barclay.
Mr. Tipping.
Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson.
Mr. Ridley.
Mr. Dodson.

Mr. Kavanagh.
Mr. Pell.
Mr. Clay.
Mr. O'Connor.
Mr. Jacob Bright.
Lord Robert Montagu.
Mr. Monseil.

Professor George Thomas Brown was further examined.

[Adjourned till Thursday next, at Twelve o'clock.

Thursday, 27th March 1873.

MEMBERS PRESENT :

Mr. Dent.
Mr. Clare Read.
Mr. Kavanagh.
Mr. O'Connor.
Mr. James Barclay.
Mr. Tipping.
Mr. Monseil.
Mr. Pell.

Mr. Clay.
Mr. Lusk.
Mr. William Edward Forster.
Mr. Dodson.
Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson.
Mr. Jacob Bright.
Mr. Ridley.
Mr. Cowley.

In the absence of Mr. William Edward Forster, Mr. Clare Read was called to the Chair; afterwards, Mr. William Edward Forster in the Chair.

Professor George Thomas Brown was further examined.

[Adjourned till Monday next, at Twelve o'clock.

Monday, 31st March 1873.

MEMBERS PRESENT :

Mr. WILLIAM EDWARD FORSTER in the Chair.

Mr. Dent.	Mr. O'Connor.
Mr. Clare Read.	Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson.
Mr. James Barclay.	Mr. Ridley.
Mr. Kavanagh.	Mr. Clay.
Mr. Pell.	Mr. Callan.

Professor James Beart Simonds was examined.

[Adjourned till Thursday next, at Twelve o'clock.

Thursday, 3rd April 1873.

MEMBERS PRESENT :

Mr. WILLIAM EDWARD FORSTER, in the Chair.

Mr. Monsell.	Mr. James Barclay.
Mr. Kavanagh.	Mr. Ridley.
Mr. Pell.	Mr. Dodson.
Mr. O'Connor.	Mr. Dent.
Mr. Jacob Bright.	Mr. Clay.
Mr. Clare Read.	Mr. Lusk.

Professor James Beart Simonds was further examined.

Mr. Charles Earleley Wilnot was examined.

[Adjourned till Thursday 24th April, at Twelve o'clock.

Thursday, 24th April 1873.

MEMBERS PRESENT :

Mr. WILLIAM EDWARD FORSTER in the Chair.

Mr. Monsell.	Mr. Ridley.
Mr. Kavanagh.	Mr. Dodson.
Mr. O'Connor.	Mr. Clay.
Mr. Jacob Bright.	Mr. Cawley.
Mr. Clare Read.	Mr. Lusk.
Mr. Pell.	

Professor Thomas Baldwin and Mr. George Philcox were severally examined.

[Adjourned till Monday next, at Twelve o'clock.

Monday, 28th April 1873.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mr. Dodson.
Mr. Kavanagh.
Mr. William Johnston.
Mr. O'Connor.
Mr. Clare Read.

Mr. Tipping.
Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson.
Mr. Monsell.
Mr. Clay.
Mr. William Edward Forster.

In the absence of Mr. *William Edward Forster*, Mr. *Dodson* was called to the Chair; afterwards, Mr. *William Edward Forster* in the Chair.

Professor *Thomas Baldwin* was further examined.

Mr. *William Stratton* and Mr. *William Hastings* were severally examined.

[Adjourned till Thursday next, at Twelve o'clock.

Thursday, 1st May 1873.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mr. Monsell.
Mr. Kavanagh.
Mr. William Johnston.
Mr. Cawley.
Mr. O'Connor.
Mr. James Barclay.
Mr. Tipping.

Mr. William Edward Forster.
Mr. Clare Read.
Mr. Ridley.
Mr. Dodson.
Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson.
Mr. Clay.
Mr. Lusk.

In the absence of Mr. *William Edward Forster*, Mr. *Monsell* was called to the Chair; afterwards, Mr. *William Edward Forster* in the Chair.

Professor *Hugh Ferguson* and Mr. *Robert Fisher* were severally examined.

[Adjourned till Monday next, at Twelve o'clock.

Monday, 5th May 1873.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mr. Dodson.
Mr. Dent.
Mr. Clare Read.
Mr. James Barclay.
Mr. Ridley.
Mr. Kavanagh.
Mr. William Johnston.

Mr. O'Connor.
Mr. Jacob Bright.
Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson.
Mr. William Edward Forster.
Mr. Monsell.
Mr. Clay.

In the absence of Mr. *William Edward Forster*, Mr. *Dodson* was called to the Chair; afterwards, Mr. *William Edward Forster* in the Chair.

Professor *Hugh Ferguson* was further examined.

[Adjourned till Thursday next, at Twelve o'clock.

Thursday, 8th May 1873.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mr. Dent.	Mr. Clare Read.
Mr. Tipping.	Mr. Jacob Bright.
Mr. Ridley.	Mr. Monsell.
Mr. Kavanagh.	Mr. James Barclay.
Mr. William Johnston.	Mr. Clay.
Mr. O'Connor.	Mr. Lusk.
Mr. William Edward Forster.	Mr. Cawley.

In the absence of Mr. William Edward Forster, Mr. Dent was called to the Chair; afterwards, Mr. William Edward Forster in the Chair.

Mr. Robert Morrow and Mr. Henry Michael Jenkins were severally examined.

[Adjourned till Monday next, at Twelve o'clock.

Monday, 12th May 1873.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mr. Dent.	Mr. William Edward Forster.
Mr. James Barclay.	Mr. Monsell.
Mr. Ridley.	Mr. Jacob Bright.
Mr. Kavanagh.	Mr. Pell.
Mr. William Johnston.	Mr. Callan.
Mr. O'Connor.	Mr. Clay.

In the absence of Mr. William Edward Forster, Mr. Dent was called to the Chair; afterwards, Mr. William Edward Forster in the Chair.

Professor Hugh Ferguson was further examined.

Mr. Jerome James Guiry and Mr. Samuel Garnett were severally examined.

Professor Thomas Baldwin was further examined.

[Adjourned till Thursday next, at Twelve o'clock.

Thursday, 15th May 1873.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mr. Clare Read.	Mr. Cawley.
Mr. Dent.	Mr. William Edward Forster.
Mr. James Barclay.	Mr. Monsell.
Sir Henry Selwin Ibbetson.	Mr. Ridley.
Mr. Callan.	Mr. Clay.
Mr. Kavanagh.	Mr. Lusk.
Mr. William Johnston.	Mr. Jacob Bright.
Mr. O'Connor.	

In the absence of Mr. William Edward Forster, Mr. Clare Read was called to the Chair; afterwards, Mr. William Edward Forster in the Chair; afterwards, Mr. Monsell in the Chair.

Mr. Peter O'Neill and Mr. Thomas Verdon were severally examined.

[Adjourned till Monday next, at Twelve o'clock.

Monday, 19th May 1873.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mr. Monsell.	Mr. O'Connor.
Mr. Clare Read.	Mr. Pell.
Mr. Dodson.	Mr. Dent.
Mr. James Barclay.	Mr. Ridley.
Mr. Tipping.	Mr. Jacob Bright.
Mr. Callan.	Mr. William Edward Forster.
Mr. Kavanagh.	Mr. Clay.
Mr. William Johnston.	

In the absence of Mr. *William Edward Forster*, Mr. *Monsell* was called to the Chair; afterwards, Mr. *William Edward Forster* in the Chair.

Captain *Charles Bayley Calmady Dent*, R.N., and Mr. *William Bolster* were severally examined.

Mr. *Thomas Verdon* was further examined.

[Adjourned till Thursday next, at Twelve o'clock.]

Thursday, 22nd May 1873.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mr. Monsell.	Mr. Dent.
Mr. Kavanagh.	Mr. Jacob Bright.
Mr. William Johnston.	Mr. Clare Read.
Mr. Pell.	Mr. James Barclay.
Mr. O'Connor.	Mr. Clay.
Mr. Callan.	Mr. Lusk.
Mr. Ridley.	

In the absence of Mr. *William Edward Forster*, Mr. *Monsell* was called to the Chair; afterwards, Mr. *Dent* in the Chair.

Mr. *Thomas Verdon* and Mr. *Richard Wahl* were severally examined.

[Adjourned till Monday, 9th June, at Twelve o'clock.]

Monday, 9th June 1873.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mr. *WILLIAM EDWARD FORSTER* in the Chair.

Mr. Dent.	Mr. O'Connor.
Mr. Kavanagh.	Mr. Pell.
Mr. Clare Read.	Mr. Clay.
Mr. Tipping.	Mr. James Barclay.
Mr. Ridley.	Mr. Jacob Bright.

In the absence of Mr. *William Edward Forster*, Mr. *Clare Read* was called to the Chair.
Mr. *John Algernon Clarke* was examined.

[Adjourned till Thursday next, at Twelve o'clock.]

Thursday, 12th June 1873.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mr. Clare Read.	Mr. Jacob Bright.
Mr. Dent.	Mr. William Johnston.
Mr. Ridley.	Mr. James Barclay.
Mr. Dodson.	Mr. Mansell.
Mr. Kavanagh.	Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson.
Mr. Clay.	Mr. Tipping.

In the absence of Mr. *William Edward Forster*, Mr. *Clare Read* was called to the chair.

Mr. *Thomas Rigby*, Professor *John McBride*, and Mr. *William Clode*, were severally examined.

[Adjourned till Monday next, at Twelve o'clock.]

Monday, 16th June 1873.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

MR. WILLIAM EDWARD FORSTER in the Chair.

Mr. Clare Read.	Mr. Tipping.
Mr. James Barclay.	Mr. Dent.
Mr. Dodson.	Mr. Pull.
Mr. Kavanagh.	Mr. Jacob Bright.
Mr. William Johnston.	Mr. Clay.
Mr. O'Connor.	Mr. Mansell.

In the absence of Mr. *William Edward Forster*, Mr. *Clare Read* was called to the chair.

Professor *John Gamgee* was examined.

[Adjourned till Thursday next, at Twelve o'clock.]

Thursday, 19th June, 1873.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mr. Clare Read.	Mr. Dent.
Mr. Kavanagh.	Mr. Clay.
Mr. James Barclay.	Mr. Dodson.
Mr. William Johnston.	Mr. Callan.
Mr. O'Connor.	Mr. Cowley.
Mr. Ridley.	Mr. Pull.
Mr. Jacob Bright.	Mr. Mansell.

In the absence of Mr. *William Edward Forster*, Mr. *Clare Read* was called to the chair.

Mr. *James Odgers* and Captain *John Smith*, were severally examined.

[Adjourned till Thursday next, at Twelve o'clock.]

Thursday, 26th June 1873.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mr. WILLIAM EDWARD FORSTER is the Chair.

Mr. Clare Read.	Mr. Dent.
Mr. James Barclay.	Mr. Dodson.
Mr. Kavanagh.	Mr. Clay.
Mr. Pell.	Mr. Cawley.
Mr. O'Connor.	Mr. Jacob Bright.
Mr. Callan.	

Mr. William Clode and Dr. Alexander Williams were farther examined.

Mr. Anthony George Robinson, Mr. George Andrew Lepper, Mr. Henry Webb, and Mr. John Drenahfield were severally examined.

[Adjourned till Monday next, at Twelve o'clock.]

Monday, 30th June 1873.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mr. WILLIAM EDWARD FORSTER is the Chair.

Mr. Dent.	Mr. O'Connor.
Mr. Clare Read.	Mr. Jacob Bright.
Mr. James Barclay.	Mr. Cawley.
Mr. Ridley.	Mr. Monsell.
Mr. Callan.	Mr. Clay.
Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson.	

In the absence of Mr. William Edward Forster, Mr. Clare Read was called to the Chair.

Mr. James Thomson, Mr. William Goodlet, and Mr. George Stewart, were severally examined.

[Adjourned till Thursday next, at Twelve o'clock.]

Thursday, 3rd July 1873.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mr. Monsell.	Mr. Clay.
Mr. Dodson.	Mr. Pell.
Mr. O'Connor.	Mr. Jacob Bright.
Mr. Clare Read.	Mr. Callan.
Mr. James Barclay.	

In the absence of Mr. William Edward Forster, Mr. Monsell was called to the Chair.

Mr. James Thomson and Mr. George Stewart were further examined.

Mr. Andrew Milne, Mr. William Stewart Walker, and Mr. David Smith were severally examined.

[Adjourned till Monday next, at Twelve o'clock.]

Monday, 7th July 1873.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mr. WILLIAM EDWARD FORSTER in the Chair.

Mr. Monsell.
Mr. Clare Read.
Mr. Dodson.
Mr. Kavanagh.
Mr. Ridley.
Mr. Dent.

Mr. Tipping.
Mr. O'Connor.
Mr. Jacob Bright.
Mr. James Barclay.
Mr. Clay.

Mr. *Herbert Murray*, Mr. *Abraham Hodgetts*, and Mr. *Herman Gebhardt* were severally examined.

[Adjourned till Thursday next, at Twelve o'clock.]

Thursday, 10th July 1873.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mr. Clare Read.
Mr. Monsell.
Mr. James Barclay.
Mr. Cawley.
Mr. Kavanagh.
Mr. Clay.

Mr. O'Connor.
Mr. Jacob Bright.
Mr. Pell.
Mr. Tipping.
Mr. Dent.
Mr. Lusk.

In the absence of Mr. *William Edward Forster*, Mr. *Clare Read* was called to the Chair.

Mr. *George Christopher Roberts*, Mr. *Septimus Lambert*, Mr. *George Woodcock*, and Mr. *William Brown* were severally examined.

[Adjourned till Monday next, at One o'clock.]

Monday, 14th July 1873.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mr. WILLIAM EDWARD FORSTER, in the Chair.

Mr. Clare Read.
Mr. Dodson.
Mr. James Barclay.
Mr. Kavanagh.
Mr. Jacob Bright.
Mr. Callan.

Mr. O'Connor.
Mr. Monsell.
Mr. Clay.
Mr. Pell.
Mr. Cawley.
Mr. Tipping.

Mr. *James Webb*, Mr. *Clare Sewell Read* (a Member of the Committee), and Mr. *Samuel James Rayment* were severally examined.

[Adjourned till Thursday, 24th July, at Twelve o'clock.]

Thursday, 24th July 1873.

MEMBERS PRESENT :

Mr. WILLIAM EDWARD FORSTER in the Chair.

Mr. Clare Read.	Mr. Monsell.
Mr. Kavanagh.	Mr. Pell.
Mr. O'Connor.	Mr. Dent.
Mr. James Barclay.	Mr. Clay.
Mr. Bidley.	Mr. Jacob Bright.
Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbotson.	Mr. Callan.
Mr. Tipping.	Mr. Lusk.

DRAFT REPORT proposed by the Chairman, read the first time as follows :

"YOUR Committee having been appointed in February last, has been occupied for 26 sittings in their inquiry, during which they have examined 47 witnesses, including the officials connected with the veterinary departments both in England and Ireland, and many landowners, farmers, veterinary surgeons, cattle importers, cattle dealers, and butchers from different parts of England, Scotland, and Ireland.

"2. Much of the time of your Committee was occupied in considering the provisions in 'The Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act, 1869,' as regards the import of foreign animals, and also the regulations issued by the Privy Council for carrying out such provisions.

"3. Some of the witnesses representing the agricultural interest have urged that all fat animals imported from abroad shall be slaughtered at the port of landing, and that foreign store animals should either be thus slaughtered or subjected to a long quarantine. On the other hand, strong representations have been made by hutchers and dealers, that such an enactment would discourage importation and tend to raise the price of meat, especially in the inland towns.

"4. Your Committee have come to the conclusion that no change should be made in the Act so far as it relates to foreign animals, but they recommend that the Privy Council should continue to order the slaughter at the landing-places of all foreign animals imported from countries in which cattle plague exists, or from which there is reason to fear it might be introduced.

"5. Evidence has been given to your Committee which convinces them that the outbreak last year of cattle plague in the East Riding of Yorkshire, was due to a cargo containing diseased animals arriving from Russia in the port of Hull; and the facts connected with this case, together with other evidence, induce them to recommend that the Privy Council, in exercising the power conferred upon them by Part III. of the English Act, should limit the ports at which foreign animals are allowed to be landed, to those at which satisfactory provisions have been made for their lairage, isolation, and slaughter, and for the disposal of their carcasses.

"6. As regards the operation of the Acts, and of the Orders of the Privy Council upon contagious and infectious diseases in the United Kingdom, your Committee, after careful investigation, make the following recommendations :—

"1. *Cattle Plague.*

"(a.) That Section 66 of the English Act which gives a local authority power, if they think fit, to order the slaughter of any animal which has been in contact with an animal affected with cattle plague, should be so far altered as to make it the duty of the local authority to order such slaughter.

"(b.) That discretion should be given to the local authority to order the slaughter of any animals on any premises adjoining the districts in which the disease exists, upon a certificate of an inspector, being at the same time a duly qualified veterinary surgeon, that such slaughter is necessary to prevent the spread of the disease.

"(c.) That compensation should be extended for any animal so slaughtered.

"2. *Pleuro-pneumonia.*

"(a.) That the slaughter of all animals affected with this disease should be compulsory.

"(b.) That there should be compensation for animals slaughtered, as is provided in the case of cattle plague.

"(c.) That the rules in the 7th schedule of the English Act should be so altered as to provide that cattle which have been in the same shed, or which have been herded with diseased animals, may be moved under regulations for isolation for two months.

"(d.) That the power given by Section 54 of the English Act to an inspector to apply the pleuro-pneumonia rules to any premises in which he finds that disease to exist, should be extended to any premises in which he finds that it has existed within 28 days.

"(e.) That the time during which the pleuro-pneumonia rules should be applied to any premises in which the disease has been discovered should be extended from 30 days to two months.

" 3. *Sheep Pox and Glanders.*

" That slaughter should be compulsory in these diseases.

4. *Foot and Mouth Disease.*

7. Many witnesses have been examined with regard to this disease, especially as to its recent prevalence both in Great Britain and Ireland, and their opinions have been conflicting, both as regards the amount of loss it causes, and the measures which should be adopted for its diminution.

" 8. Some agriculturists have recommended very stringent measures, such as the stoppage of all fairs and markets, and of the movement of animals, except by license, as during the prevalence of the cattle plague.

" 9. On the other hand, there has been evidence of much weight, both by agriculturists and by professional witnesses, tending to show that such enactments would meet with strong opposition, and would be difficult, if not impossible, to carry out.

" 10. Your Committee have come to the conclusion that it is hopeless to attempt to extirpate, or even materially to check, this disease unless the above-mentioned stringent measures are strictly enforced; and they also believe that such enforcement would require a costly and numerous staff of inspectors, an amount of supervision by the central authority which would excite much local opposition, at any rate in Great Britain, and such an interference with the home trade in animals as would much affect prices, and would induce not only the consumer but the producer to consider the remedy to be worse than the disease.

" 11. Your Committee are confirmed in this opinion by finding themselves obliged to believe that the efforts which have been made in many counties in Great Britain to check the disease under permissive orders from the Privy Council, have been of little or no effect; and that a like failure has been experienced in Ireland where it has been attempted to carry out a general order by the help of the constabulary.

" 12. Your Committee, however, consider that the sale in a public place, or carriage, of animals affected with this disease ought not to be permitted.

" They therefore recommend,—

"(a.) That the Privy Council should cease to issue orders for the check of this disease.

"(b.) That Section 57 of the English Act which makes the exposure or carriage of animals affected with a contagious disease an offence, should continue to apply to foot and mouth disease.

"(c.) But that power should be given to the Privy Council to allow the movement, under proper precautions, of animals so affected, for the purposes of slaughter, inconvenience having been found to result from the absence of such power.

" 13. Many witnesses have insisted upon the ill effect resulting from a want of uniform action by the different local authorities, both in England and Scotland, and your Committee agree with them in the belief that the regulations with regard to the stoppage of disease should cease to be varying or permissive, and should be uniform throughout Great Britain, as they are at present in Ireland.

" 14. Your Committee recommend that the power of entry given by Section 32 of the English Act to the inspector or other officer of the local authority, when he has reason to suspect the existence of cattle plague, pleuro-pneumonia, or sheep pox, should be extended to all contagious diseases.

" 15. Many complaints have been made to your Committee by English and Scotch farmers with regard to the Irish import, alleging that it has caused an increase both of pleuro-pneumonia and of foot and mouth disease.

" 16. Without, however, attempting to estimate how far this has been the case, or whether

whether disease has been more prevalent in Irish or in British animals, your Committee recommend—

"(a.) That the regulations in Great Britain and Ireland, with regard to contagious diseases, should be similar.

"(b.) That such regulations should be carefully enforced at the landing places both in Great Britain and Ireland.

"(c.) That the Irish Government should take steps by inspection at Irish ports to prevent the shipment to Great Britain of any diseased or infected animals.

"Your Committee believe that these precautionary measures would be of advantage not only to the English cattle-buyers, but also to the Irish cattle breeders.

"17. The Orders of Council relating to the transit of animals, both as regards disinfection and the prevention of cruelty, appear to be well adapted for their purpose; but your Committee are of opinion that such Orders will not be carried out without inspection from time to time by the officers of the central authority, of the vessels engaged in the Irish and coasting as well as in the foreign trades, and also of the railways.

"18. As regards the constitution of the Veterinary Departments of Great Britain and Ireland, your Committee recommend no change."

DRAFT REPORT proposed by Mr. KENNEDY, read the first time as follows:—

" OPERATION OF ACTS.

"1. With regard to the operation of the several Acts above named, your Committee propose to deal with them—

"First. As to their success in checking the spread at home of the different contagious diseases to which they apply.

"Second. As to their efficacy in preventing the introduction of these diseases from abroad.

"2. With regard to the first, your Committee regret to have to report that in their opinion the evidence which they have taken has proved that the provisions of the existing Acts as now enforced have been powerless, excepting in the case of cattle plague, to check the spread of the most serious of these diseases at home.

"3. In reporting the recommendations which appear to them desirable, your Committee have dealt separately with the different diseases to which these Acts apply, viz., cattle plague, pleuro-pneumonia, foot and mouth disease, sheep-pox, sheep scab, and glanders. Although the entire freedom of the country at the present time from cattle plague would seem almost to obviate the necessity of their referring to it at all, yet they feel bound, from the absolute necessity of immediate action being taken in the event of a fresh outbreak occurring in the country, to recommend that the powers vested in the local authority by sect. 65, 66, and 67 of c. 70, 32 & 33 Vict., should also be conferred upon the Veterinary Department of Privy Council, and that this power should be extended to the slaughter of any animals in the vicinity of those affected with this disease, although not actually in contact with them.

"4. Your Committee now proceed to deal with the other diseases, taking first those two which, as being most prevalent in this country, have been mainly brought under their notice. These are pleuro-pneumonia and foot and mouth disease, both of which, your Committee are of opinion, are of a foreign origin, and of a highly infectious and contagious nature.

" PLEURO-PNEUMONIA.

"5. The evidence has proved that pleuro-pneumonia is a disease of a most fatal character, in which the cure or complete ultimate recovery of the animal is almost hopeless. That the disease can only be communicated to a healthy subject by contact with, or inhaling the breath of, the infected one. That the disease, when once communicated to an animal, though certain as to its result, is slow in incubation, sometimes lying dormant for months.

"6. Your Committee are of opinion that the immediate slaughter of all animals so affected should be made compulsory, and that in order to ensure the immediate discovery of the occurrence of the disease, which they regard as a consideration of the greatest importance, recommend that the owner of the animal so slaughtered, if he has given the earliest information possible to the proper authority, should be compensated out of the local rates to the amount of four-fifths of the fair marketable value of the animal before it became infected, proper care and precaution being of course taken to ascertain what that
real

real value was, and that any failure or omission to give this information should be made punishable by a heavy fine.

" 7. They further recommend the isolation, for at least two months, of any animals which may have been in contact with the affected ones.

" 8. Your Committee are of opinion that, if this system was uniformly carried out in a firm and judicious manner, the disease would be before long stamped out of the country.

" 9. They feel bound to add that an almost absolute unanimity of opinion prevailed among the many witnesses examined before them in recommending the immediate compulsory slaughter of animals affected with this disease.

" FOOT AND MOUTH.

" 10. The foot and mouth disease, the Committee consider, has been clearly and satisfactorily proved by the evidence before them, to be a disease of a much milder type, and not dangerous or fatal in its character, but from its highly infectious nature to be one which it would appear to be hopeless to attempt to deal with by legislation, unless restrictions were imposed which, doubtful in their result, would occasion more loss to the public than the disease in its most virulent form. Many witnesses were examined by your Committee upon the subject of this disease, and suggestions received for its restraint or extirpation, but in none of them could your Committee see any practical prospect of beneficial result. By some witnesses restrictions were suggested of a more or less stringent character; by others it was complained that the existing restrictions were irritating and useless, that the present system of inspection at cattle markets tended more to spread infection than to restrain it, and by interfering with the trade, to raise the price of meat.

" 11. Your Committee are of opinion that the weight of evidence has been in support of this latter argument, and that these restrictions have done more to fetter trade than to check disease.

" 12. The evidence has further proved not only that on former occasions of outbreaks of this disease, before any restrictions were in force, it died out and disappeared of itself, but that since the imposition of these restrictions the outbreaks have been more widely spread and have lasted for a longer time; considering all these facts, your Committee recommend that foot and mouth should be struck out of the Act, and that the provisions of Section 5 of the 33 and 34 Vict. c. 36, should be extended to Irish cattle, which giving power to the properly appointed authority to seize and confiscate any affected animals at port of debarkation in England, would afford a security to the English farmer against diseased animals being sent from Ireland, either through ill intention or neglect; your Committee also recommend that the Veterinary Department in Ireland should exercise the same authority at the ports of embarkation in England.

" 13. With regard to the second issue of the operation of these Acts, viz., the efficacy in preventing the introduction of disease from abroad, your Committee are of opinion that so far as their provisions have been carried out their action has been most beneficial, and that the powers vested by these Acts in the Veterinary Departments afford an invaluable safeguard and protection to the country, which, as long as a single instance of cattle plague is known to exist in any part of the world, ought to be sustained.

" 14. In considering, however, the different bearings of this question, issues of varied natures were raised by the evidence brought before your Committee.

" 15. On the part of the agricultural interests it was maintained that the powers under these Acts were not sufficiently exercised.

" 16. That the importation of foreign stock was a fruitful source of disseminating disease which caused more loss to the country than the value of the cattle which were imported; and as a protection it was urged, that all cattle should be slaughtered at the port of landing, and the dead meat forwarded thence to the interior.

" 17. On the other hand, the towns, on the consumers' interests, contended that the home production was totally inadequate to supply the demand, and that the restrictions imposed for the purpose of checking the importation of disease, while unsuccessful in securing that result, had turned the foreign trade from our shores, and so produced the scarcity and high price of meat from which they suffered.

" 18. Your Committee consider that the question of the yearly increasing price of meat in this country to the consumer, is one of the very gravest importance, and that nothing but the very sternest necessity would warrant the adoption of any measure having a tendency in that direction. They believe that, while it is necessary for our own protection to enforce the slaughter at the port of landing of any animal liable or subject to any of those diseases coming from a scheduled country, to extend that enactment to unscheduled countries, and thus restrict the foreign supply of meat to the dead meat trade, would, in their opinion, be a very unjustifiable proceeding, and tend greatly to lessen the supply of meat, and increase the evil now complained of. They further think that with proper precautions, no risk of spreading disease attaches to the introduction into the interior of the country of stock only for the purpose of slaughter.

" 19. But

"19. But your Committee regard in a very different light the other class of foreign import, viz., store stock. To supply the demands of dairymen and farmers, evidence has been given to prove that it is a fruitful source of infection, and appears to contribute in no small degree to keep alive diseases in the metropolitan dairies, and in the other rural districts where these animals go.

"20. It would also seem, especially with regard to Holland, from whence these store cattle chiefly come, to be a source of supply, of a very fickle and capricious nature, being governed by the question of the scarcity or otherwise of hay or winter food for the sustenance of those animals in that country.

"21. Your Committee are of opinion that greater risk than advantage attaches to this source of supply, as such stock instead of being purchased on landing by butchers, as in the case of fat stock, and sent direct to their destination for slaughter, are exposed in pens and markets, and if infected spread that infection through the land; only remotely and indirectly can restrictions upon this class of the trade affect the price of meat.

"22. They therefore recommend that, after proper notice being given, the importation of all foreign stock, save for the purpose of slaughter, should be discontinued.

"23. With regard to sheep-pox, your Committee recommend the compulsory slaughter of every animal affected with it, and the isolation of those in contact with them; they are, however, happy to be able to report, from the evidence before them, that this disease has entirely disappeared, and they believe that powers vested in the Veterinary Department of the Privy Council are ample to guard against its re-introduction.

"24. With regard to sheep-scab, your Committee recommend that it should be struck out of the Act, for although of a highly contagious nature they believe that it is not infectious, and that it is easily cured; and that, as in the case of foot and mouth disease, sufficient power of obtaining redress from the seller of any animal so infected is open to the purchaser by an action in the civil courts of law.

"25. With regard to glanders as a disease of a highly contagious and infectious nature, and being entirely unamenable to treatment or capable of cure, your Committee recommend the compulsory slaughter of every animal affected with it; they are happy, however, to be able to report, from the evidence before them, that this disease is by no means prevalent in the country, its existence being confined chiefly to the metropolitan districts.

"26. With regard to the general precautions for the prevention of the spread of these several diseases in this country, your Committee are of opinion that the provisions of the Act having reference to the cleansing and disinfecting of the railway trucks and steam vessels used in the cattle trade have not been applied with sufficient stringency, and that the neglect of these preventives have been a fruitful source of keeping alive these diseases, and spreading the infection. More attention, they consider, could, with advantage, be applied in the case of the railway companies to supply the cattle with food and water on their transit, and in the case of the steam packet companies to the better regulation of the ventilation on board their vessels. With reference to the provisions of the Act as regards disinfection in the latter case, evidence has been given as to the objection and difficulty of the use of whitewash as now required by some of the inspectors at the ports, which appear to your Committee to be reasonable, and they are of opinion that if a thorough cleansing of those parts of the vessels used in the transit of cattle could be ensured without it, it might with advantage, be dispensed with.

"27. Your Committee now come to the last part of the order of reference of their inquiry, 'the constitution of the Veterinary Departments of Great Britain and Ireland;' this they conceive must be taken with reference to the proportion which the expense involved in their administration bear to the general advantage to the public derived from same. With regard to the English Department, your Committee are very decidedly of opinion that, considering the perfect system of surveillance maintained by that department over the sanitary conditions of those countries from which we derive our principal foreign supplies of cattle, and the protection thereby afforded to us against the re-introduction of the cattle plague, the expense necessary to its maintenance is not excessive considering the advantages of the security which it thus affords. Your Committee have already stated that with regard to its influence in checking the spread of those other diseases in this country they are of opinion that it has been nearly powerless; but they are bound to say, from the evidence before them, that they believe, so far as legislative action is concerned, its failure in this respect is due more to the fact that the power and responsibility of carrying out the provisions of the Act and the various orders of the Privy Council has been relegated to the local authorities, to remissness and utter want of uniformity in their action, than to any fault on the part of the department itself. Considering this state of things, your Committee feel bound to advise that the power and responsibility of carrying out their recommendation for stamping out pleuro-pneumonia should be entrusted to the central instead of the local authority.

"28. With regard to the Irish Department, they consider that it has been both efficiently and economically managed, and that the fact that no very apparent beneficial effect in checking the spread of these diseases has resulted from its action, proves the
 inutility

inutility, in the case of foot and mouth disease, of legislation with regard to it, and the necessity, in the case of pleuro-pneumonia, of the adoption of the most energetic measures.

"29. In the case of Ireland, the failure of the system in checking the spread of these diseases cannot be attributed, as it fairly may in a great measure in this country, to the action, or rather want of action, of the local authorities, the responsibility and power being there vested solely in the central authority, the Veterinary Department of the Privy Council, and its orders being carried out by an efficient body of men, the Royal Irish Constabulary."

MOTION MADE, and Question proposed, That the Draft Report proposed by the Chairman be now read a second time, paragraph by paragraph—(The Chairman).—Amendment proposed to leave out the words "The Chairman," and insert the words "Mr. Kavanagh"—(Mr. Kavanagh).—Question put, That the words "The Chairman," stand part of the Question.—The Committee divided:

Ayes, 11.
Mr. Monnell.
Mr. Ridley.
Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson.
Mr. Jacob Bright.
Mr. Pell.
Mr. James Barclay.
Mr. Dent.
Mr. Tipping.
Mr. O'Connor.
Mr. Clay.
Mr. Clare Read.

Noes, 1.
Mr. Kavanagh.

Main Question put, and agreed to.

Draft Report proposed by the Chairman, read a second time, paragraph by paragraph:

Paragraph 1—3, agreed to.

Paragraph 4.—Amendment proposed, at the end of the paragraph to add the words, "and further recommend, that should stringent measures be taken in the United Kingdom for stamping out pleuro-pneumonia, foreign cattle coming from all countries in which that fatal disease exists, shall also be slaughtered at the port of landing, as the Committee are satisfied that no inspection can guard against the introduction of a disease which has so long and uncertain a period of incubation"—(Mr. Clare Read).—Question put, "That those words be there added."—The Committee divided:

Ayes, 6.
Mr. Ridley.
Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson.
Mr. Pell.
Mr. James Barclay.
Mr. Callan.
Mr. Clare Read.

Noes, 7.
Mr. Monnell.
Mr. Jacob Bright.
Mr. Kavanagh.
Mr. Dent.
Mr. Tipping.
Mr. O'Connor.
Mr. Clay.

Another Amendment proposed, at the end of the paragraph to add the words—

"But your Committee regard in a very different light the other class of foreign import, viz. store stock. To supply the demands of dairymen and farmers, evidence has been given to prove that it is a fruitful source of infection, and appears to contribute in no small degree to keep alive disease in the metropolitan dairies, and in other rural districts where these animals go.

"It would also seem, especially with regard to Holland, from whence these store cattle chiefly come, to be a source of supply, of a very fitful and capricious nature, being governed by the question of the scarcity or otherwise of hay or winter food for the sustenance of these animals in that country.

"Your Committee are of opinion that greater risk than advantage attaches to this source of supply, as such stock instead of being purchased on landing by butchers as in the case of fat stock, and sent direct to their destination for slaughter, are exposed in pens and markets, and if infected spread that infection through the land; only remotely and indirectly can restrictions upon this class of the trade affect the price of meat.

"They therefore recommend that, after proper notice being given, the importation of all foreign stock, save for the purposes of slaughter, should be discontinued."—(Mr. Clare Read).—

Read).—Question put, That these words be there added.—The Committee divided:

Ayes, 6.

Mr. Ridley.
Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson.
Mr. Pell.
Mr. Kavanagh.
Mr. Callan.
Mr. Clare Read.

Noes, 8.

Mr. Monseil.
Mr. Jacob Bright.
Mr. James Barclay.
Mr. Dent.
Mr. Tipping.
Mr. Lusk.
Mr. O'Connor.
Mr. Clay.

Question put, That the Paragraph stand part of the Report.—The Committee divided:

Ayes, 10.

Mr. Monseil.
Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson.
Mr. Jacob Bright.
Mr. James Barclay.
Mr. Kavanagh.
Mr. Dent.
Mr. Tipping.
Mr. Lusk.
Mr. O'Connor.
Mr. Clay.

Noes, 4.

Mr. Ridley.
Mr. Pell.
Mr. Callan.
Mr. Clare Read.

Paragraph 5.—Amendment proposed, in line 1, to leave out from the word "convinces," to the words "other evidence," in line 4 (both inclusive).—(Mr. Clay).—Question put, That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the paragraph.—The Committee divided:

Ayes, 8.

Mr. Ridley.
Mr. Pell.
Mr. James Barclay.
Mr. Kavanagh.
Mr. Dent.
Mr. Tipping.
Mr. Lusk.
Mr. Clare Read.

Noes, 6.

Mr. Monseil.
Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson.
Mr. Jacob Bright.
Mr. Callan.
Mr. O'Connor.
Mr. Clay.

Another Amendment proposed at end of the paragraph, to add the words, "and should also insist upon the space devoted to foreign stock being at a reasonable distance from any home cattle market, or place where home stock are kept or grazed".—(Mr. Clare Read).—Question, That those words be there added,—put, and *negatived*.—Paragraph *agreed to*.

Paragraph 6.—Amendment made.—Another amendment proposed in line 15, after the word "pleuro-pneumonia," to leave out Sub-sections (a) and (b), and insert the words: "Your Committee are of opinion that the immediate slaughter of all animals so affected should be made compulsory, and that in order to ensure the immediate discovery of the occurrence of the disease, which they regard as a consideration of the greatest importance, recommend that the owner of the animal so slaughtered, if he has given the earliest information possible to the proper authority, should be compensated out of the local rates to the amount of four-fifths of the fair marketable value of the animal before it became infected, proper care and precaution being of course taken to ascertain what that real value was, and that any failure or omission to give this information should be made punishable by a heavy fine".—(Mr. Kavanagh).—instead thereof.—Question, That the words, "That the slaughter of all" stand part of the paragraph,—put, and *agreed to*.

Other Amendments made.

Another Amendment proposed, in page xvii, Enc 3, Sub-section (c), to leave out "two" and insert "three".—(Mr. James Barclay).—instead thereof.—Question, That the word "two" stand part of the paragraph,—put, and *agreed to*.

[Adjourned till To-morrow, at Half-past Eleven.

Friday, 25th July 1873.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mr. WILLIAM EDWARD FORSTER in the Chair.

Mr. Clare Read.
Mr. Callan.
Mr. Tipping.
Mr. Ridley.
Mr. Dent.
Mr. Kavanagh.
Mr. Clay.

Mr. Pell.
Mr. O'Connor.
Mr. Lusk.
Mr. James Barclay.
Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson.
Mr. Monsell.
Mr. Jacob Bright.

Paragraph 6, as amended, further considered.—Other Amendments made.—Paragraph, as amended, agreed to.

Paragraphs 7—8, agreed to.

Paragraph 9.—Amendment proposed, at the end of the paragraph, to add the words: "Your Committee regret that the circulation given to a 'Report on Trade in Animals,' by its publication in the Journal of the Royal Agricultural Society of England, has caused much needless alarm, very injurious in its effects, as to the prevalence of foot and mouth disease amongst cattle in Ireland. That it has been proved to the satisfaction of your Committee that the cattle in Ireland are, as a rule, singularly healthy, and that Irish cattle leaving homes in perfect health frequently become affected with disease from being brought into contact with cattle in this country"—Mr. Callan.—Question put, That these words be there added.—The Committee divided.

Ayes, 3.
Mr. Kavanagh.
Mr. Callan.
Mr. O'Connor.

Noes, 10.
Mr. Ridley.
Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson.
Mr. Pell.
Mr. James Barclay.
Mr. Dent.
Mr. Cawley.
Mr. Tipping.
Mr. Lusk.
Mr. Clay.
Mr. Clare Read.

Another Amendment proposed, at the end of the paragraph, to add the following words: "That the evidence given clearly proves the fact to be that the steamers trading from the principal Irish ports are of superior construction, built expressly with a view to supply the requirements of the cattle trade. That the cattle conveyed by those steamers are carried carefully, and generally delivered from the steamers in good condition. That the evidence respecting those steamers proved that the mortality arising from accidents, overcrowding, &c., is not more than 1 in 25,000; and that the Orders of Council regarding disinfection of the steamers are substantially carried out"—(Mr. Callan).—Question put, That these words be there added.—The Committee divided:

Aye, 1.
Mr. Callan.

Noes, 12.
Mr. Ridley.
Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson.
Mr. Pell.
Mr. James Barclay.
Mr. Kavanagh.
Mr. Dent.
Mr. Cawley.
Mr. Tipping.
Mr. Lusk.
Mr. O'Connor.
Mr. Clay.
Mr. Clare Read.

Paragraph agreed to.

Paragraph 10.—Amendment proposed in line 2, after the word "disease," to insert
353. c 4 th

the words, "when widely spread"—(Mr. James Barclay).—Question put, That those words be there inserted.—The Committee divided:

Ayes, 2.
Mr. James Barclay.
Mr. Clare Read.

Noes, 11.
Mr. Ridley.
Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson.
Mr. Pell.
Mr. Kavanagh.
Mr. Dent.
Mr. Cawley.
Mr. Callan.
Mr. Tipping.
Mr. Lusk.
Mr. O'Connor.
Mr. Clay.

Paragraph agreed to.

Paragraph 11.—Amendment proposed, at the end of the paragraph, to add the words: "Should this disease gradually disappear, or become restricted to a few localities, as many witnesses anticipate, it may be found practicable to apply such stringent restrictions within these localities as may prevent the spread of the disease"—(Mr. James Barclay).—Question, That those words be there added,—put, and negatived.—Paragraph agreed to.

Paragraph 12.—Amendment proposed, in line 3, after the word "disease," to insert the words "except for the purposes of slaughter"—(Mr. Kavanagh).—Question put, That those words be there inserted:

Ayes, 3.
Mr. Kavanagh.
Mr. Callan.
Mr. O'Connor.

Noes, 10.
Mr. Ridley.
Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson.
Mr. Pell.
Mr. James Barclay.
Mr. Dent.
Mr. Cawley.
Mr. Tipping.
Mr. Lusk.
Mr. Clay.
Mr. Clare Read.

Another Amendment proposed, in Sub-section (a), line 1, after the word "cease," to insert the word "meanwhile"—(Mr. James Barclay).—Question, That the word "meanwhile" be there inserted,—put, and negatived.

Another Amendment proposed, at end of Sub-section (a), to insert the words: "Although at some future time, in circumstances already indicated, restrictions may be found expedient and practicable within limited areas"—(Mr. James Barclay).—Question, That those words be there inserted,—put, and negatived.

Another Amendment proposed, at the end of Sub-section (b), to insert the words, "but owners shall be relieved from the necessity of giving notice to the police of the existence of this disease among their stock"—(Mr. Clare Read).—Question, That those words be there inserted.—The Committee divided:

Ayes, 8.
Mr. Pell.
Mr. James Barclay.
Mr. Dent.
Mr. Cawley.
Mr. Callan.
Mr. Tipping.
Mr. O'Connor.
Mr. Clare Read.

Noes, 6.
Mr. Monsell.
Mr. Ridley.
Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson.
Mr. Kavanagh.
Mr. Lusk.
Mr. Clay.

Another Amendment proposed, at the end of Sub-section (b), to insert the words, "except in the cases of animals intended for slaughter"—(Mr. Kavanagh).—Question, That those words be there inserted,—put, and negatived.

Another Amendment proposed, at the end of Sub-section (b), to insert the words, "but that in case of that disease the penalties for moving cattle shall not apply within any borough which has a population exceeding 100,000 people; and that the penalties for exposing cattle

cattle shall not apply to markets where no store cattle are offered for sale"—(Mr. Kavanagh).—Question put, That those words be there inserted.—The Committee divided:

Aye, 1.
Mr. Kavanagh.

Noes, 12.
Mr. Monsell.
Mr. Ridley.
Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson.
Mr. Pell.
Mr. James Barclay.
Mr. Dent.
Mr. Cawley.
Mr. Callan.
Mr. Tipping.
Mr. Lusk.
Mr. O'Connor.
Mr. Clay.
Mr. Clare Read.

Other Amendments made.

Paragraph, as amended, *agreed to*.

Paragraph 13 *agreed to*.

Paragraph 14.—Amendment proposed, at the end of the paragraph to add the words, "except foot and mouth disease"—(Mr. Clare Read).—Question, That those words be there added:

Ayes, 10.
Mr. Monsell.
Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson.
Mr. Pell.
Mr. Kavanagh.
Mr. Cawley.
Mr. Callan.
Mr. Tipping.
Mr. Lusk.
Mr. O'Connor.
Mr. Clare Read.

Noes, 4.
Mr. Ridley.
Mr. James Barclay.
Mr. Dent.
Mr. Clay.

Paragraph, as amended, *agreed to*.

Paragraph 15.—Amendment proposed, in line 1, to leave out the words, "to your Committee," and at end of paragraph insert the words, "But your Committee are of opinion that these complaints have been much exaggerated, and that, as regards the two countries, the spread of infection has been reciprocal. They therefore recommend"—(Mr. Kavanagh).—instead thereof.—Question put, That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the paragraph.—The Committee divided:

Ayes, 9.
Mr. Ridley.
Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson.
Mr. Pell.
Mr. James Barclay.
Mr. Dent.
Mr. Cawley.
Mr. Tipping.
Mr. Lusk.
Mr. Clay.

Noes, 5.
Mr. Monsell.
Mr. Kavanagh.
Mr. Callan.
Mr. O'Connor.
Mr. Clare Read.

Paragraph *agreed to*.

Paragraph 16.—Amendment proposed, to leave out from the beginning down to the word "recommend," in line 3.—(Mr. Kavanagh).—Question, that the words proposed to be left out stand part of the paragraph.—put, and *agreed to*.

Another Amendment proposed, to leave out Sub-section (b).—(Mr. Callan).—Question put, That Sub-section (b) stand part of the paragraph.—The Committee divided:

Ayes, 11.
Mr. Monsell.
Mr. Ridley.
Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson.
Mr. Pell.
Mr. James Barclay.
Mr. Dent.
Mr. Cawley.
Mr. Tipping.
Mr. Lusk.
Mr. Clay.
Mr. Clare Read.

Noes, 3.
Mr. Kavanagh.
Mr. Callan.
Mr. O'Connor.

Another Amendment proposed, at the end of Sub-section (d) to insert the words, "and that all such animals should be rested six hours, and fed and watered, before they are sent inland by rail"—(Mr. *Clare Read*).—Question put, That those words be there inserted.—The Committee divided:

Ayes, 2.
Mr. Pell.
Mr. *Clare Read*.

Noes, 12.
Mr. Monsell.
Mr. Ridley.
Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson.
Mr. James Barclay.
Mr. Kavanagh.
Mr. Dent.
Mr. Cawley.
Mr. Callan.
Mr. Tipping.
Mr. Lusk.
Mr. O'Connor.
Mr. Clay.

Another Amendment proposed, to leave out Sub-section (e)—(Mr. *Kenanagh*).—Question put, That Sub-section (e) stand part of the paragraph.—The Committee divided:

Ayes, 10.
Mr. Ridley.
Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson.
Mr. Pell.
Mr. James Barclay.
Mr. Kavanagh.
Mr. Dent.
Mr. Cawley.
Mr. Tipping.
Mr. Lusk.
Mr. *Clare Read*.

Noes, 4.
Mr. Monsell.
Mr. Callan.
Mr. O'Connor.
Mr. Clay.

Another Amendment proposed, at end of Sub-section (e), to insert the words, "That similar steps should be taken in Great Britain to prevent shipment to Ireland of any diseased or infected animals"—(Mr. *Callan*).—Question put, That those words be there inserted.—The Committee divided:

Ayes, 7.
Mr. Monsell.
Mr. James Barclay.
Mr. Kavanagh.
Mr. Dent.
Mr. Callan.
Mr. O'Connor.
Mr. *Clare Read*.

Noes, 7.
Mr. Ridley.
Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson.
Mr. Pell.
Mr. Cawley.
Mr. Tipping.
Mr. Lusk.
Mr. Clay.

Whereupon, the Chairman declared himself with the *Noes*

Question put, That the paragraph stand part of the Report.—The Committee divided:

Ayes, 11.
Mr. Monsell.
Mr. Ridley.
Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson.
Mr. Pell.
Mr. James Barclay.
Mr. Dent.
Mr. Cawley.
Mr. Tipping.
Mr. Lusk.
Mr. Clay.
Mr. *Clare Read*.

Noes, 3.
Mr. Kavanagh.
Mr. Callan.
Mr. O'Connor.

Paragraph 17.—Amendments made.—Another Amendment proposed, at end of the paragraph as amended, to add the words, "and that a sufficient number of travelling inspectors should be appointed and employed by the central authority to give effect to such

such orders"—(Mr. Pell)—Question put, that those words be there added.—The Committee divided:

Ayes, 8.
Mr. Monsell.
Mr. Ridley.
Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson.
Mr. Pell.
Mr. Dent.
Mr. Cawley.
Mr. Tipping.
Mr. Clay.
Mr. Clare Read.

Noes, 4.
Mr. James Barclay.
Mr. Kavanagh.
Mr. Lusk.
Mr. O'Connor.

Paragraph, as amended, agreed to.

Paragraph 18.—Amendment proposed at the end of the paragraph to add the words, "But your Committee have inquired into the relative expenses of the Veterinary Departments of London and Dublin. In Ireland the importation of foreign stock is insignificant. The London Department have to regulate a large and varying foreign trade, and are responsible for the proper transit, landing and inspection of thousands of cattle and sheep. They have to keep the Privy Council informed of the state of disease among stock upon the Continent, which is chiefly procured through the Foreign Office. The real work, however, of the inspection of foreign stock falls first upon the port inspectors, and afterwards upon the different market inspectors who are not appointed by the Veterinary Department. Throughout Great Britain the Act is put in force by the various local authorities, therefore the chief employment of the central office with regard to home stock is mainly confined to issuing general orders, and in collecting and tabulating returns, which have hitherto been made public at irregular intervals; on the other hand, in Ireland, every regulation for the suppression of cattle diseases, and for the inspection, isolation, and transit of stock, emanates from the central authority. The Veterinary Department in Dublin, through the agency of the constabulary, entirely work the Act without any assistance or contribution from the local authorities, or in England and Scotland. With regard to the home trade, therefore, a much greater amount of responsibility and of trouble rests upon the Veterinary Department in Dublin than in London; yet the former costs the country only 1,800*l.* a year, while the expenses of the latter are nearly 12,000*l.* It appears that Professor Ferguson himself, with a salary of 750*l.*, performs the duties which are in London divided among the secretary, chief clerk, and head inspector, whose united salaries amount to 2,400*l.* Your Committee deem it their duty to draw attention to these different rates of payment, and are of opinion that as the reports of foot and mouth disease are now discontinued, the clerical work of the London Office cannot be so great as when those voluminous returns were insisted upon."—(Mr. Clare Read)—Question put, That those words be there added.—The Committee divided:

Ayes, 3.
Mr. Pell.
Mr. James Barclay.
Mr. Clare Read.

Noes, 10.
Mr. Monsell.
Mr. Ridley.
Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson.
Mr. Jacob Bright.
Mr. Dent.
Mr. Cawley.
Mr. Tipping.
Mr. Lusk.
Mr. O'Connor.
Mr. Clay.

Another Amendment, That the following new paragraph be inserted in the Report:—"Your Committee recommend that annual reports should be prepared by the secretary and inspectors, and laid before Parliament early in each year"—(Chairman).—Question, That this paragraph be inserted in the Report.—put, and agreed to.

Another Amendment proposed, That the following new paragraphs be inserted in the Report:

"Many witnesses have strongly represented that a reduction in the number of local authorities would result in greater efficiency, and economy in carrying out the provisions of the Act, and it has been suggested that the authorities for counties or ridings should include the boroughs within them, provision being made in the constitution of the local authorities for the due representation of the boroughs."

"In the case of, at least, two important counties in Scotland, the county and hugh authorities have amalgamated so far as practicable, under the Act, and the union has proved satisfactory."

"Your Committee are of opinion that amalgamation is desirable, and recommend that in Scotland, where the local authorities are differently constituted from what they are in England, there should be only one local authority for each county, the hughes being duly represented at the general board; and that the general expenses be levied over the whole district, and the cost attending the slaughter of cattle exclusively over the hugh

burgh or landward part of the county wherein the slaughter takes place"—(Mr. James Barclay).—Question, That this paragraph be inserted in the Report,—put, and agreed to.

Another Amendment proposed, That the following new paragraphs be inserted in the Report:—"All the witnesses who have expressed an opinion on the subject agree that the compensation provided by the Act is insufficient. It has been urged that it is of the greatest importance for dealing successfully and economically with the suppression of disease, to have early discovery of its existence; that this is practically impossible by any system of inspection, particularly as regards pleuro-pneumonia, and that local authorities must trust very much to the co-operation of stock-owners, who, however, cannot be expected to report disease, unless fairly and liberally compensated for their loss.

"The witnesses concur in the belief that a higher rate of compensation would not induce fraud or recklessness; on these grounds, that, inasmuch as the compensation is paid out of local rates, the local authority would exercise sufficient vigilance to prevent excessive claims; and that, if farmers were compensated to the extent of even the full value of the animals slaughtered, their indirect loss would still be considerable.

"Your Committee concur generally in these opinions, and recommend that whatever compensation is paid should bear a certain proportion to the owner's loss, rather than to the value of the animal, and that local authorities should be empowered to grant such compensation to an extent not exceeding three-fourths of the loss sustained by the owner, provided that it does not exceed 25 l. for any animal"—(Mr. James Barclay).—Question proposed, That this paragraph be inserted in the Report.—Amendment proposed to proposed Amendment, in line 18, to leave out the word "three-fourths," and insert "one-half"—(Mr. Dent).—instead thereof.—Question put, That the word "three-fourths" stand part of the proposed Amendment.—The Committee decided:

Ayes, 4.

Mr. Monseil.
Mr. Ridley.
Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson.
Mr. Pell.
Mr. James Barclay.
Mr. Cawley.
Mr. Tipping.
Mr. O'Connor.
Mr. Clare Read.

Noes, 4.

Mr. Jacob Bright.
Mr. Dent.
Mr. Lusk.
Mr. Clay.

Main Question put, and agreed to.—Paragraph inserted.

Another Amendment proposed, That the following new paragraph be inserted in the Report:

"INSPECTION.

"(2.) It appears that many local authorities have nominally appointed inspectors without assigning to them any duties or emoluments. Your Committee are of opinion that, with very few exceptions, local authorities ought to appoint some competent person to carry out the provisions of the Act, and they recommend that every local authority should appoint at least one inspector or chief officer, with duties and emoluments approved by the Privy Council Department"—(Mr. James Barclay).—Question, That this paragraph be inserted in the Report,—put, and agreed to.

Another Amendment proposed, That the following new paragraph be inserted in the Report, "The evidence of the Clerk to the Deptford Market shows that the nearest railway station where foreign meat can be loaded is one mile away, and that direct railway communication is very desirable. Your Committee are of opinion that this deficiency prevents buyers for the manufacturing districts attending the market, and deprives the inhabitants of such districts and the foreign importer of the full advantage which a market, in every other respect good and complete, might be expected to confer: and that the introduction of a railway or tramway would facilitate the transmission of large and regular supplies to populous districts outside the Metropolis"—(Mr. Pell).—Question put, That this paragraph be inserted in the Report.—The Committee decided:

Ayes, 6.

Mr. Jacob Bright.
Mr. Pell.
Mr. James Barclay.
Mr. Cowper.
Mr. Clare Read.

Noes, 8.

Mr. Monseil.
Mr. Ridley.
Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson.
Mr. Dent.
Mr. Cawley.
Mr. Tipping.
Mr. Lusk.
Mr. O'Connor.

Question, That this Report, as amended, be the Report of the Committee to The House,—put, and agreed to.

Ordered to Report, together with the Minutes of the Evidence, and an Appendix.

EXPENSES OF WITNESSES.

NAME of WITNESS.	Profession or Condition.	From whence Summoned.	Number of Days Absent from Home, under Orders of Committee.	Allowance during Absence from Home.	Expenses of Journey to London and back.	TOTAL Expenses allowed to Witness.
				£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.
Mr. Robert Fisher -	Tinney Farmer -	Leconfield, Beverley -	3	3 0 -	3 - -	6 0 -
Mr. Jerome J. Galey -	Landed Proprietor -	Bedford, Tipperary -	4	4 4 -	0 10 -	10 14 -
Mr. Samuel Gerrett -	Magistrate for counties of Meath and Dub- lin.	Archar, Meath -	4	4 4 -	3 13 -	10 17 -
Professor Thomas Baldwin	Superintendent Model Farms, &c., Ireland.	In London when sum- moned.	6	6 3 -	- - -	3 3 -
Mr. Wm. Baker -	Farmer -	Tellerboy, County Limer- ick.	4	4 4 -	3 6 -	10 10 -
Mr. Thomas Verden -	Cattle Dealer -	Liverpool -	8	8 3 -	7 3 -	15 11 -
Mr. Richard Walsh -	Cattle Dealer -	Kingswood Saggart, Ire- land.	7	7 7 -	5 19 -	13 6 -
Mr. Thomas Duckham	Farmer -	Baystone Court, Ross -	8	3 3 -	3 10 -	6 13 -
Mr. Peter O'Neill -	Secretary to the Dro- gheda Steam Packet Company.	Drogheda -	5	5 5 -	7 6 -	13 10 -
Professor Ferguson -	Director General of the Veterinary Depart- ment in Ireland.	Dublin Castle -	10	10 16 -	0 8 -	23 1 -
Mr. Robert Morrow -	Farmer and Cattle Ba- peter.	Belfast -	4	3 6 -	4 3 6	10 9 6
Captain James Smith	Chief Constable of Cheshire.	Chester -	3	3 3 -	3 5 -	6 8 -
Mr. James Thomson -	Veterinary Surgeon -	Aberdeen -	8	3 8 -	7 3 6	15 11 6
Mr. William Goodlet -	Farmer -	Aberbroath -	4	4 4 -	7 10 3	11 14 6
Mr. George Stewart -	Veterinary Surgeon -	Perth -	7	7 7 -	7 1 3	14 8 6
Mr. Wm. S. Walker	Board of Supervision, Edinburgh.	Edinburgh -	9	3 3 -	7 7 -	10 10 -
Mr. Andrew Milne -	Farmer -	Monrovia -	7	7 7 -	7 3 -	14 10 -
Mr. David Smith -	Farmer -	Dundee -	3	5 3 -	5 10 -	8 13 -
Mr. Herbert Murray	Treasurer Remembrance, Ireland.	Dublin Castle -	3	3 3 -	5 13 -	8 15 -
Mr. Septimus Lambert	Veterinary Surgeon and Cattle Dealer.	Thorford, Marshmore -	3	3 3 -	2 13 8	6 1 6
Mr. William Brown	Builder -	Beckley, Manchester -	3	2 3 -	2 13 6	5 3 6
TOTAL - - - £.				114 12 -	113 2 -	227 14 -

LIST OF WITNESSES.

<i>Monday, 10th March 1873.</i>		<i>Thursday, 22nd May 1873.</i>	
	PAGE		PAGE
Mr. Alexander Williams - - -	1	Mr. Thomas Verdon - - -	325
		Mr. Richard Walsh - - -	334
<i>Thursday, 13th March 1873.</i>		<i>Monday, 9th June 1873.</i>	
Mr. Alexander Williams - - -	20	Mr. John Algernon Clarke - -	339
<i>Thursday, 20th March 1873.</i>		<i>Thursday, 12th June 1873.</i>	
Mr. Alexander Williams - - -	42	Mr. Thomas Rigby - - -	360
Professor George Thomas Brown -	53	Professor John Adam McBride -	370
<i>Monday, 24th March 1873.</i>		Mr. William Clode - - -	383
Professor George Thomas Brown -	64	<i>Monday, 16th June 1873.</i>	
<i>Thursday, 27th March 1873.</i>		Professor John Gamgee - - -	385
Professor George Thomas Brown -	86	Mr. Thomas Duckham - - -	404
<i>Monday, 31st March 1873.</i>		<i>Thursday, 19th June 1873.</i>	
Professor James Beart Simonds -	109	Mr. James Odams - - -	410
<i>Thursday, 3rd April 1873.</i>		Captain Johnes Smith - - -	421
Professor James Beart Simonds -	131	<i>Thursday, 26th June 1873.</i>	
Mr. Charles Eardley-Wilmot - -	146	Mr. William Clode - - -	424
<i>Thursday, 24th April 1873.</i>		Mr. Alexander Williams - - -	436
Professor Thomas Baldwin - - -	150	Mr. Anthony George Robinson -	437
Mr. George Philcox - - -	172	Mr. George Andrew Lepper - -	446
<i>Monday, 28th April 1873.</i>		Mr. Henry Webb - - -	450
Professor Thomas Baldwin - - -	174	Mr. John Denchfield - - -	452
Mr. William Stratton - - -	183	<i>Monday, 30th June 1873.</i>	
Mr. William Hunting - - -	192	Mr. James Thomson - - -	458
<i>Thursday, 1st May 1873.</i>		Mr. William Goodlot - - -	468
Professor Hugh Ferguson - - -	196	Mr. George Stewart - - -	476
Mr. Robert Fisher - - -	208	<i>Thursday, 3rd July 1873.</i>	
<i>Monday, 5th May 1873.</i>		Mr. James Thomson - - -	482
Professor Hugh Ferguson - - -	216	Mr. George Stewart - - -	483
<i>Thursday, 8th May 1873.</i>		Mr. Andrew Milne - - -	485
Mr. Robert Morrow - - -	236	Mr. William Stuart Walker - -	491
Mr. Henry Michael Jenkins - -	245	Mr. David Smith - - -	498
<i>Monday, 12th May 1873.</i>		<i>Monday, 7th July 1873.</i>	
Professor Hugh Ferguson - - -	260	Mr. Herbert Murray - - -	504
Mr. Jerome James Guiry - - -	261	Mr. Abraham Hodgkiss - - -	508
Mr. Samuel Garnett - - -	265	Mr. Hermann Gebhardt - - -	511
Professor Thomas Baldwin - - -	277	<i>Thursday, 10th July 1873.</i>	
<i>Thursday, 15th May 1873.</i>		Mr. George Christopher Roberts -	527
Mr. Peter O'Neill - - -	278	Mr. Septimus Lambert, jun. -	539
Mr. Thomas Verdon - - -	289	Mr. George Woodcock - - -	551
<i>Monday, 19th May 1873.</i>		Mr. William Brown - - -	552
Captain Charles Dent - - -	301	<i>Monday, 14th July 1873.</i>	
Mr. William Bolster - - -	305	Mr. James Webb - - -	558
Mr. Thomas Verdon - - -	317	Mr. Clare Sewell Read, M.P. -	560
		Mr. Samuel James Rayment - -	564

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE.

Monday, 10th March 1873.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mr. James Barclay.
Mr. Crawley.
Mr. Clay.
Mr. Dent.
Mr. Dodson.
Mr. William Edward Forster.
Mr. William Johnston.
Mr. Kavanagh.

Mr. Moncell.
Lord Robert Montagu.
Mr. O'Connor.
Mr. Pell.
Mr. Clare Read.
Mr. Ridley.
Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson.
Mr. Tipping.

THE RIGHT HONOURABLE WILLIAM EDWARD FORSTER, IN THE CHAIR.

Mr. ALEXANDER WILLIAMS, called in; and Examined.

1. *Chairman.* WHAT office do you fill in the Veterinary Department of the Privy Council?—Secretary.

2. For how long have you filled that office?—With the exception of six months, for nearly eight years.

3. Therefore you have been secretary of the office ever since the Act of 1869 was passed, and for some time before?—I have.

4. Were you at all engaged in this matter before being appointed to that office?—I was.

5. You were medical advisor, were you not, to Colonel Harness?—Yes.

6. What office did he hold at that time?—He was Secretary to the Cattle Plague Department at that time, but I had previously been Secretary of the Veterinary Department.

7. The Veterinary Department was temporarily established before its present constitution was settled, was it not?—It was; in August 1865.

8. On what form?—I had some clerks at my own house, and relieved Professor Simonds of some of the work that he used to take; all the correspondence and the general business connected with it; Professor Simonds attended to the professional matters.

9. At that time the Department was under the control of the Home Secretary, was it not?—It was; the organisation was recommended by Mr. Baring, now Lord Northbrook; he and Mr. Helps, now Sir Arthur Helps, and Mr. Childers, arranged the first temporary establishment.

0.58.

10. When was the Cattle Plague Department transferred to the Privy Council Office?—In 1868, a conference was held between Mr. Hamilton of the Treasury, and Mr. Baring, now Lord Northbrook, as representing the Home Office, and Mr. Bruce, as representing the Council Office, he being then Vice-President of the Committee of Council on Education; and on their recommendation the Cattle Plague Department was sanctioned as a temporary department under the Privy Council Office. The Veterinary Department was then made a subordinate branch of the Cattle Plague Department, merely taking the statistical work.

11. The Cattle Plague Department being at that time under the Privy Council?—Under the Privy Council.

12. How long did that arrangement last?—For six months. In November 1868 the Treasury sanctioned the re-organisation of the Veterinary Department, and the resumption by the department of its original name, it having been for six months called the Cattle Plague Department, under a different organisation, and having different officers attached.

13. How long did it last in that form?—Until the close of 1868, without any great alteration, except that it was reduced from time to time as the work was reduced. On the disappearance of the cattle plague, as the work grew less, the number of clerks was reduced.

14. Then, in 1868, what change was made?—In 1868 the department was for the first time entered

Mr.
Alexander
Williams.
—
10 March
1873.

Mr.
Alexander
Williams.
—
10 March
1873.

entered on the Estimates as a subordinate department of the Privy Council Office. Previously, all payments connected with the department had been made out of the Civil Contingencies Fund, no grant being made by Parliament directly for the department in any way, but sums being repaid for the expenses that had been incurred.

15. That was its form at the time the Act of 1869 was passed?—It was.

16. And there has been no alteration, has there, in its actual form in consequence of the passing of that Act, though there might have been changes from time to time in the number of the clerks?—In 1868 another Commission sat upon the subject before the passing of the Act.

17. What Commission was that?—It consisted of Lord Robert Montagu, Mr. Hamilton, Mr. Helps, and Sir William Clarke, and it took into consideration the state of the country with regard to the risk of the contagious diseases of cattle, the work performed by the Veterinary Department, the propriety of reducing that work and the staff of the establishment.

18. That was a departmental commission, was it not, in consequence of the cessation of the cattle plague, to consider what should be the constitution of the office?—Yes.

19. And the present constitution of the office is very much the result of the decision of that Commission, is it not?—No; there has since been another Commission, which modified it. By a Treasury Minute of the 22nd of October 1869 another Commission, consisting of Mr. Forster, Mr. Hamilton, Mr. Helps, and Sir William Clarke, was appointed to organise the staff that was necessary for conducting the business of the Veterinary Department.

20. But am I not right in saying that although the last Commission (of which I was a member) decided the actual number of the principal clerks, yet that the constitution of it as a Veterinary Department was settled in the previous Commission?—It was.

21. Then the result of the Commission of which I was a member was the organisation of the department as at present, was it not?—Yes.

22. What is its present constitution and organisation?—The Treasury sanctioned an establishment consisting of a secretary, chief clerk, two inspectors, and three clerks.

23. Three first-class clerks, you mean?—Three clerks are the only clerks that are on the establishment.

24. What are the duties of the secretary?—In the first place, to keep himself generally acquainted with all matters connected with the subject at home and abroad, then to attend Committees of the Lords of the Council which relate to the department, and to submit all matters to them according to his instructions, and generally to carry out the instructions of the Lords of the Council.

25. The secretary is responsible, is he not, to the Lord President, and to the Vice-President of the Council, for the carrying out under his control and supervision of the Act of 1869, so far as the Central Department can carry out such Act?—Yes.

26. Has the chief clerk any special duty?—He conducts the general business of the office, and the correspondence, and takes the duties of the secretary in his absence.

27. Then there are three clerks who are specially named as clerks; I suppose that each of

them has special business under him?—Generally so, but the business varies so much that one is obliged to assist the other whenever the pressure is upon any particular branch.

28. In what mode do you attempt to divide it?—Miscellaneous, in the first place; then statistical (which is much the largest branch of the office) in the second place; then the transit of animals, and all matters connected with that, is a third branch.

29. How many other clerks have you in the office?—At the present moment we have seven temporary clerks, our proper complement being nine; there being two vacancies which have not been filled up; the salaries of this class vary from 150 l. to 210 l. Then we have 17 other temporary clerks, who are now registered as writers, at salaries varying from 2 l. to 2 l. 10 s. a week; and we have five ordinary writers, who are dismissed when they are not required, and taken on again when they are required.

30. Your demand for writers must of course vary, according to the pressure upon the office, from the state of diseases?—I am sorry to say that the writers are not capable of doing the work that could be done by the temporary clerks, and therefore we cannot make as much use of them as we ought to do, but we do apply for them when we are pressed, though we very rarely find them capable of doing the better class of work.

31. You have suffered by the change of system, from temporary clerks to writers?—Very seriously; though only so far as these five clerks are concerned at present; but if the places of all our clerks are to be supplied by writers, I do not think I shall be able to carry out the work of the office; you cannot expect that class of work for 30 s. a week.

32. The first duty of the department is the carrying out the Act, as regards the import of foreign animals, is it not?—It is.

33. Secondly, the prevention, as much as possible, of home diseases?—I should scarcely say the prevention; we do very little with regard to seeing that the Act is carried out; that is not done at all by us; that is done, or ought to be done, by the local authorities.

34. But it is your business, is it not, to communicate with the local authorities, and to get information from them?—Quite so, and to call their attention to the provisions of the Act.

35. Is it not the case that you have much more work in the department, with regard to home diseases, than with regard to the foreign import?—Certainly.

36. Then, again, there are the regulations of the Act of Parliament, and of the Orders in Council, with regard to the transit of animals?—Yes.

37. How many inspectors are there connected with the office?—Two are attached to the office.

38. What are their names?—Professor Brown and Mr. Cope are the inspectors now.

39. Mr. Cope has been appointed in consequence of Professor Simonds having left the office, has he not?—Yes.

40. What are the duties of those two gentlemen?—Generally advising the department with reference to all matters relating to contagious diseases of animals; visiting and inspecting places where disease exists, or about which information is required, and advising the department with regard

Mr.
Alexander
Falkner
10 March
1873

regard to foreign diseases, as well as English diseases.

41. In case of the outbreak of any serious disease in the country, the inspector would be sent down to inquire into it, would he not?—He would.

42. There are several inspectors of foreign animals at the ports, are there not?—There are.

43. Until lately they were appointed by the Customs, I believe?—They were.

44. And they are now appointed under the Veterinary Department, are they not?—By the Lord President.

45. When was that change made?—The change was brought about gradually. The first appointment was the 1st of October 1871, and on the 1st of July 1872 the last appointment appears to have been made.

46. Those inspectors are now not only appointed by the Lord President, but they are entirely under the authority of the Veterinary Department, are they not, and are not responsible to the Customs?—Entirely so.

47. What is their duty?—To carry out the instructions of the department.

48. This paper which I have in my hand contains the instructions to those inspectors, does it not?—It does.

49. Will you read it in?—I will.

50. The payment of those gentlemen is now transferred from the Customs Department to the Veterinary Department, is it not?—It is.

51. Was it not the case that they were paid by fees, and that they are now paid generally by a fixed salary?—It is so.

52. It is their duty, is it not, to be on the watch for foreign cargoes of cattle which come from all countries, and to examine them?—It is. They also have communication with the Customs, who inform them of the expected arrival of vessels.

53. What was the chief reason which actuated the Veterinary Department in desiring the transfer of those gentlemen to their control?—They had no direct control over them, as to what the examination should be, and only indirectly by communications through the Customs, and with the approval of the Customs.

54. Was it not the case that great inconvenience was found in your having, in case of urgency, to communicate with the Customs, and through them with the inspectors, and also from the fact of the Lord President and myself being obliged to take that course?—Quite so.

55. And you found an advantage in their being immediately responsible to the department which is responsible to the public for the prevention, as much as possible, of these diseases?—Yes.

56. Previously they were paid by fees upon each animal, were they not?—Fees and allowances. There were different methods of payment; some by fees for each animal, some for each cargo, and varying materially at different places, but all for work done, the inspector having no interest whatever in the matter except on his services being required.

57. I must not be supposed for a moment to cast any slur upon those gentlemen, who, I believe, have performed their duty very well; but we considered, did we not, that a system was bad which might induce them to hurry over their inspection?—Quite so.

058.

58. When the "Joseph Soames," which, as you are aware, was the ship which brought the cattle plague into Hull, arrived at Hull, the Customs officer went on board, and information was sent to the veterinary inspector, who immediately attended. It is the business, of course, of the Customs officers, in the performance of their duties, always to board a ship on her arrival, is it not?—I presume so.

59. The statement being that the veterinary inspector immediately attended, those animals could not have been landed, and either slaughtered or passed into the interior without having been previously examined?—Certainly not.

60. The examination is after their being landed, is it not?—After their being landed.

61. And the business of the inspector is to deal with them after landing, and not before?—After landing. He had special instructions in this case, and therefore he went on board; otherwise they would only have come under his charge after landing.

62. The first instruction in this paper is, that the inspector is responsible, at the place or places at which he is acting as veterinary inspector, for carrying into effect the provisions of the foreign animals Order of 1871, from the time at which any foreign animals are delivered into his charge by the officers of Customs?—Yes; the landing is entirely in the hands of the Customs, the inspection after landing being in the hands of the inspectors.

63. There are a great many inspectors appointed throughout the country in consequence of the passing of the Act of 1869; it is the business of each local authority to appoint inspectors, is it not?—It is.

64. With the exception of the two general inspectors whom you have mentioned, the only inspectors appointed by the Lord President are those at the ports, are they not?—Yes.

65. But we do not consider that their duties are entirely restricted to the examination of foreign animals, do we?—We do not.

66. What other duty do we call upon them to perform?—There are two sets of inspectors, one paid by salary and the other still by fees, as formerly. As to those paid by salaries, we are entitled to the whole of their time, and when they are not engaged in the inspection of foreign cattle and we do not require them for that purpose, they are sent to obtain information about disease, or to look after the transit of animals in the district; but, of course, in those matters they can do little, because their time is much occupied in the attendance necessary at their own stations.

67. By far the largest proportion are paid by salary, are they not?—Yes.

68. And those at the principal ports?—Yes; at all of those importing a large number of animals.

69. I think that we do not ask from Parliament more money than was asked by the Customs?—The same amount.

70. Although we impose upon them, or try to impose upon them, other duties?—Yes, we do really impose upon them other duties.

71. I suppose I should be right in thinking that it is almost impossible for them to perform those duties without an addition to their number?—Certainly, it is impossible for the present number to perform them properly.

72. That is to say, that the present money which we have for inspection, which is the same amount as was previously voted to the Customs, does

Mr.
Alexander
Williams.
—
10 March
1873.

does not enable me to have that examination of Irish cattle that we should desire to have?—We should want four times the staff, I think.

73. At present we have an inspector at Liverpool and one at Bristol, have we not?—Yes; but not for Irish animals specially.

74. Those inspectors carry on the inspection which exists at those ports for foreign cattle; and we tried to get them to examine Irish cattle also?—Yes.

75. With regard to the regulations for transit, we ask them to inspect the vessels which arrive, and to report to us as regards their fulfilment of our Transit Order in the matter of ventilation and crowding?—Yes, we do.

76. But there, again, we should be glad of a rather large staff?—Quite so.

77. Supposing they find that the Act has not been carried out in the disinfection of a steamer, what power have the inspectors of carrying it out?—The inspectors merely report it to the office, and an official letter is then written to the owners, calling their attention to the order, and requiring them to attend to it.

78. I have shown you the heads of a Return with regard to the expenses incurred by the local authorities; has any similar Return ever been moved for?—Yes, a similar Return was moved for by Sir Charles Adderley, about the end of March 1871, I think.

79. Will you give the heads of that Return?—We received the letter from the Home Office on the 6th of April 1871; it was to be a Return “of all expenses during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1871 of the entire staff of officers connected with the Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act, 1869, in the Council Office, and of the salaries and duties of each officer, clerk, &c., and from all clerks of the local authorities of allowances of Inspectors during the year ending 31st of March 1871, under that Act in each district, whether paid to inspectors or in extra fees to police, showing the amounts expended by each committee, sub-committee, or district committee, appointed by any such local authority.”

80. You received the letter from the Home Office on what date?—On the 6th of April.

81. When did you get answers?—On the 18th of April the whole of the local authorities, 404 in number, had received the letter; only 283 of them had replied on the 30th of May, on which date a second circular was sent to those who had not replied. After waiting till the 4th of July, the Return was sent in, leaving 37 local authorities then from whom no replies had been received at all.

82. Acting upon my advice, I think you did not wait any longer, otherwise the Return could not have been brought before Parliament?—Quite so.

83. Did you find that the returns were always similar, or did they vary in the information which they gave?—They varied very much, and were very difficult to arrange.

84. It is very important to this Committee that we should as much as possible obtain a return of the expenses incurred by the local authorities, and of the number of officers whom they appoint; is there any suggestion which you could make by which we should be more likely to get that while the Committee is sitting?—I really do not know at all how to get it, or how to get it rapidly.

85. When you talk about extra staff, there is an impression, I believe, in the country that you could very well perform extra work, not having enough work to do at present; what is the real fact of that matter?—That, if we have the slightest extra work in the office, or if one of the clerks is ill or unable to attend, we are thrown back directly.

86. During what hours are the clerks expected to attend?—From eleven to five.

87. Have they ever any extra work?—Constantly; during the making of that Report, a number of them were there night after night till one o'clock, for which they do not get any pay; and not only do they get no pay, but they are put to expenses to which they would not otherwise be put.

88. And you have not always kept the Sabbath as much as you ought to do in this country, I believe?—We were 12 or 14 Sundays at work during the last year.

89. I think it is true that you have hardly had a holiday since you have been appointed?—Not in any one year have I had the holiday to which I am entitled.

90. What was the law with regard to the import of foreign animals previous to the passing of the Act of 1869?—In December 1868 all foreign cattle, except those from Spain, Portugal, Normandy, and Brittany, which were landed on the south or west coast of England and other places, were subject to the Foreign Cattle Regulations.

91. The Privy Council Office had the power, had it not, of issuing orders at that time with regard to the import of foreign animals?—Yes.

92. It also had the power, had it not, upon the appearance of disease in the country, of issuing orders as regards the movement of animals?—Yes.

93. Whence did it derive those powers?—From the Acts then in force.

94. There were several Acts in existence, were there not?—Eight at that time.

95. When it was my duty to bring in the Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act in 1869, the first thing I had to consider was that there existed a great many Acts varying in their provisions, almost conflicting, and a great number of Orders in Council?—There were.

96. One thing that was done in passing the Act, was to consolidate those Acts, was it not?—It was so.

97. What were the Regulations in force relating to the importation of animals before the Act, say in December 1868?—In addition to the Regulations with regard to all foreign cattle already mentioned, sheep from the Continent of Europe were obliged to be slaughtered at the landing place, or to undergo 14 days' quarantine.

98. That was in consequence of a recent outbreak of sheep-pox, was it not?—It was.

99. What was done in February 1869?—On the 19th of February the Government revoked the Orders relating to sheep coming from the Continent of Europe.

100. Now, I want to get at the exact state in which, so far as you can recollect, we were with regard to the import of foreign animals just before the Act of 1869 was passed; there were several countries, were there not, on arriving from which cattle had to be slaughtered at the port of landing?—There were.

101. What were those countries?—All countries,

tries, excepting Spain, Portugal, Normandy, and Brittany.

102. That restriction had been imposed in consequence of the cattle plague, had it not?—In consequence of the cattle plague.

103. Were the cattle from the countries you have just named, which had not to be slaughtered at the port of landing, under any restriction whatever?—Under examination the same as at present, only not quite so stringent.

104. In what position was the metropolis at that time?—At that time the movement of the cattle of the metropolis was prohibited, with certain exceptions.

105. The cordon was in existence?—The cordon was in existence.

106. When was the cordon put on?—In February 1866.

107. And it was taken off, was it not, upon the opening of the Deptford Market?—Upon the opening of the Deptford Market.

108. At what date?—On the 1st of January 1872.

109. How was the metropolis supplied with foreign cattle at that time before the opening of this market?—Foreign cattle landed at landing places outside the metropolis were allowed to come to the Metropolitan Market by railway.

110. That applied to Thames Haven, did it not?—It applied to Thames Haven, and to two other places outside the metropolis; sometimes they were used, and sometimes they were not.

111. With regard to sheep, was there any restriction upon their import?—Not at that particular time, unless they came in the same vessel with foreign cattle.

112. In which case they shared the fate of the cattle?—Yes.

113. What were the changes made in the regulations with regard to foreign animals immediately after the passing of the Act?—A general order was passed, forming for the first time what we called the schedule of foreign countries, which brings them within the regulations of the 4th Schedule of the Act as to slaughter at the landing place.

* 114. When you speak of foreign countries you mean those foreign countries, cattle arriving from which had to be slaughtered, not only at the port of landing, but within a certain defined area at the port of landing?—Yes.

115. What were the countries which were scheduled immediately after the passing of the Act?—Russia, the Austro-Hungarian Empire, the States of the North German Confederation, the dominions of the Sultan, the dominions of the King of Italy, the Papal States, Belgium, the Netherlands, and the dominions of the Hollands.

116. Then the only countries in Europe with ports that were not scheduled were Spain, Portugal, France, Denmark, Sweden, and Norway?—Yes.

117. Were any alterations made in the schedules during the year 1870?—In September 1870, France was added to the schedule on account of the cattle plague, when the war broke out; sheep and goats from the North German Confederation were scheduled on the 24th September 1870 on account of the cattle plague, and the same was done with relation to France as to sheep and goats; and the same as regards Belgium on the 1st of December 1870.

118. All that was in 1870?—All that was in 1870.

Q.58.

119. In consequence of the outbreak of cattle plague which followed the war between France and Germany, France was scheduled, and sheep and goats from Germany were ordered to be slaughtered, and also from Belgium?—Yes.

120. What alterations were made in 1871?—The landing in this country of cattle brought from France and Belgium was prohibited. First they had been scheduled, and then they were prohibited.

121. In consequence of the cattle plague raging so greatly in France and Belgium, the import was prohibited altogether, was it not?—Altogether.

122. Was it prohibited from Germany in 1871?—I think not.

123. When was Holland unscheduled?—On the 29th April 1871.

124. You recollect, I suppose, the grounds upon which Holland was unscheduled; can you describe them?—The Dutch Government passed a decree (as I think it is called) prohibiting entirely the import into the Netherlands of any animals, cattle, sheep, and goats, I believe.

125. When you talk of animals, you mean cattle, sheep, goats, and pigs?—Yes; except in this case, in which pigs are not included.

126. There was a correspondence between the Governments and personal interviews between myself and the representatives of Holland in this country, were there not?—There were.

127. And it was not until we had got that guarantee of a prohibition of import into Holland that we permitted the export from Holland to this country of animals allowed to go into the interior?—Just so.

128. We got a guarantee that there should be no animals whatever imported into Holland, did we not?—I will give you the words: "Prohibiting the importation and transit from foreign countries of cattle, sheep, goats, fresh hides, fresh and salted meat, unskinned fat, manure, and other matters likely to produce contagious and infectious diseases." Three weeks' notice was to be given of any alteration in those regulations.

129. There is a notion that we were contented with allowing the through transit of animals from Germany, or from other countries, into Holland; but that was not the case?—Not at all.

130. It is true, is it not, that representations were constantly made to the office to unschedule other places; for instance, Schleswig and Holstein?—Yes.

131. And that we refused to do so, because we could not obtain an assurance that there would not be that through transit of animals from other parts?—That is the case.

132. What alterations were made in 1872?—The most important one was that of admitting cattle from Schleswig and Holstein under certain regulations.

133. What was the date of that order?—The 4th of July 1872.

134. Will you describe the exact purport of that order?—I must mention that cattle coming from any part of the Empire of Germany were at that time subject to slaughter at the place of landing; that is to say, Germany was in the schedule. Representations were made, and pretty good evidence given that neither Schleswig nor Holstein had ever had any cattle plague in it; that the animals there were generally very healthy, and that therefore if an import could take place from

Mr.
Alexander
W. Benson.
—
10 March
1873.

Mr.
Alexander
Williams.
10 March
1873.

from Schleswig and Holstein, and only from Schleswig and Holstein, the cattle might be admitted under the same regulations that the free cattle, or cattle from the Netherlands were admitted under at that time.

133. It had been constantly represented to the office that Schleswig and Holstein were safe as regards disease, and that they were countries in which so many and such good cattle were bred that it was very desirable to permit the import; but we had always refused to do it, because we could get no guarantee that we received only Schleswig and Holstein cattle?—Quite so.

134. We considered that we did get that guarantee by the stringent conditions (as you called them) on which they were then permitted to be imported; what were those conditions?—The cattle were to be accompanied by a declaration and certificates; the declaration being from the agent, solemnly and sincerely declaring that the cattle now about to be put on board, and so on, were bred and fed exclusively in Denmark, Schleswig, or Holstein, and that they had never been in contact with cattle not so exclusively bred and fed; then there was a description of the cattle, so that they could be identified; secondly, this declaration was made before the British Consul at the port of export, and he certified that it was so made, and that it was worthy of belief; then it was also accompanied by a certificate of an officer of the Royal Prussian Provincial Council Office to this effect: "I hereby certify that I have this day seen the cattle above described, and that I believe the foregoing declaration of A. B. to be true in all respects," and the Government themselves appeared to wish, and indicated that they would take every precaution.

137. Supposing that these conditions were not fulfilled, was there any penalty?—I presume that the cattle would not have been allowed to land. There is a general penalty of a head of 1,000 l. on all landing.

138. It is the case, is it not, that the owner or charterer of the vessel in which they were imported entered into a bond not exceeding 1,000 l. that those conditions should be fulfilled?—Yes.

139. The principle of this permission was this, was it not, that the German Government undertook to give a certificate that those animals were really Schleswig or Holstein animals; that that certificate was endorsed by a representative of the British Government, and that a bond was entered into that those conditions were fulfilled?—Yes.

140. And the importers were also informed, were they not, that any breach of those conditions would result in the immediate stoppage of the import?—Yes.

141. It turned out, did it not, curiously enough, a few weeks after this order was issued, that although there had never been cattle plague, as far as we can tell, in Schleswig or Holstein before, cattle plague broke out in Hamburg, and that there was supposed to be one case on the borders of Holstein, close to Hamburg?—Just so.

142. And, of course, that order was revoked?—It was.

143. Have you any reason to suppose that that order had anything whatever to do with the outbreak of cattle plague in this country last year?—Not the slightest.

144. In fact, we know, as far as it is possible to know, that it had nothing to do with it?—Quite so.

145. What are the Schleswig or Holstein ports?—I am not very well up in that matter, but I believe Hasso and Tönning are the principal ones.

146. We did not permit the Schleswig or Holstein cattle to come from anywhere but from ports in Schleswig or Holstein?—Certainly not.

147. We did not permit them to come from Hamburg under those conditions?—No; that is a general regulation.

148. The reason why we had refused beforehand to do something of this sort was, not that we suspected the Schleswig or Holstein cattle, but that inasmuch as there was a railway communication between Schleswig and Holstein and the interior of Germany, we could not guarantee that we should not get other animals through the Schleswig or Holstein ports?—Quite so.

149. And it was only on obtaining this Government guarantee that they were only Schleswig or Holstein animals, that we allowed them to come in?—Quite so.

150. If the Schleswig or Holstein animals had been shipped at Hamburg, or at any port outside Schleswig or Holstein, they would have been treated just like German animals, and would have been slaughtered at the place of landing, would they not?—They would.

151. In fact the order only applied to Schleswig or Holstein animals coming from Schleswig or Holstein ports?—Certainly.

152. The order is now revoked, is it not?—It is.

153. That was one order which was made in 1872: what other orders were there with regard to foreign import?—There is one of the 16th July which revokes in part the order of the 8th December 1871, prohibiting the landing in Great Britain of cattle brought from France and Belgium, and some other matters.

154. That was relaxing the restriction on cattle brought from Belgium on account of the dissemination of the cattle plague, was it not?—Yes, and the same order applies the regulations of the 4th schedule to cattle coming from that country.

155. Owing to the outbreak of cattle plague in Russia, and its import into this country, an order was issued with regard to Russia, was it not?—Yes, on the 19th July (I think that is the date of the order), absolutely prohibiting the landing of cattle and other things from any place in that country.

156. The first cargo that arrived last year with any case of cattle plague on board was one which came into Deptford, was it not?—Yes.

157. And the next day, I think, the order was issued prohibiting all import of cattle from Russia?—Yes, the disease was only absolutely proved to exist on the 19th, and the order was passed the same day; it was a very obscure case.

158. Will you state from what country cattle are prohibited; are they prohibited from any country but Russia?—They are prohibited from Russia only.

159. What are the scheduled countries cattle arriving from which must be slaughtered at the port of landing?—The Austro-Hungarian Empire, Belgium, France, Germany, Greece, Italy, and Turkey; Russia has a special regulation, sheep and goats being scheduled.

160. Sheep and goats from Russia are not allowed to be imported alive into the interior?—They are not.

161. Are

Mr.
Alexander
Wills.
—
10 March
1873.

161. Are there any restrictions with regard to sheep, goats, and pigs from other countries?—Not any at the present moment.

162. Unless they come in the same cargo with cattle, and are landed in a different part of a port?—Quite so.

163. All sheep, goats, or pigs that are in the same cargo with cattle when landed from any scheduled country must be slaughtered within a defined part of a port, as well as the cattle?—Yes.

164. There has been a proposition made to the department, has there not, for a renewal of the import from Russia?—There has.

165. In what form was that proposition made?—The first proposal was to import as previously.

166. That was at once disregarded, was it not? It was at once refused. Afterwards a proposal was made to establish a quarantine station at or near some port in Russia, and to have proper officers and every arrangement to insure the health of the animals, and then to export them, I think, from Cronstadt to this country, the importers offering to bear the expense.

167. The proposal was this, was it not: that the importers would bear the expense of keeping the animals for some time, either at St. Petersburg or Cronstadt, and that they would bear the expense of inspection, and would allow any officer from this country to examine them?—Yes.

168. And they stated, did they not, that they could guarantee a large import?—Yes, a very large import.

169. Do you remember what they talked of?—I think they said something like 1,000 a week at once, or from 500 to 1,000.

170. Fat cattle, I suppose?—Fat cattle. That was a mere verbal communication; we have no papers on the subject.

171. That was some months ago, was it not?—That was some months ago, but they have called since about it.

172. However, hitherto the offer has not been entertained?—It has not been entertained as yet.

173. Did you think it could have been done with safety?—It is possible, but it would have been very difficult to do. It depends entirely upon the arrangements.

174. It would depend, in fact, upon how far we could rely upon the inspection in Russia, would it not?—That they propose that we should do by sending our own inspector out.

175. There has always been cattle plague in Russia, as far as we know, has there not?—I think so. To my knowledge it has not been free from cattle plague.

176. But the reason that we did not prohibit the import from Russia was the immense size of the country, and the belief that cattle might come safely from one port, though perhaps not from other ports?—Yes.

177. And another reason was, I believe, that in consequence of the length of the voyage, the disease was almost certain to appear during the voyage?—Almost certain to be detected.

178. And that has been proved to be the case by the experience of the cargoes of last year, has it not?—I think so.

179. Nevertheless, the directions of the Department are for the present to continue the prohibition from Russia?—Yes.

180. There was an International Conference with regard to the diseases of animals at Vienna last year, was there not?—There was.

181. Did you attend it?—I did, on behalf of the Privy Council.

182. Do you think it likely to result in any practical advantage?—I think it is possible that if it were taken up by diplomats instead of by veterinary surgeons and secretaries it might so result.

183. What were the conclusions come to from which you would expect most advantage?—In page 26 of the Appendix to my Report, the first recommendation is, that every country should communicate, by telegraph, direct information of every outbreak of cattle plague, so as to keep other countries properly informed on the matter. Of course I am strongly in favour of the second recommendation, which is, that every country should extinguish the cattle plague as soon as possible.

184. You think there would be an advantage if there was a general concurrence in the efforts to stop the cattle plague throughout Europe?—Certainly.

185. The great danger, I suppose, comes from Russia, and from the Danubian Provinces?—And Austria, I think.

186. Is not the great difficulty to get those countries to take the necessary steps?—Austria and Russia will not take any steps, I believe.

187. The cattle plague more or less exists still in some of the provinces of the Austrian Empire, does it not?—Yes. At page 30 of the Appendix to my Report for 1872, you will find that a great number of provinces in Austria were infected with cattle plague during 1872.

188. Do you consider that there are any parts of Austria to which it is indigenous as it is in the steppes of Russia?—I do not think so.

189. Not even in Galicia?—I should scarcely say so; Austria says not.

190. Do you at all think that any arrangement could be come to by the different countries through diplomatic negotiations, which would enable us to take off the restrictions upon foreign import?—To relax the restriction I think there might, but not to take it off altogether.

191. Do you think that it would enable us to allow animals generally to be imported into the interior of the country?—I am afraid that that could scarcely be arrived at; but such a regulation might be made as would add very materially to our security; if, for instance, Germany would take the same precautions with regard to the through transit of animals as it does to protect itself, and give a guarantee that the animals were healthy when they left Germany. That is one part of the recommendations.

192. There is great care taken in Germany, is there not, to prevent the import of cattle over the Germano-Russian border?—There is.

193. But you think that, at any rate, until lately, there has not been the same care to prevent the through transit of affected animals which were coming to this country?—No; I believe not.

194. Is it not the case that our department informed the German Government of the almost certainty that cattle plague would break out at Hamburg; at any rate, before any information came to us from them of the existence of such cattle plague?—Certainly; they have to communicate with the central authority before any stoppage comes into force.

195. With regard to that outbreak at Hamburg, can you recollect what is supposed to be the

Mr.
Alexander
H. Wilson.
10 March
1873

the history of it?—It will be found in page xii of my Report.

196. Do you think that contagious diseases, and especially cattle plague, have been more prevalent than usual on the Continent during the last few years?—I do; they have been more extensively distributed.

197. In consequence of the war?—In consequence of the war, certainly; but also generally without reference to the war.

198. The history of this plague seems to show, does it not, that any war, and especially any war in which are engaged troops coming from Russia, or in which troops are fed from Russia, almost always brings the plague into the West of Europe?—It has almost always been so.

199. Besides the danger from war, there is a great increase of communication, is there not, between the West and the East of Europe?—Very great, and I think that we shall eventually be entirely dependent for our foreign supply of cattle indirectly upon Russia.

200. Does that answer mean that we must look forward soon to the time when the West of Europe, or Europe independently of Russia, and countries somewhat like Russia, such as Galicia, and parts of Transylvania, will not breed more cattle than they want for themselves?—I believe so.

201. And that the increased demand must be supplied from Russia, or from other sources?—Yes.

202. There is now direct railway communication between Hamburg, for example, or Antwerp and Russia, is there not?—I believe so.

203. Then you think that in future any large increase of the import of live animals into this country must be from Russia or from countries similarly situated?—Either directly or indirectly; Germany imports into her territories as many cattle as she sends to us. I found that out when I was at Vienna. If that be the case now, and any further supplies are wanted, considering the competition of the other markets, such as Paris, Berlin, and so on, I do not think we can possibly get any great import of cattle further than we have now without going directly or indirectly to Russia for it.

204. Germany imports largely from Russia, does she not?—Not now; at the present moment she has stopped it.

205. Do you think that the stoppage of the import from Russia has had anything to do with the great scarcity of cattle?—I do not know that it has yet, but I think it must have. We shall lose the Schleswig cattle, I believe, by Germany requiring it for herself.

206. Until this late outbreak, with increased violence, of cattle plague in Russia was known, there was considerable import from Russia into Germany, and you think that that enabled us to import cattle from Schleswig and Holstein?—I think so.

207. So that, unless Germany imports from Russia, you think that Germany will want her own cattle for herself?—From Russia or from somewhere else, but most likely from Russia, Austria, or Hungary.

208. Austria is naturally an exporting country, is it not?—It is.

209. Holland is a largely exporting country, is it not?—It is.

210. But we take almost the whole of her export, I think?—A good deal.

211. Do you expect that the supply from Holland is likely to diminish?—I think so. As Germany and France compete, we shall not be able to buy them, unless we give more for them.

212. Then you think that it would be a very great advantage as regards the home consumption if by any means we could make the import from Russia safe?—I think so; very great indeed.

213. But, at present, you would believe the danger to be very great from Russia?—Very great.

214. Even if we are able to take of the absolute prohibition, you do not look forward to the time at which we could allow Russian cattle to be landed without very stringent regulations for their slaughter?—It would depend very much upon what the regulations were. I think there would not be very much danger in admitting Russian cattle under the regulations of the schedule, if proper precautions were taken.

215. But you do not look forward to the time at which Russian cattle could be admitted freely into the interior?—No, I look forward to the time when precautions will be taken on the Germano-Russian frontier, so that they will be able to get Russian cattle and we shall get German cattle.

216. You think it possible that Germany may have such a system of quarantine on its borders as would enable them to import cattle from Russia, and so to send us cattle?—Certainly.

217. Russian store cattle are sent into Germany, are they not?—I think not.

218. During the war, there was great danger of the introduction of the cattle plague into this country, was there not?—Very great.

219. That is to say, the cattle plague was raging in France, in Belgium, and in Germany?—Yes, and also to the shore in France, within 30 miles of our coast.

220. So that then there was apparently men danger of its introduction, than there was at the time the cattle plague was first introduced into England?—Certainly; there was a daily danger.

221. You have every reason to believe that although there was the cattle plague in those neighboring countries, yet that there was no cattle plague introduced from either Germany, Belgium, or France?—Certainly not directly in that way.

222. As you know the slaughter of all fit stock at landing places, and the quarantine of all store stock is strongly recommended, do you think that those regulations would be sufficient to prevent the spread of cattle plague if it were introduced into this country by foreign cattle?—I do not think they would; the result of putting healthy cattle and diseased cattle under the same regulation as to slaughter, would immediately take away the inducement of the importer to bring healthy ones, because whether they are healthy or diseased, he would get the same price for the animals, and therefore the chance is that we should get all the infected animals from the Continent which people wanted to get rid of, and disease would always be prevalent, I think, in a market of that class.

223. The regulations which we have in force for the slaughter of all scheduled animals do not give us a perfect immunity against danger, do they?—Certainly not.

224. For instance, the cattle plague was introduced into Hull last year, where there was a strict

Mr.
Alexander
Williams.
—
16 March
1873.

strict regulation that they should be slaughtered at the port of landing?—Yes.

225. And then the disease was introduced, as we fully believe, by cattle from a Russian vessel?—Indirectly.

226. We have reason to believe that the introduction of the cattle plague is owing to the cattle plague having come to Hull in the "Joseph Seance," which came from Russia?—Yes.

227. Notwithstanding all possible precautions with regard to slaughter, there is always the danger of the disease being conveyed by some individual?—Yes, indirectly.

228. On the Continent I believe they take the most stringent precautions with regard to individuals?—They take precautions which it would be impossible to carry out in a large market such as would be required at all the ports.

229. For instance, I think I was informed that at Hamburg, the cattle plague breaking out in a village close to which there was a large hotel, a cordon was put around that hotel, and nobody was allowed to leave for some time, and even then not without being disinfected?—Yes, I believe so.

230. You think that it would be rather difficult to carry out so stringent regulations in England?—I think so.

231. Then I understand you to say, that although the slaughter at the port of landing is a most desirable precaution, and likely to do a great deal towards preventing the introduction of the disease, yet it does not make us absolutely safe from disease; and you believe that that being the case, the disease is quite as likely to spread, or rather more likely to spread, if all the animals be slaughtered at the port of landing than it is at this moment?—I believe so.

232. Why do you think that?—Because the percentage of diseased animals which came with the whole stock would be very much larger.

233. Take this illustration, for instance, an importer of cattle from a scheduled country, who knows that they must be slaughtered at Deptford, knows the worst that will happen to those animals, and is not so very careful to prevent disease amongst them; but an importer from the country, animals from which are admitted to go into the interior unless disease be found amongst them, is very anxious that such disease should not be found?—Quite so.

234. And his anxiety arises, does it not, from the fact that our orders are, that if there be any animal diseased, the whole cargo must be slaughtered?—Yes.

235. And that is a great inconvenience, and of course a costly inconvenience to him?—Just so. This has already been proved by the returns during the past year from Deptford, as compared with the undefined parts of the port of London.

236. You mean to say that there is more disease among the animals arriving at Deptford than among the animals arriving at undefined parts?—Yes.

237. Are those statistics arrived at by the examination upon landing?—Yes; in accordance with the terms of the Act. In 1872, of 161,300 animals landed at Deptford, 4,321 were found affected with disease; whilst of 578,683 landed at the other landing places, only 46 were found affected.

238. And if anything, the examination would be rather more stringent of those which do not land at Deptford than of those which do?—It would.

0.58.

239. Would you suggest any modification with regard to the present regulations for the import of foreign animals?—In the first place, with regard to the vessels bringing the animals, I think improvements might be made both as regards their fittings, and also as regards their ventilation. Then, I think, that at all the landing places where foreign animals are allowed to land there should be thoroughly proper provision made for the isolation of the animals, for the slaughtering of them, and for the disposal of the carcasses of any diseased ones. At present, only at Deptford are those arrangements made.

240. Your remark now applies to the scheduled animals?—To all animals.

241. With regard to animals which come from scheduled countries, a cattle market was put up at Deptford by the Corporation after much negotiation with the Veterinary Department, and you have reason, have you not, to be quite satisfied with the provisions which are made at Deptford for slaughtering and for landing?—Yes.

242. But similar provisions have not been made at many of the outports?—Not at any of the other ports.

243. Is it not the case that the department has considered that it had great ground of complaint as regards the port of Hull?—Particularly of the port of Hull.

244. Why were our suggestions not carried out with regard to the port of Hull?—They simply would not carry them out, and the only remedy you have is to stop the importation of cattle.

245. It is true, is it not, that we constantly recommend and, in fact, ordered, certain things to be done at Hull?—Yes, we have done so.

246. And without success?—Without success.

247. And we found that the only way in which we could meet the difficulty was to say that no animal should be imported into Hull unless these requirements were fulfilled?—That seemed the only way in which it could be done.

248. And that has not been done?—It has not been done.

249. Take, for instance, the port of Hull; what additional provision have we tried to get made there?—I think if you would be good enough to examine Professor Brown upon that point he would be able to enter into particulars; I know nothing of the locality myself.

250. But generally speaking there needs to be better provision for the slaughter, does there not?—Better provision for isolation, better provision for slaughtering, and better provision for the destruction of carcasses.

251. That applies to the ports generally?—That applies to the ports generally.

252. I suppose that there would be considerable expense involved in carrying this out, would there not?—There would.

253. And it would, in fact, be compelling every outport to have something like the same provision as the City of London has made at Deptford?—Not so extensive as that.

254. But as extensive in proportion?—As extensive in proportion.

255. And it would require them to incur the same expense?—Yes, the same proportionate expense.

256. Do you think that much of the difficulty or danger arises from the defined area not being sufficiently separated from the other part of the town?—In the case of Hull it does, certainly; there is no division whatever; it is merely an imaginary.

B

Mr.
Alexander
Wilkinson,
—
20 March
1873.

imaginary line supposed to be guarded; whether it is or not, I am not prepared to say.

257. We have had constant correspondence going on with regard to the area at Hull, have we not?—Yes, and they have proposed to remedy it on several occasions, but afterwards we have found that it has not been done. I should reduce the number of ports for the same reasons; some of the ports land only a few animals in the year, and yet we have to keep up all the machinery.

258. But we have reduced the number, have we not?—We have reduced them from above 200 to 32.

259. When did we do that?—We did that gradually on altering the arrangements as regards the inspectors.

260. Was it not the case last year, after the change of inspectors, that there was a considerable diminution in the number of ports?—There was.

261. Are you prepared with any suggestion as to any further reduction in the number of ports?—I should simply take the import, and where it amounted to only a very few animals it is scarcely worth while to keep the port open for them.

262. Are you prepared with any suggestion as to the details of the conditions upon which a port should be allowed to keep open for the reception of animals?—I could prepare it in the course of a few days.

263. Mr. Dent.] Do all your observations apply to cattle from scheduled countries?—Yes, but very nearly the same observations would apply to cattle from unscheduled countries.

264. Chairman.] When there were a very large number of ports, what were the regulations?—The regulations were somewhat similar to what they are now, but the Customs had then something like 150 inspectors; butchers or any people who happened to be nearest were employed to examine any cargoes of cattle which came.

265. Was it not the case that you and I were always much alarmed at the possibility of the import of disease into ports at which few animals arrived, because we could not rely upon that inspection?—Quite so.

266. And that was one reason, was it not, why we wished the transfer of the inspectors to our own control, and why when that transfer was effected we very much diminished the number of ports?—Quite so.

267. These suggestions which you make are suggestions with regard to machinery, and not suggestions with regard to the principle of an order; our orders have always been to this effect, that animals could only be landed in a certain port and must be slaughtered in the port, and you would make no change with regard to that?—I should not make any change with regard to that.

268. But you would simply oblige the local authority to shew us the mode in which it would carry out these provisions, and that it would do so more effectually?—More effectually, and that it would have real isolation, and not an assumed isolation; we have got a great deal done in the various ports during the last few years in this matter, but it is still very imperfect.

269. Do you consider that we have got anything done at Hull?—Yes; I forget now the exact state of Hull at the present moment, but the defined part has been altered several times. They have no land in the defined part for the burial of carcases.

270. It is quite true, is it not, that we could have prevented the import of cattle into Hull by our powers?—Yes, on one or two occasions we have done it as regards other parts.

271. But that would have been a very serious interference with the trade?—Very serious, and not only with the trade in animals but with the trade of the port.

272. It is the case in Hull and in ports generally, is it not, that there are much fewer vessels given up to the cattle trade than in London?—I do not know that there is one vessel out of London given up to the cattle trade.

273. And consequently anything that affects the import of cattle affects almost the whole of the carrying trade?—Yes.

274. It makes it more difficult, does it not, to have proper precautions, the cattle being brought in with other cargo?—Certainly; there ought to be ships for cattle only.

275. Would you suggest that no cattle ought to be allowed to be imported except in ships provided for the cattle trade?—I should certainly suggest it.

276. I suppose you are aware, are you not, that there would be very considerable representations against that from importers?—No doubt.

277. Do the cattle which come into Hull, for instance, arrive upon the deck of the vessel?—I think so.

278. With regard to the outbreak of cattle plague in this country last year, do you yourself consider that the account given by Professor Brown of that outbreak in the Appendix to your Report is the correct one?—I do.

279. Are you of opinion that it was not produced by the carcases washed ashore at various parts of the coast?—Certainly; I consider it impossible that it could have been so produced.

280. Do you agree with Professor Brown in believing that it was introduced from the "Joseph Scamers"?—Indirectly from the "Joseph Scamers".

281. When did you first hear of that outbreak?—It was on the 4th of September.

282. What day of the week was that?—Wednesday, I think.

283. I was in Yorkshire, was I not?—I believe you were.

284. You telegraphed for me, and I came up?—Yes.

285. When did we issue the first order?—We first sent down Mr. Wilkinson, our Inspector, in Newcastle.

286. Upon the supposition that there was cattle plague, you ordered Mr. Wilkinson, the neighbouring Inspector, to proceed to the spot?—Yes.

287. And you sent down Professor Brown almost immediately?—Almost immediately.

288. Mr. Wilkinson was one of our Inspectors at the ports?—Yes, at Newcastle, one of our best Inspectors. On his certifying that the disease was cattle plague, we immediately informed the local authority. Professor Brown had then already started. Mr. Wilkinson's Report was received on the 6th of September, and on the 6th, the Friday, Professor Brown was on the spot, endeavouring to trace the history of the outbreak.

289. On Friday, I think, I was in London?—You were.

290. On Saturday the order was issued stopping the movement of cattle in the East Riding?—Yes; Professor Brown having telegraphed to say that three of the cattle had been bought at Hull, and that there was an indication of any other part of the country having received the disease.

291. On that Saturday when Lord Harrington and I issued that order, the only fact which we had before us was the undoubted existence of the cattle plague in one farm?—Yes; at Yapham.

292. The order that we issued was, stopping all the fairs and the market in the city of York, and the movement of all cattle in the East Riding?—Yes, as well as the markets.

293. Although it was a matter of serious question whether we ought to issue so strong an order on the Saturday, there being only an outbreak in one farm, yet our fears were quite justified by the news which came on Monday. Did we not receive an account of a fresh outbreak on Monday?—Yes.

294. One great reason why we issued that order at once was to do everything in our power to prevent the conveyance of cattle from the East Riding to the London market, was it not?—Yes.

295. And I suppose, judging from what happened when the cattle plague broke out before, if it had got into the London market there is every reason to fear that it would have been all over England immediately?—In a very short time.

296. Do you think that the Act requires alteration with regard to the cattle plague?—I think that the power of slaughter should be extended.

297. You would not suggest any alteration with regard to our power of preventing the import from other countries as regards cattle plague?—No, I think there are ample powers for preventing its introduction.

298. You do not suggest any alteration with regard to its introduction, but after it has once been introduced would you make any suggestion to prevent its spreading?—I would apply the power of slaughter not only to infected animals, and to animals in contact with infected animals, but also to any animal which, in the opinion of a qualified inspector, would be likely to introduce the disease anywhere else.

299. At present the local authority is ordered to enforce the slaughter of all animals affected, is it not?—Yes.

300. But it lies within its discretion to enforce the slaughter of animals which have been herded with those that are infected?—It does.

301. Would you take away that discretion?—Yes; I should make that compulsory.

302. Is it not the case that although we have every reason to be thankful for the care taken generally by the local authorities, and especially by Admiral Dencombe, in getting that order carried out, yet that a good deal of difficulty was found even last year in getting those animals slaughtered which had been herded with those which were affected?—Considerable difficulty and delay.

303. And we were obliged to make strong representations to the East Riding, and Admiral Dencombe found it necessary himself to take very active measures?—It was so.

304. But you would go still further, would you not, and give power to the local authority to order

the slaughter of animals in neighbouring fields and farms?—I do not think that it would be sufficient to give it to the local authority; it would be necessary, I think, to give it to the Privy Council, or some person who would carry it out, but there should be the power to slaughter animals which would be likely to spread disease.

305. Would you impose upon our Department the responsibility of drawing a line within which we should slaughter all the animals?—I cannot see any other way of dealing with it.

306. Supposing that any such power existed anywhere, you think that it is a power that ought to be exercised by the Central Department, rather than by the local authority?—I think that it would not be exercised by the local authority if it existed, and, therefore, somebody must supersede their action.

307. You would not leave such power to the discretion of any local inspectors?—Certainly not.

308. But it ought to be exercised, you think, according to the orders of an inspector from the Central Department?—Certainly.

309. I understood you to say, I think, that you would furnish us in greater detail with your suggestions as to the precautions to be taken at the outposts with regard to cattle from scheduled countries?—I will do so.

310. The experience that we gained last autumn, that it was very difficult to get cattle slaughtered which had been herded with those which were diseased, merely confirms the experience of the great outbreak of the cattle plague, does it not?—It does.

311. And even after it had been raging for some time, and people were convinced that nothing but slaughter would stamp it out, it was still exceedingly difficult to get that slaughter done, was it not?—Very difficult, indeed; and the same thing has been found in every country.

312. Therefore, you would take away any discretion about the matter, and make it compulsory; would you suggest any alteration in the amount of compensation for slaughtered animals?—I am scarcely capable of giving an opinion upon that; it was very fully discussed in Parliament, and I do not think that I could give any additional information on the subject.

313. Have you found any obstacle in carrying out the Act, as consequences of the present regulation with regard to compensation in reference to cattle plague?—I could not say positively so.

314. Do you agree with the recommendation of the International Conference at Vienna, that for all animals killed, and goods destroyed, by order of the authorities, for the purpose of suppressing the cattle plague, the owner shall receive compensation equal to their value?—I do not; I think I gave no vote upon that matter. When the compensation was increased in the Netherlands, returns of cattle plague came in enormous numbers when they paid the full value, and lots of animals were probably slaughtered which were not affected by it; I should say that the full value should not be paid.

315. You would consider that if an animal has the cattle plague its value goes down almost to nothing?—Certainly.

316. And you would consider that the value of an animal, which happens to be in a field along side of an animal which has the cattle plague, would be very much diminished?—Certainly.

Mr.
Alexander
Williams.
—
to March
1873.

Mr.
Alexander
H'Diama.
—
10 March
1873.

317. Do you consider that the market price of these animals which are in an adjacent field would be diminished if all the facts were known?—I should say so, because they would not be slaughtered unless they were likely to get the disease.

318. Do you consider that pleuro-pneumonia has been largely introduced from abroad during the last few years?—Not largely.

319. Do you think it has been introduced to any extent from Holland?—I should say not.

320. Or from Denmark?—Certainly not, I should say; there is a record in the Report of all the cases which have been detected, and every case which has been stated, which has come before me, I have been careful to inquire into, and I have found that the evidence was inconclusive in every instance that the disease had been introduced by foreign animals.

321. Have you reason to believe that it has been introduced from Spain or from Portugal?—No, I think not.

322. The main part of our import from unscheduled countries comes from Spain, Portugal, Denmark, and Holland, does it not?—Yes, I should say so.

323. And you do not believe that pleuro-pneumonia has been introduced, to any extent, from those countries?—I do not.

324. Do you believe that foot and mouth disease has been introduced, to any extent, from those countries?—Not into the country; we have had a good many cases brought to the ports, but not only the animals themselves, but all the animals brought with them have been slaughtered.

325. The regulation is, that whenever any animal, infected with the foot and mouth disease, is in a cargo, the whole of that cargo is slaughtered at its landing?—Yes.

326. And the importers have made very strong representations against that, have they not?—Yes.

327. And those representations have been backed by deputations from the butchers and consumers of the towns in the North of England?—They have.

328. The restriction, with regard to foot and mouth disease, upon the importation of animals from abroad is very much more stringent, is it not, than with regard to animals from Ireland?—Yes; except the restrictions applying to home animals, there are no further restrictions with regard to Ireland.

329. We do not order the slaughter of home or Irish animals for foot and mouth disease, under any circumstances?—No.

330. With regard to the foreign import, the presence of an animal infected involves the slaughter of the rest of the cargo; but nothing of the sort applies to home animals going from one place to another, or to Irish animals coming into England?—That is so.

331. Have not great complaints been made as to that by the foreign importers?—There have been many complaints.

332. Have you reason to believe that the presence of the foot and mouth disease, within the last year or two, is mainly, or to a considerable extent, owing to foreign import?—I have no reason to believe so.

333. With regard to Deptford, when animals arrive there, how soon must they be slaughtered?—They are detained until two inspections have taken place, the last one of which must be by

daylight; so that if the first takes place when they land, say at six o'clock in the evening, the second examination will take place in the morning. If the first examination took place in the morning, and it was dark at the expiration of 12 hours, they would be detained 24 hours, until the next morning, for a day-light examination, as a last examination.

334. How long can they be kept after examination?—They must be slaughtered within 19 days.

335. Has scab been more prevalent in this country lately, or not?—I should think there has not been much difference from last year.

336. Do you think that it has been introduced much from abroad?—We slaughter them all for scab, and during the year there have come from Belgium 14; from France, one; from Germany, 414; from Holland, nine; from Norway, 40 (which were returned to Norway), and seven from the Cape of Good Hope. All these were slaughtered. I have no reason to believe that any one of them introduced any scab into this country.

337. Not only were all these slaughtered, but all the animals which came in the same cargo with them were slaughtered?—Yes, except the 40 which were returned to Norway.

338. Supposing that we were to schedule all countries, and that we were to oblige all animals arriving at our ports to be slaughtered at the port of landing, do you think that that would put an end to pleuro-pneumonia in the country?—Certainly not.

339. To foot and mouth disease?—No, certainly not.

340. To scab?—Certainly not.

341. Do you think that it would materially diminish either of those diseases?—I do not think it would diminish them at all. That is my firm belief. After carefully going into a great number of cases, I have never been able to trace a single case; there are cases, I have no doubt, of those diseases being introduced by foreign animals, but in every case I have gone into the evidence has failed.

342. Do you, or do you not, consider that, if combined with that stoppage of foreign import, there was any relaxation of home restrictions, there would be a considerable increase of disease?—A considerable increase of disease.

343. Of course, we grow the greatest quantity of the meat which we consume, but there is a very considerable import of foreign live meat, is there not?—There is.

344. So much so that even if there be some risk in the consequent introduction, it is a risk which we must be prepared to run in order to obtain the necessary supply?—I believe so.

345. In your Report, at page 25, you make a calculation of the proportion which the foreign supply of cattle, and also the Irish supply, bears to the home supply of cattle?—I do.

346. And you have still reason to believe that calculation to be correct?—Simply as a statistical calculation.

347. In the year 1870, for instance, you think that the home supply was about 60½ per cent. of our live cattle; the Irish supply 27½ per cent., and the foreign supply 12½ per cent.?—Just so.

348. As regards the weight, I suppose Schleswig cattle would run alongside of some of our heavier animals?—I believe so, but I am not at all practically acquainted with that; I have taken

the figures which the honourable Member for South Norfolk furnished, I believe, to the journal of the Chamber of Agriculture, namely, 500 lbs.

348. The agricultural returns so furnished by the officers of Inland Revenue, are they not?—By the Board of Trade through the officers of Inland Revenue.

350. The question I am now going to ask you is one which I ask you of your own knowledge, of your own department. I do not suppose that you would think yourself justified in giving an answer with regard to another department; but looking merely at your own department, do you not consider that those returns might with great advantage be supplied by the inspectors under our department?—I think it would give them such a knowledge of all matters relating to the cattle, such a thorough knowledge of the cattle population of the country, that it would enable them to carry out the law, and to see that it was carried out much more efficiently than can be done so long as the things are separated.

351. Do you not suppose that in all probability it would result in a considerable saving?—I should imagine so, certainly.

352. I am not now speaking of the inspectors at the ports merely, but I am speaking of the inspectors throughout the country, and the local authorities; do you not think, that if those inspectors and the local authorities performed their duties under the Act they would be able, with much less trouble than persons employed specially for the purpose, to make the returns to the Inland Revenue?—I should rather say that the persons who take the agricultural returns would have more facilities for working out the Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act than perfectly independent persons.

353. But in order to do that they ought to be qualified in other ways with veterinary knowledge, ought they not?—Yes; the present inspectors are not so qualified, and therefore I can hardly imagine that the present inspectors and the local authorities would be able to do either the one or the other. I do not think that it could be carried out without qualified veterinary surgeons as inspectors.

354. Do the same persons make the returns for cattle as for corn at present?—I am not aware.

355. You simply think that whoever is employed in inspecting animals ought to be able to give the statistics with regard to animals?—For instance, in Portugal, and in two or three countries, the people who collect the agricultural returns have districts allotted to them, and they absolutely know every animal in the district perfectly well; every animal born and everything about it, so that they would be much more capable of seeing that the regulations were carried out than people who had no knowledge on the subject whatever. Therefore, I think that if the inspectors under the Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act would take the returns also, they would be much more competent to carry out the provisions of the Act.

356. With regard to sheep-pox, there have been one or two outbreaks since 1869, have there not?—No outbreak at all; three sheep have been landed with sheep-pox; one in 1869, one in 1870, and one in 1871.

357. You consider that our present regulations have been proved to be quite efficient enough as regards sheep-pox?—I do; I believe that the

slaughter of the animals would reduce the time of the existence of the disease, and to that extent reduce the number of cases; but that the present regulations as to isolation are perfectly sufficient to prevent its spreading if properly carried out.

358. Some persons, especially in Norfolk, have strongly recommended that there should be the same regulation with regard to sheep-pox as with regard to cattle plague, would you recommend that?—I would not; it would not have the same advantage; slaughter would be advantageous, but not necessary.

359. Experience proves that we have been able to stamp it out very quickly?—Yes.

360. Professor Brown, in page 23 of the Appendix, recommends that there should be power to slaughter all animals that actually have the disease of sheep-pox, do you disagree with that recommendation?—No, I think it would be advantageous, but not necessary; that is the distinction which I make.

361. At present we can only compel isolation?—That is all.

362. As regards the cattle plague and the sheep pex, the effect of the efforts to prevent their spread in the country you consider to have been on the whole successful?—Certainly.

363. You would not think that there has been anything like the same success with pleuro-pneumonia?—I do not.

364. It still exists to a great extent in the country, does it not?—It does.

365. Do you think it has actually increased within the last few years or not?—It is very difficult to discover; the returns show a greater number of cases, but that may be due to increased vigilance in finding out the disease and sending in the returns.

366. Before the Act was passed, there was no attempt at all to stop the disease in the country, was there?—None at all.

367. And consequently it would be some years before persons would get accustomed to putting the Act into operation?—Quite so.

368. And, therefore, the fact that the returns which we obtain do not show a decrease, is no proof that there is not a decrease?—It is not.

369. But nevertheless pleuro-pneumonia still exists, does it not?—It does.

370. Would you make any suggestion with regard to an improvement in the method of stopping it?—I can scarcely make a suggestion with regard to pleuro-pneumonia without saying also that I would impose the same general regulation with regard to all contagious and infectious diseases. A mere declaration of the inspector should make a place an infected place, simply for the purpose of stopping the movement within the district; I think that the movement should be stopped within a district in which a case of any of these infectious or contagious diseases occurred.

371. Foot and mouth disease has been very prevalent of late, has it not?—It has.

372. It is sometimes supposed that the outbreak last year was more virulent and more extended than any previous outbreak in the country, do you think that that was so?—I have no information with regard to that; that is rather a medical question.

373. It is the case, is it not, that there is much quicker communication with the central department with regard to that disease than there ever was between the provinces and London respecting it before?—Except during the last year,

Mr.
Alexander
Williams.
—
10 March
1873.

Mr.
Alexander
M'William.
10 March
1873.

during which we have not treated returns of foot and mouth disease.

374. Going back to pleuro-pneumonia, there was an application from several persons, was there not, to order the slaughter of animals affected?—There was.

375. And after that application had been made from many counties an order was at last issued permitting such slaughter?—Yes.

376. What was the date of that order?—Sixteenth of February 1871.

377. Have many counties made use of it?—On the 31st of December, only 28 local authorities altogether had it in operation, of which 22 were counties, and six boroughs.

378. That order not only enabled the local authority to enforce the slaughter, but compelled it to give compensation, did it not?—It did; there was another order with regard to pleuro-pneumonia as to the slaughter of animals after contact.

379. There was an order issued on the 31st of December 1872, was there not, enabling cattle to be slaughtered which had been in contact with cattle affected with pleuro-pneumonia?—Yes, but it was dated the 5th of November.

380. And that has been applied in five counties, but not in any borough; is not that so?—Yes.

381. With regard to foot-and-mouth disease: in September 1869, in consequence of an outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease, and several counties having requested that the Foot-and-Mouth Disease Regulations (which are optional) should be made compulsory, an order was issued, I believe, applying the pleuro-pneumonia rules to the foot and mouth disease through the whole of the country?—Yes.

382. Do you recollect how many local authorities had asked for the issue of that order?—I cannot recollect the number. There were complaints made that the provisions and restrictions of the Act were not sufficient to check the foot-and-mouth disease, and the Privy Council passed an Order applying the provisions of the Act relating to pleuro-pneumonia, and laying down certain rules instead of the pleuro-pneumonia rules.

383. The Act passed on the 9th of August, and this order was issued on the 28th of September 1869. That was an order enforcing the application of the provisions with regard to pleuro-pneumonia, with some slight alterations, in the case of foot-and-mouth disease throughout the country?—It was.

384. It is true, is it not, that that order was issued immediately after my return from abroad, whence I had returned in consequence of the outbreak?—Yes.

385. Will you, if you can, furnish the number of local authorities who had requested the issuing of that order?—I was away when that order was passed.

386. After that order had been passed many counties very strongly protested against its enforcement, did they not?—They did.

387. And, in consequence, finding that public opinion did not agree with the Department in its enforcement, the order was revoked, and, in place of it, another order was issued allowing the counties to enforce such orders, if they thought fit to do so?—Yes, permissive orders.

388. When was the date of that?—Sixteenth of December 1869.

389. Can you tell us without much difficulty, how many local authorities enforce the pleuro-pneumonia rules with the slight alteration which was made for foot-and-mouth disease, and how many do not?—Twenty-three enforce them out of 404.

390. The Order of January 1870 was modified by the Consolidated Order, which was issued on the 8th of November 1870?—Yes, after the 30th of November the returns for foot and mouth disease were much simplified.

391. But at present a discretion rests with the local authorities whether they do or do not enforce the special rules with regard to the foot-and-mouth disease?—Merely for prohibiting or regulating the movement of animals out of any field, stable, shed, and so forth: but those rules were not adapted for foot-and-mouth disease.

392. What are the present rules with respect to which they have discretion?—Article 25 of the General Order, by which a local authority may from time to time make regulations "for prohibiting or regulating the movement out of any field, stable, cowshed, or other premises in which foot-and-mouth disease has been found to exist, of any animal that has been in the same field, stable, cowshed, or other premises with or in contact with any animal affected with foot-and-mouth disease."

393. Discretion lies with the local authorities whether they do or do not enforce this regulation?—That is so.

394. Can you tell us in what counties that discretion is used for enforcement, and in what counties it is not?—I can do so in the course of a day or two, so far as we have received information.

395. Although there are several counties which decline to put in force those regulations, were not strong representations made last autumn for much more stringent regulations with regard to foot-and-mouth disease?—Both then and since.

396. What did those representations demand?—That the cattle plague restrictions should be put on for the purpose of stopping the disease.

397. That is to say, that markets should be stopped for a time (and I think this time generally suggested was six weeks), and that no cattle should be allowed to be moved without a licence?—Quite so.

398. And the department, after much consideration, felt that they could not advise such stringent regulations for the foot and mouth disease?—Certainly not.

399. From what parts of the country did those representations mainly come?—I can scarcely say off-hand.

400. There was one very strong one from Northumberland, was there not?—There was.

401. Could you furnish the Committee, at their next sitting, with the principal counties from which those representations came?—Yes.

402. At first an attempt was made to obtain detailed returns from the local authorities with regard to foot and mouth disease?—That was so.

403. Did you find it easy to obtain such returns, or not?—It was very difficult to obtain them.

404. I believe you made very reiterated efforts to get them more correct?—We did.

405. And at last, finding that they could not be relied upon, and that they were very partially furnished, acting on my advice and Lord Ripon's,

you

you discontinued asking for those returns?—We did.

406. Did you not find, at any rate, that previously to last autumn there were many parts of the country in which there was a strong feeling, that the restrictions which we attempted to enforce with regard to foot and mouth disease, were worse than the disease itself; that the remedy was worse than the disease?—In many parts of the country it was so.

407. And in fact, that public opinion did not support the department in any strong efforts to stop it?—I think not, though perhaps that is modified to some extent now; there seems to be more feeling in favour of strong restrictions for stopping foot and mouth disease than there was; before the passing of the Act it was considered by many absurd to put it into the Act, they thought it so unimportant, but now I think the feeling is very much modified, and in other countries it is so too.

408. Are there other countries in Europe where they have very strong regulations with regard to foot and mouth disease?—Yes, in Switzerland.

409. Do you recollect the regulations there?—Up to the end of last year they had, first of all, to prevent the movement of animals affected by this disease, and then, to insure this, licenses were required for the movement of any cattle above six months' old.

410. Do you think that at present the Act, or the administration of the Act, does anything to stop the spread of foot and mouth disease?—I certainly think that the disease would be infinitely worse if nothing were done.

411. But still, would you consider that we have been at all successful in our efforts to stop it?—I think not, because the Act has not been enforced.

412. Is it the case that in some districts the Act is enforced, and that in neighbouring districts there is no attempt to enforce it?—It is so.

413. At the same time it is enforced by the county, and not put in force by the borough?—It is so.

414. And in those places in which it is put in force is there not a great difference in the mode in which it is attempted to be done?—It is so.

415. Do you imagine that there would be any chance of really stamping out the disease if compulsory isolation were enforced throughout the country?—With other precautions, certainly.

416. It was the case, was it not, that while the regulations were in force at the time of the cattle plague the effect of thus diminishing the movement of animals without licenses would very much diminish foot and mouth disease?—It almost entirely got rid of it; there was scarcely a case to be found.

417. Would you not say that although there are outbreaks more or less violent coming at intervening spaces of two or three, or four, or more years, yet that the disease has been existing in the country for the last 20 or 30 years?—Certainly.

418. I observe in your Report, at page 25, that after two suggestions about which we have already asked you with regard to the foreign import, you make two suggestions as to the home movement of animals, one being that we should increase our restrictions on the movement of animals, and make those restrictions uniform
058.

and compulsory; how would you so increase the restrictions?—I should do so by the method which I explained a short time ago, namely, by making infected places in the case of any of those diseases.

419. Taking foot and mouth disease, for instance, you would make it compulsory that any place in which it was discovered should be considered an infected place?—That is to say, that under the certificate of an inspector that the foot and mouth disease existed in any place, that place should thereupon become an infected place, and all movements should be immediately stopped in a rather large district at first.

420. Your next suggestion is "to provide, by Government supervision and by licenses for movement, for these restrictions being more efficiently carried out"; then am I to understand that, for foot and mouth disease, you would oblige every local authority to declare the place in which it breaks out infected, and to prevent the movement of any animal from that place, except by license?—Yes. In the infected places no movement should be allowed without the license or consent of the inspector. The area of these infected places, although large at first, might be allowed to be reduced by the declaration of the local authority.

421. You do not consider that merely giving the local authorities power to do this would have any effect at all?—No.

422. It must be made obligatory from the central department?—I see no other way of carrying it out.

423. Do you think that the officers of the local authorities could be relied upon for its due observance?—I think the officers of the local authorities should be independent.

424. Do you think that the officers should be appointed by the department throughout the kingdom?—I think so.

425. Who should give the licenses?—The Inspector. He should be assisted by the officers of the local authority who might carry out all the details under his superintendence.

426. Would you not leave the licenses to be given by the justices?—I do not think so; I am sorry to say that the justices do not inquire much into the circumstances, on the whole.

427. You think that you could not rely sufficiently upon the investigations of the justices to make that of much force?—I think not.

428. Was it not the case that during the greatest violence of the cattle plague great difficulty was found in carrying out with real stringency the restrictions as to isolation and movement?—At first there was, but afterwards they were pretty well carried out, except with regard to the licenses.

429. Do you think that it is at all probable, seeing that the deaths from foot and mouth disease are a very small per-centage, that public opinion would sufficiently support such stringent regulations, so as really to enable you to carry them out?—I did not formerly think so; but, looking to the estimates made not only in this country but abroad, with regard to the enormous losses from foot and mouth disease, I think, if the public could be shown that those losses were really not imaginary, they would probably support the regulations.

430. Then your hope that these regulations will be carried out lies in your belief that the public will be convinced of the necessity
n 4 from

Mr.
Alexander
Williams.
—
10 March
1878

Mr.
Alexander
Wallace.
—
10 March
1873.

from a proper estimate of the loss?—I think it possible.

431. Is that confirmed by the experience which you have had?—The experience of those who have inquired into the matter.

432. Is there any country, except Switzerland, in which you have reason to suppose that those regulations are strictly carried out?—I do not think they are strictly carried out in Switzerland. In Germany and in the Netherlands they do not attempt to carry them out.

433. Although in Germany and Holland they have very strong regulations with regard to cattle plague, they do not attempt to carry out regulations with regard to the foot and mouth disease?—So I believe. In Switzerland they tried it last year by means of the cantons. There is a report just received that, notwithstanding the attempts of the cantons to carry out the regulation, they failed to check the disease because they did not carry them out; and the Federal Council have now passed a more stringent law on the matter, and they will themselves see that they are carried out.

434. Am I right in taking this impression from your Report, and what you have said to-day, that you think it is not of much use to contend with foot and mouth disease at all, unless we make it compulsory throughout the country that a place where it occurs should be declared infected, and that there should be a prevention of movement without license?—I believe so; I do not mean in that particular way, but in some similar method, movement should be prevented in any place where the disease exists.

435. And you think that that would be effectual if it were carried out?—I do.

436. And you think that it could not be carried out, unless under very strong supervision from the central department?—I do.

437. And your ground for hoping that it would then be successful is your trust that public opinion might support it?—It would be successful, whether it were supported or not, if it were absolutely carried out; but it is a question of expense.

438. You mean that the department should be prepared, out of Treasury money, to do the work if the local authorities did not do it?—Quite so, and to recover it from the local authority if thought advisable.

439. You would not order cattle to be killed for foot and mouth disease?—I should not.

440. Supposing that you had these regulations in force, and a case of foot and mouth disease occurred, say, in the market on Norwich Hill, what would you do?—I can scarcely go into detail; I am quite prepared to go into it if I had time to prepare the details, but I have not as yet had time. I should make the Inspector absolutely and really responsible that everything that was proper was done, and I should dismiss him if he did not do it.

441. Would not that imply, in order to be successful, that there should be power somewhere, and that that power should be sometimes used to stop markets on account of foot and mouth disease?—It might become necessary, though I do not think it would be necessary as a general measure, but only in particular instances.

442. Supposing that Parliament, or that the Government, were not prepared to carry out these very stringent regulations, would you consider it of much use to carry on the present regulations

with regard to the foot and mouth disease?—Very little; I think it may have some effect in checking the disease, but not to any great extent.

443. Supposing there was no foot and mouth disease in a district at all, would you have any restrictions whatever?—No.

444. Then you would not subject the district to any restriction until the disease had been reported?—Certainly not.

445. Would you rely upon the local authority for reporting?—I should not.

446. Then it would be necessary to have officers from the central department to report?—Certainly.

447. Then, in fact, in order to effectually stop the disease, you think it would be necessary to have inspectors throughout the country appointed by and responsible to the central department?—It is the only way, I think, in which it can be checked.

448. Do you think they would be able to get this information?—Yes, if there were compulsory powers of entry.

449. Another suggestion would be that there should be compulsory powers of entry?—Yes.

450. Inasmuch as there would be no slaughter for foot and mouth disease, there would of course be no compensation; and would not the owner have a very strong inducement to conceal the disease?—I should hope there would be such machinery that it could not be concealed.

451. Then in order that it should be found out, would it not be requisite that the Inspector should be constantly visiting almost every farm?—He should constantly know what was going on at every farm.

452. Have you at all considered what number of inspectors would be necessary?—Yes, it would require a very large number; but that does not at all alter my opinion as to the necessity.

453. Have you at all estimated the amount of bill upon the Treasury that it would imply?—A very large amount.

454. Of course, although put in force by inspectors appointed by the central department, Parliament might require that the expenses should be defrayed by the locality?—Yes; I give no opinion upon that.

455. But you are strongly of opinion that in order to make these restrictions of real force, we must rely upon administration from a central department, and not upon local administration?—Certainly.

456. And, I suppose, your reason for that would be that it would be very difficult for the local authorities to be sufficiently convinced of the danger from the disease to induce them to incur the loss consequent upon this mode of preventing it?—I should think so.

457. We have in a county a great many local authorities; at present each borough is a local authority; does much practical evil result from that?—Very great.

458. You would prefer for working the Act that there should be only one local authority?—I am not prepared to say exactly what form of local authority there should be, but it is certainly objectionable to have a borough and a county with separate jurisdictions.

459. Do you imagine that the boroughs would very patiently submit to the local authority of the counties?—No, I am certain they would not.

460. With regard to the Irish import, do you think that disease have been lately introduced from Ireland?—I have no doubt of it.

461. Do

461. Do you think that much pleuro-pneumonia has come from Ireland?—Some has, I believe, but I have very little evidence of any absolute cases of pleuro-pneumonia from Ireland.

462. As regards foot and mouth disease, it is only recently that it has broken out in Ireland at all, is it not?—Comparatively recently.

463. I think it is since you and I have been colleagues?—I think it was there before, but the present outbreak commenced from some animals sent from this country.

464. For a year or two after I was first in the department they supposed in Ireland that they were free from the disease, did they not?—I think they said so, but I really have no information about Ireland.

465. They consider in Ireland, do they not, that we sent it to them?—Yes.

466. But they have sent it back with interest of late?—With very considerable interest.

467. And there has been a very considerable import of animals from Ireland with foot and mouth disease?—Undoubtedly.

468. Into what parts chiefly?—Bristol and Liverpool are the two worst.

469. Into Holyhead?—Holyhead I have not so carefully gone into; at Liverpool and Bristol we have inspectors; Birmingham complains also.

470. We have had strong representations, have we not, from the county authorities, both in the neighbourhood of Liverpool, and in the neighbourhood of Bristol, on account of the increase of foot and mouth disease near those two ports?—We have.

471. And they have requested us to take stronger steps as regards our inspection of those ports?—They have.

472. What have we done?—We have simply stationed an inspector at each of those ports, who does not inspect the animals, because it would be simply impossible for him to do it; it would require eight or nine inspectors; but on seeing the disease he reports to the local authorities.

473. That inspector being one of our inspectors?—Yes, he is one of our inspectors.

474. But we consider that it is the business of the local authority to do that?—Yes.

475. The Act contemplates that the local authority should undertake that duty, does it not?—It does.

476. And consequently in any attempt to do it by our inspector out of the Treasury money, we should have been met with a difficulty on the part of the Treasury authorities?—Quite so, and we should have wanted four times the staff of inspectors.

477. Consequently we have not been able to appoint an inspector for the purpose, but we have tried to get our inspectors for foreign animals to attempt to perform the duty?—Partially.

478. But you consider that it cannot be performed by our inspectors unless they are very considerably increased in number?—Quite so.

479. Supposing that a cargo arrives from Ireland with foot and mouth disease on board, what happens?—They are landed, and go away just as they like, I think. Nothing occurs.

480. If that cargo, instead of coming from Limerick or from Dublin, came from Antwerp or from Rotterdam, all the animals would be killed, would they not?—Certainly.

481. And consequently not only the farmers in the neighbourhood have complained, but the
Q.58.

foreign importers have complained, have they not?—They have.

482. Clause 57 of the Act enables prosecutions in the event of an animal with foot and mouth disease being moved along the highway, does it not?—Yes; and the attention of the local authorities is always called to that; but it would be impossible to carry that out; there is not accommodation for the animals; they have no places to put them in.

483. There is no provision at all corresponding to the regulation with regard to foreign import, because the apparently healthy foreign animals that come are all killed, whereas the apparently healthy animals coming from Ireland would go into the interior without any hindrance whatever?—Quite so.

484. And you have reason to fear that many of those animals carry the disease with them?—Yes.

485. A railway truck comes with animals to Islington Market, and there is foot and mouth disease amongst some of them; what becomes of those animals?—What should become of them would be that they should be seized by the inspector and removed to some isolated place.

486. Is that the regulation in force?—That is the regulation in force, and I believe that it is carried out.

487. But those animals that were not diseased would be able to travel about without let or hindrance?—They would.

488. Therefore, although the Irish import has nothing like the same restrictions put upon it as the foreign import, yet, at the same time, the Irish import is in exactly the same position as the transit of animals from one part of England to another part, or the animals arriving by sea from Scotland to the port of London?—Quite so; but from the numbers it is impossible to carry it out in the case of Irish animals, whereas it can to a great extent be carried out in the case of transit. If you get five or six carcasses into a port it is impossible to carry it out, it would stop the trade.

489. Is not the Irish traffic so enormous that the danger is considerably greater?—It is so.

490. The Irish import of cattle, you say, is 27 per cent. of our whole supply?—Yes, more than twice the foreign supply.

491. Consequently, if there be foot-and-mouth disease in an Irish cargo, the danger of its spread is very much greater to the country than in any transit, you may say, of one particular set of animals from one part of England to another, generally speaking?—Certainly; because they are herded together in such large numbers.

492. As regards England, or as regards Great Britain, there is more or less of an attempt to prevent the spread of foot-and-mouth disease by restrictions when it breaks out; I presume you do not feel yourself able to give any information as to what is done in Ireland?—No, I cannot.

493. You would say, would you not, that your general experience with regard to all import from all countries is, that there is an inclination on the part of the owner of a diseased beast to send him to a distant market?—Certainly; to smuggle him off in any way.

494. Have you any suggestion to make as to what should be done in England itself with regard to the Irish import?—I do not think we could do anything more to the Irish cattle than I should propose to do to the home cattle; that is to say,
C

Mr.
Alexander
Williams.
—
10 March
1873.

Mr.
Alexander
Williams.
—
10 March
1873.

to put them under precisely the same regulations, but to see that they were carried out. I mean that, if the animals were diseased, they should be detained and treated.

495. If your regulations with regard to the stoppage of the disease in the English farms were carried out, of course that would be sufficient with regard to the Irish import?—I believe so, except that at each port you would require the accommodation necessary for the purpose of carrying it out.

496. That is to say, you would require to have places to which animals that were at all affected, or animals that had been in contact with diseased animals, should be sent?—Yes.

497. There is no such provision at any one of the provincial ports, is there?—Not at one of them, nor even for retaining the Irish animals.

498. At any of the large markets in the country is there any provision for retaining animals?—I could scarcely answer that question, but Professor Brown has visited them all, and he will be able to tell the Committee.

499. Supposing we were not to attempt to carry out these very stringent restrictions that you have advised with regard to foot and mouth disease in our home farms, would you or would you not in that case recommend anything to be done as regards the Irish import?—I do not think I should require anything to be done as regards the Irish import, which we did not do to English stock.

500. I understood you to say that you thought there would be very little advantage in our present regulations, and that we should have to choose between ceasing to treat foot and mouth disease breaking out in Great Britain as a disease, and putting in force the very strong regulations which you recommend throughout the country. Supposing that we took the first course, and felt that we could not do what you suggest, and therefore that we had better do nothing, do you think it would then be possible to continue the restrictions, as regards foot and mouth disease, upon the foreign import?—I do not think it would be just to do so.

501. The Veterinary Department issued a transit order, followed by two or three orders of the same sort?—Yes.

502. There was a departmental committee, was there not, to consider what order should be issued, both as regards the disinfecting of vessels and railways, and as regards the prevention of cruelty, with especial reference to the provision of water and food for animals, both upon steamers and upon railways?—There was.

503. That committee consisted, did it not, of Sir Arthur Helps on behalf of the Privy Council, of yourself for the Veterinary Department, of Mr. Farrer for the Board of Trade, and of Mr. Goulburn of the Customs?—Yes.

504. In consequence of their recommendation that transit order was issued; taking first disinfecting, have you reason to suppose that that order has had any effect upon the foreign import?—I think so, certainly, as regards disinfecting vessels.

505. You would apply that more to the Port of London than to the outports, would you?—Certainly.

506. Chiefly because the cattle trade being of such importance to the Port of London, many of the vessels are given up to that trade entirely?—Yes.

507. As regards ventilation, has anything been done with reference to the vessels from the Continent coming into London?—They are all ventilated in the simple way of having an orifice communicating with the lower part of the hold, and another coming out of the hold; but I am informed that the other systems which have been brought before me have broken down on attempting to carry them out.

508. That committee reported in favour of efforts to prevent overcrowding; do you think that has been of any effect?—I think it has.

509. That, again, would apply more to cattle coming from the Continent to London than from other places, would it not?—Yes.

510. With regard to vessels arriving from Ireland, has much been done for disinfecting them?—We have endeavoured to carry that out by reporting to the local authorities and writing to the owners, and we have in a great number of cases succeeded in getting it carried out. Most of the vessels to Bristol, I think, carry out the disinfecting arrangement pretty well.

511. There again you were under a disadvantage, were you not, by not having a sufficient staff to carry out the order?—Yes.

512. The difference being that you had to rely upon the local authorities as regards carrying out the Privy Council Orders for disinfecting Irish vessels, whereas as regards foreign vessels we rely upon our own officers?—It is so.

513. Was not an attempt made to get a better supply of water for animals at the landing places?—Yes.

514. That has been generally carried out, has it not?—I think it has very generally at every place where they are put on board or landed.

515. Has anything been done to prevent overcrowding in Irish vessels?—The same regulations apply to Irish vessels as apply to foreign vessels.

516. There was great complaint of overcrowding, was there not?—There was.

517. Do you think it has been really seriously diminished?—I have very little information about it.

518. In order really to carry out the regulations with regard to the disinfecting of Irish vessels, and to secure their ventilation, and the prevention of overcrowding, would you not think that one of two things must be done; that is to say, either that you must have a larger staff at the ports in England at which they arrive, or that more steps must be taken in Ireland with regard to the vessels before they leave?—Yes.

519. With regard to railways, it was recommended that water should be supplied at many stations, was it not?—It is already supplied at 547 stations.

520. What order was that?—The first was the order of the 12th May 1870.

521. Can you hand in a table containing the number of stations at which it has been supplied?—It is in last year's Report.

522. Has anything been done with regard to overcrowding on railways?—Only the order which says that they are liable if they do overcrowd.

523. Do you think there has been less overcrowding than there was before?—I think there has; but so long as railway companies let trucks by the truck, instead of by the head of cattle, I think overcrowding will take place.

524. There have been some prosecutions, have there not, under this Act?—A good many.

525. Have

525. Have they succeeded generally?—As regards transit I think they have, but we have had nothing to do with them.

526. Would you not think that upon the whole as regards cruelty, it is diminished?—Decidedly.

527. Have you any suggestions to make upon that point?—We are not given information which would enable one to make suggestions. There has been no proposal by which it could be improved practically.

528. Do you suppose that if we were able to have one or two inspectors, whose business it would be to see that these regulations were carried out on the railways, much more would be done?—I think so.

529. At present whatever you have done has been done with your staff, without any addition for that purpose?—Without any addition for that purpose; at odd times and very irregularly.

530. Complaints are very often made of the animals being delayed in their transit; have we any power to prevent that?—None whatever that I am aware of.

531. That matter was debated, was it not, at the time of the passing of the Act?—It was.

532. And no power was given to us to stop it?—No.

533. There have been some prosecutions for not giving water in transit, have there not?—The only information I get is through the newspapers in that matter. We have nothing to do with the prosecutions, but I have seen some accounts of some of them.

534. With regard to food, do you know whether the order stating that food must be supplied at the request of the owner has been put in force?—We have had no information; we have had no complaints about it, and therefore we consider that it is in force.

535. It has been very often urged that the Order should be altered. At present the railway company is compelled to provide the water, but it is not compelled to give the water at the request of the owner or of the person in charge of the animals. It has been suggested that the railway company, or their servants, should have the responsibility of seeing that the animals had sufficient water; would you be in favour of that change, or not?—I think it would be an advisable change; but I do not think it would ever receive the sanction of Parliament, because in 1869 it was strongly discussed at the time the Bill was brought forward, and it was thoroughly opposed by the railway companies.

536. The change would be this: that whereas they must now provide the water, they would then, in fact, have to water the animals, and the

reply that they make is that that ought to rest with the person who is in charge, whose interest it is to see that the animals are watered?—Yes; and there are other difficulties. They would be liable to prosecutions for detaining the animals, and there are lots of objections and difficulties made.

537. However, that is the change which has been constantly before us; and we have not felt that we have sufficient power to do it?—Quite so.

538. You would see advantages in it; but you would not give a positive opinion that it should be attempted?—Certainly not, unless some better mode of watering were adopted.

539. Are not animals often sent without any one being in charge at all?—I think not. I believe the railway companies give a free pass to people in charge of cattle.

540. Do you think that cattle come from Scotland to London without anybody in charge?—I really do not know. I should imagine that small numbers of cattle would constantly be sent without anybody in charge of them.

541. There have been several suggestions for providing trucks which would enable the animals to obtain water while travelling; have you seen any of those provisions which you think would be successful?—I have seen most of the proposals, but I have not seen one that I think would be successful. I think it might be readily done if the railway companies really wished to do it.

542. It has been frequently stated that it is probable that the foot and mouth disease is caught upon the vessel by the animals, although it did not exist before their departure from Ireland; do you not think that that is the case?—It is possible if the vessel were not disinfected, if any germs of the disease existed on board.

543. How long does it take for the foot and mouth disease to show itself?—I think that is rather a question for the inspectors than for myself; I am of opinion that if a lot of cattle were collected together in a vessel, and were 48 hours together, if there was any foot and mouth disease amongst them, it would show itself in some of them in 48 hours.

544. There has been a memorial from Cheshire, has there not, with regard to the foot and mouth disease?—There has.

545. Will you put that in?—I will.

546. Will you also put in the memorial from the Central Chamber of Agriculture?—I will.

547. Was there not a memorial from the Highland Agricultural Society?—There was.

548. Will you put that in also?—I will.

Mr.
Alexander
Williams.

10 March
1873.

Thursday, 15th March 1873.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mr. James Barclay.
Mr. Jacob Bright.
Mr. Callan.
Mr. Cawley.
Mr. Clay.
Mr. Dent.
Mr. Dodson.
Mr. William Edward Forster.

Mr. William Johnston.
Mr. Kavanagh.
Mr. Lusk.
Mr. Monsell.
Mr. O'Connor.
Mr. Clare Read.
Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson.
Mr. Tipping.

CLARE SEWELL READ, Esq., IN THE CHAIR.

Mr. ALEXANDER WILLIAMS, called in; and further Examined.

Mr.
Alexander
Williams.

13 March
1873

548. Chairman.] I THINK when you were last under examination, you did not give the Committee any account of the expenses of your department; will you hand in a return or statement of those expenses?—This is the statement (*handing in a Paper*).

550. Before we go into the particulars of those expenses, will you kindly give us an abstract of the work that is done in the department?—I can furnish such an abstract.

551. We should be glad to have the Paper put in, but at the same time, if you can now give us the substance of them in evidence, we should wish to have it?—The work of the office is divided into three branches, as I have already stated; first, what we may call the miscellaneous work, which includes the correspondence. This may be divided into the docketing, registration, indexing, writing, forwarding and keeping copies of outward letters, and copying despatches, of which we have a large number.

552. Can you give us any idea how many letters are written by the department?—During the year 1872, the inward letters and other papers requiring registration, amounted to 5,558; the outward letters during the same period, were 3,043.

553. Were those written in the office?—Those were written in the office, and the circulars were 3,276. Of the diplomatic and consular despatches received during the year, 437 had to be copied. They are registered, and then they are copied, because the Foreign Office requires them to be returned. In this branch is done the drafting of the Orders of Council, recording all matters relating to them, and also to the orders and licensing required to be published by the local authority, examining and noting all orders and regulations of local authorities; keeping all records of all changes in the names and addresses of their clerks, inspectors, and other officers, and of their districts, in order to communicate with the proper authority, or proper inspector. The number of local authorities is 404; the number of inspectors during the year, was between 1,600 and 1,700.

554. Does that include the superintendents of police?—All persons who were appointed inspectors, whether superintendents of police or otherwise. Those were not absolutely in office on the 31st December. I have here a list of them, which is rather a formidable document (*handing in a volume*). Another part of the work of this branch is the supplying of copies of orders to local authorities, lords lieutenant, inspectors, public offices, embassies, and other persons. During the year 16 orders were prepared and passed, and upwards of 58,000 copies of them were distributed.

555. With regard to the 1,600 inspectors, I suppose you do not communicate directly with them, but through the local authority?—On certain points we are obliged to communicate directly with them, as regards returns and other things.

556. Do they send you weekly returns?—Yes.

557. As well as to the local authority?—As well as to the local authority, on all diseases except foot and mouth disease.

558. When the inspectors are superintendents of police, do they communicate direct with you?—I believe so. The counties are very different in their means of communication; sometimes the chief of the police makes all the communications, at other times single inspectors send their returns and communications; it is different in different counties.

559. Whether they are veterinary surgeons or police officers?—Whether they are veterinary surgeons or police officers. You will find in that return the arrangement in each county; but they are so very different that it is impossible to give any general idea of the way in which it is managed.

560. Mr. Dent.] Take, for instance, the West Riding of Yorkshire; a weekly return of the disease there is sent from the chief constable's office to you, is it not, and not from each separate inspector?—It is sent from each individual inspector; in fact, I am not aware that we receive a general return at all.

561. Do

561. Do you not receive a weekly summary?—I think not; we make them all up ourselves from the inspector's returns.

562. [Chairman.] Is it not the duty of every inspector appointed by a local authority to furnish you with a weekly return, as well as to furnish the local authority with it?—It is; but in some counties they have made a different arrangement.

563. Is it by Act of Parliament that they are bound to give you the return, or is it by order?—By order. By Act of Parliament they are bound to give us such returns as we require, and our orders require them weekly, except in the case of foot and mouth disease; then an additional part of the work of the miscellaneous part of the office is recording the opinions of the legal adviser of the department; we are constantly asked for opinions, and of late years we have given them whenever we have been able, to the local authorities on their application.

564. Previously, I believe, your general answer was, that you did not interpret Acts of Parliament?—It was so.

565. Now you are good enough to give legal advice on the wording of your orders?—Yes.

566. And also, perhaps, on the wording of an Act of Parliament, to the local authorities?—It is done always, with the proviso that it is merely as we are advised; not that it has any weight in a court of justice.

567. Have you any legal adviser for drawing orders?—We have.

568. Do you submit all the orders to some legal opinion?—We do. Mr. Reilly is the legal adviser of the department, and has been for some years, except for an interval when the Treasury refused to allow us to consult him. He drew the Act.

569. There is no solicitor especially belonging to the office, is there?—There is none at all. We draw all the orders ourselves, and submit them to Mr. Reilly.

570. Have you given us now all the work of the office?—During the past year we had a second series of the handbook to compile, which took up a great deal of time. It was thought advisable that the local authorities should have some little handbook of reference on various points, and the second series was compiled during the last year, and we distributed upwards of 4,000 copies of that. That is all with reference to that branch. The Committee will have to consider that these divisions are not absolute or real, but that it is rather that the work is generally done in those separate branches. At the same time, one has to help the other; but the things are thoroughly mixed up, and sometimes the whole office is engaged on one particular branch. The next branch to which I will refer is the statistical branch.

571. That, I suppose, some years ago was under Mr. Glode, was it not?—It was.

572. He has left your office for some time, has he not?—Yes; he was merely lent for a short time from the Registrar General's Office, during Colonel Harnett's time. In the statistical branch, first, the accounts are kept, which are not a very small item in the work, on account of there being so much correspondence.

573. What sort of accounts are they?—Accounts of every farthing received and every farthing paid, with vouchers for everything in particular forms, divided into all kinds of separate items; and the difficulty of knowing what you

can pay and what you cannot pay, renders it extremely awkward to check the accounts. Twelve months afterwards the question comes up as to whether you ought or ought not to have paid those sums.

574. What expenses do you pay?—The Privy Council is responsible for it, but we keep the accounts, and practically pay all the amounts granted us by the vote. We are obliged to account practically for every penny of the vote.

575. But the expenditure is almost all in salaries, is it not; you have only 350*l.* for travelling expenses, and 350*l.* for incidental expenses, whereas there is 10,000*l.* as salaries?—I think it is something of that kind.

576. Will you be good enough to tell the Committee what accounts are kept beyond those salaries?—The accounts are kept by one of the clerks of the office; I am scarcely capable of explaining all the details, but I know there is constant difficulty and trouble about it.

577. What would be the amount of those ordinary expenses, barring the salaries?—If any person in the department takes a cab there must be a voucher for it, and entries made; then if any inspector goes travelling anywhere, he is not allowed a certain sum, but he is obliged to bring accounts for every item, and every item has to be checked, in case there should be, for instance, an item for washing in the hotel bills, which sometimes occurs, and which causes great difficulty afterwards, because you cannot return the money and settle the matter, but you have to go through a long correspondence. With regard to all the inspectors at ports the same thing occurs; their accounts must be produced, and all the accounts must be gone through carefully, to see that they are in accordance with the Treasury sanction.

578. But the whole amount of the travelling expenses and incidental expenses is something like 700*l.*, is it not?—Then we have to keep monthly accounts of all the payments made, get vouchers, and deduct income tax, and so forth.

579. From the salaries of the officers of the department?—Yes; then we have to get the orders of the Paymaster General, and then we have to get the receipt or order cashed. In the case of the temporary clerks and writers, that has to be done weekly, and all the vouchers returned to the Council Office. Then the inspectors spend money in disinfectants; the Board of Trade pay certain sums for the burial of carcasses.

580. Do they charge that to you?—They charge it to us, and we have to go into the items to see whether we have Treasury authority to pay it, before we can pay it.

581. Does that come under the head of incidental expenses?—It comes under the head of incidental expenses.

582. Still they are not very enormous, are they?—No, but if there are 10,000 items in a sum of 350*l.*, it is almost as troublesome as if they were 50*l.* each. It is the number of copies required; there are four or five copies of the monthly requests for payment.

583. Is there any other observation which you would like to make upon that head?—I have only at present mentioned the accounts in the Statistical Department; but the principal work in the Statistical Department is that relating to the diseases among home animals. First, there is the registry and indexing returns, and I may mention that

Mr.
Alexander
W. Glode.
13 March
1873.

Mr.
Alexander
Williams.

13 March
1873.

those returns are so very frequently incorrect and wrong, that a correspondence is necessitated on a great number of them, and therefore they have to be very carefully treated, in order to find out the errors, or else the total of our returns would be worth very little.

584. Notwithstanding all the correspondence, there were not above 3,000 letters sent out last year, is not that so?—A good deal of the correction of returns is done without being registered; the returns are examined and checked, and frequently on the returns, matters of information or correspondence are put by the inspectors, and copies have to be made, because the original return must be retained in the statistical branch as a check upon that.

585. With regard to the correspondence, are you aware that it is no very uncommon thing for Members of Parliament to write 3,000 letters with their own hand in the course of a year?—Yes, but I do not think they would be able to lay their hands in a quarter of an hour upon any individual letter written five years ago; it requires a very complicated machinery to do that. It would be useless to us if we could not refer to all the letters. That was carefully gone into by each Committee; five Committees have sat upon the department; and all this has been very carefully gone into by each of them as regards reducing the work; and each of these Committees recommended that it could not be reduced so as to be carried on efficiently.

586. You have now one secretary, one chief clerk, three first class clerks, eight temporary clerks, seventeen extra temporary clerks, and three writers, have you not?—That is merely the estimate that we think we shall require; we may require less, but we cannot have more without application to the Treasury.

587. But I see that it is precisely the same number which you had last year, or that the estimate was for last year, except that you had two extra clerks and two writers less?—I doubt whether that is correct.

588. Who makes this calculation?—I sent in a certain estimate, but it has been altered by the Treasury.

589. This is the only return that we have as Members of Parliament to guide us as to the expenses which are incurred; can you give us any other return?—The Appropriation Accounts will tell you the money absolutely spent. I have already given in a paper which will give you the actual expenses. This is a mere estimate. This has been altered since it was sent in by me; I am certain on one point, and it is altered incorrectly. They have put down a salary of 500 l. for the second inspector, whereas he is only receiving 400 l. We have to keep records of all outbreaks of cattle plague, pleuro-pneumonia, sheep-pox and glanders, and general returns of the attacks, deaths, and recoveries from those diseases; and also of sheep scab, and other diseases of animals so returned.

590. You do not often publish those, I think?—We do not, except once a year.

591. We have had no report, have we, till last year from your department since the year 1868?—No; the arrangement was only made last year that it should be published once a year. I represented that it would be advisable to publish it weekly; but, from expense and one thing and another, it was objected to.

592. From 1868 to 1872, I think we had only one report?—Yes, the 1871 Report.

593. And that was published in July 1872, was it not?—Yes, I believe so. I was away in the early part of last year. We make (the information can be always obtained at the office) a weekly, quarterly, half-yearly, and yearly summary of those diseases in each county of Great Britain; that refers to the corrected returns; but we prepare the weekly return as soon as possible, without correction, for the information of the Privy Council. As regards those diseases, we had to deal with 32,361 returns during the year 1872. Then we register and index all declarations of the existence of and freedom from disease, received from inspectors or local authorities. The declaration of disease in some cases is first made by the inspector, and the local authority has additionally to declare.

594. Not foot and mouth disease, I think?—Not foot and mouth disease; cattle plague, pleuro-pneumonia, and sheep-pox.

595. As foot and mouth disease was the most general disease, I suppose not having to take any notice of that rather lessens the work of the department, does it not?—It does, so far as that is concerned.

596. I suppose that frequently you had returns of foot and mouth disease when there is no other complaint in the district?—I should imagine so. Then we have to check the declarations with the returns, which is a very necessary thing to do. Then we record the number of horses, cattle, and other animals, sent to the horse slaughterers in London, with the cause of death in each case, in order, if possible, to trace the existence of disease in any of the stables or linn. Then we authorise the slaughter, record the number of cattle affected with pleuro-pneumonia, and supply the forms for the returns.

597. And, of course, a great number of accounts and tabulated statements are kept which are not comprised in the return?—Yes, a great number. I chose those which I thought would be most useful to the Committee in that case. Then we occasionally have to prepare statistical work for the Privy Council in deciding any matter, and for Parliament; but really it takes considerable time in almost all cases, because it is wanted in a different form from that in which we keep it, and therefore it involves great labour. During the last year we had the Report for 1871 to prepare, which took a considerable time, in addition to the ordinary work of the office. I think that will pretty well include the work of that branch. The work of the transit branch of the office has been considerably modified since the last order relating to the transit of animals was passed, and has since been much reduced. In addition to the work relating to the transit of animals, the following work is done in this branch: registering certificates from veterinary inspectors at the different ports; tabulating the number of animals inspected, the number thrown overboard during the voyage, and the cause; the number landed dead, the number slaughtered or which died at the place of landing, and the number affected with disease; preparing a monthly return for the "London Gazette" of the number of animals found to be affected with any contagious or infectious disease on landing; treating diplomatic and consular despatches relating to diseases abroad, and translating the various enclosures and foreign laws

Mr.
Alexander
Williams.
13 March
1872.

and regulations; giving weekly information to the veterinary inspectors at the different ports of places abroad where cattle plague exists; tabulating the number of animals imported weekly into Great Britain; keeping a record of the number of animals at the metropolitan markets, and of the rise and fall of the prices of meat.

598. I understood you to say that you were particularly pressed at the Veterinary Department just now, and that your clerks were employed night and day, and also on Sundays?—Occasionally.

599. What is the reason of this unwanted necessity; I should hope that it is not generally the case that the clerks are employed on Sundays?—Whenever any extra work of a special character is required, such as that during the late outbreak of cattle plague, if we keep up our general work at the same time, we must work at nights and on Sundays, because we cannot get fresh hands to take up our regular work, and consequently we are obliged to put on those hands who are accustomed to the work to do it, and then they are obliged to stay to do their own work afterwards.

600. You have got rid of the returns of the foot and mouth disease; what extra work is there?—All the information which I have been giving to the Committee has been obliged to be prepared; the returns which I have handed in this morning, and all the other things.

601. But that is not a portion of the annual report; that does not entail all the extra labour, does it?—The annual report entails a great deal of extra labour; our staff is only calculated to do the current work of the office, and anything which we do extra adds to the work, and necessitates either late hours or an additional staff of good men.

602. Do you not think that the annual report is part of the work of the office, as it is in other departments?—When the office was established it was not considered a part of the work, nor was it done at all. When the first report was issued, a special arrangement was made, and an additional staff taken on for doing it.

603. But if these accounts are so well and minutely kept, I should think tabulating them for a report is not very difficult?—It is the difference of form.

604. Mr. Jacob Bright: I think I saw it stated in your evidence the other day, that at your office the work began at 11 o'clock in the morning?—Yes.

605. Instead of working on Sundays, and working very late at night, would it not be better to begin at nine o'clock in the morning?—I should think, as a rule, it would, but I am under the control of my superiors; the office hours, as laid down, are from eleven to five; there is one clerk who comes every morning at nine o'clock.

606. You would not expect, I presume, in any ordinary business concern, that if there was any great pressure of business the office work would only begin at 11 o'clock in the morning?—I should say not, certainly; but then I should pay the men in proportion to the number of hours that they worked. I consider that the contract with the clerks is for six hours work, for which they are inadequately paid, I believe, and I think that it is unfair to ask them for more work than they are paid for.

607. (Chairman.) We now come to the salaries; who arranges the scale of payments for the

officers?—The scale of payment of the officers has been arranged from time to time by various Commissions which have sat.

608. Committees of the Treasury, of the Privy Council, or what?—I have already, in my evidence, given the various Commissions.

609. They were departmental Commissions, I suppose, and had nothing to do with the House of Commons?—Nothing; the Treasury really arranges it.

610. Will you be kind enough to turn to the Civil Service Estimates for the present year; the salaries of the office as detailed in the Civil Service Estimate for the current year have been fixed by those committees, have they not?—Practically by the Treasury. The Committee recommends, but the Treasury settles it afterwards, and not always in accordance with the recommendation.

611. Now we come to the salary of the secretary, and I see that that is put down at a maximum of 800 l.?—It is.

612. For 1873-74 and the previous year it is 1,000 l., and there is a note which says, "including a personal allowance of 200 l.;" what does that "personal allowance" mean; is it an order from the Treasury?—I have before me a quotation from the Report of the Committee who inquired into the office towards the close of the year 1869; it is a confidential memorandum, but I think I am justified in mentioning it. The Committee after going into the whole question, and taking evidence of that kind, say, "On full consideration we propose that the establishment of the Veterinary Department of the Privy Council Office should be fixed as follows: a secretary at a salary of 800 l. a year, one chief clerk at 500 l., rising by 50 l. annually to a maximum of 600 l.; two inspectors at 500 l. a year each, upon the understanding that they give up their whole time to the public." Then there is a special arrangement with Professor Simonds which I dare say the Committee will not wish to hear; "three first class clerks at a salary of 250 l., increasing 15 l. a year to 400 l.; nine second class clerks at 100 l., increasing by 10 l. to 230 l." (it was modified a little after this report); "that the remaining clerks, as many as may be found necessary, should hold no permanent appointment, but be engaged temporarily according to the requirements of the service, and that they should be paid at the rate of from 2 l. to 2 l. 10 s. a week. In consideration of Dr. Williams having received a salary of 1,000 l. a year before it was reduced last year, and of his having the responsibility and additional duty of the organisation of a new department, as well as the additional duties which will devolve upon him under the Act of last Session, we propose that his salary shall be fixed at 1,000 l. a year; the additional 200 l. a year to be considered as personal to Dr. Williams. For nearly the same reasons, we recommend that Mr. Hardley Wilnot should be allowed to receive the maximum salary of his class, viz., 600 l. a year."

613. I gather from those minutes which you have read, that previously to the passing of the Act of 1869 the salary of the secretary was 1,000 l. a year?—It was.

614. It never appeared in the Votes as more than 800 l., did it?—It did not appear at all in the Votes before 1868-69.

615. What is the date of that minute?—The latter end of 1869, after the Act passed.

616. But in the Estimates for 1868-69 there

Mr.
Alexander
Willison.

13 March
1873.

is a maximum of 800*l.*, and there is also a personal allowance of 200*l.*; who is now the chief clerk?—Mr. Eardley Willson is now the chief clerk.

617. Can you tell me how it was that in one year the salary of the chief clerk was put at 200*l.*, and in the next at 600*l.*?—I can. When the Committee sat upon the department after the cattle plague had ceased (I could give you the exact date, if required), to ascertain whether a reduction could not take place, as cattle plague no longer existed in the county, and as we had then nothing to do practically with the other diseases, that Committee recommended a great reduction of the staff. In the first place, in April 1869, the secretary's salary was reduced, I think, from 1,000*l.* to 800*l.*, and the salary of the present chief clerk, who was then acting as assistant secretary, was also reduced.

618. From what?—I had no chief clerk at that time. He took office as an ordinary clerk during the reduction, receiving 5*l.* a week only, or 260*l.* a year. Afterwards, however, the Treasury, on account of the large amount of work which came in at that time, paid him the back pay, amounting to 600*l.* a year, from the time when he took office.

619. Where do we find that?—I have not the slightest idea.

620. So that when it appears in the Estimates of 1868–69 date, the chief clerk was receiving 200*l.* a year, he was actually receiving 600*l.*?—No; he did not know it, and it was not so.

621. But he was paid 600*l.*, was he not?—They made it up to him, so that it amounted to 600*l.* throughout. His first appointment was at 400*l.* a year, and it was afterwards made up to 600*l.* a year from the date of his appointment.

622. Therefore, this scale of salaries, which says that the minimum is 600*l.* a year to the chief clerk, to be increased by 20*l.* annually to a maximum of 800*l.*, is altogether moonshine?—No, because he only gets his maximum on account of special services, without waiting for the increase, as has, I believe, been frequently done in other offices.

623. May I ask why Professor Brown, whose minimum salary is 600*l.*, as chief inspector, and whose maximum salary is 800*l.*, does not get the annual increase of 20*l.* a year?—He will get it from this time; that was only allowed by the Treasury some three weeks or a month ago.

624. I see that he has 600*l.*, and he simply receives now the minimum salary of 600*l.* this year and last year; how many years has Professor Brown been in the office?—Nearly eight years; Professor Simonds received 600*l.*, and when he retired I applied to the Treasury for Professor Brown to receive it, but it was refused. I applied again, because I was afraid that I should lose Professor Brown if he did not get a proper amount, and after considerable correspondence they agreed, about six weeks ago, that such increase should be made; it was accordingly commenced from the date of the Treasury authority, and now Professor Brown is receiving 100*l.* a year more than he was receiving last year, and will go on with the increase as it is arranged now with the Treasury. There is extreme difficulty in getting a qualified man to keep and hold these appointments, unless there is some inducement to him in the way of increment to remain, which was not the case before.

625. It appears to me that these increments

are very irregular; in the case of one official it is stated that in one year his salary was 200*l.*, and that in the next it was 600*l.*; and here we have Professor Brown put down at 600*l.* in each year, with no apparent rise; can you explain that?—I think it is not so in this year's Estimates. The arrangement has only just been entered into.

626. Are not the Estimates exactly alike in the two years?—It is not correct Professor Brown only received 500*l.* last year.

627. Mr. Dest.] I think that there is a little misunderstanding; Professor Simonds was the chief inspector last year, was he not?—Yes.

628. And he received 600*l.* a year, did he not?—Yes.

629. Was not Professor Brown, the second inspector, receiving 500*l.* a year?—Quite so.

630. Now Professor Brown, who is put down as the chief inspector, starts with 600*l.* a year, that is really the case, is it not?—That is really the case.

631. Chairman.] The new inspector is stated to receive 500*l.* this year, and you say that is wrong?—He receives only 400*l.* I cannot understand the reason for putting those figures; they were not put by me.

632. Then the scale of the salary which says that the minimum should be only 400*l.* is, in reality, what is now paid to Mr. Cope?—Yes.

633. There are three first class clerks, are there not, their average salary being about 350*l.* each?—Yes.

634. So that the total amount of the estimate for the present year of the salaries of inspectors and officials is 10,893*l.* is it not?—It is; that includes the salaries of the inspectors at the ports as well.

635. Those inspectors receive, do they not, salaries amounting to just 3,000*l.*, some being paid by fees and some by salaries?—It will not come quite to 3,000*l.*; that is the estimate; we have only used 2,770*l.* of the salaries at present.

636. Then I see in these same Civil Service Estimates that the salaries of the Medical Department amount to 10,684*l.*, so that the health of the stock costs more than the health of the human beings by 260*l.*, does it not?—Yes; but the local authorities pay, I should think, twenty times as much with regard to the public health.

637. In those detailed estimates of expense I see nothing put down for law; can you tell us what that costs in a year?—I could ascertain it, but it is paid by the Solicitor of the Treasury, who has the sole charge of all the law expenses, so far as I know; Mr. Reilly is our counsel, and I simply check that he has been consulted on the occasions for which he sends in his account, and the fees and all that are arranged by the Treasury, and are charged, I believe, in the general law expenses; we make no payment whatever on that account.

638. Then you will, perhaps, be kind enough to give that, if you can obtain it?—I can only give you the number of consultations; the fees are arranged by the Treasury.

639. But is it possible for you to obtain from the Treasury what the law expenses of the Veterinary Department are?—I do not think I could; I have no standing to apply to the Treasury for anything of the kind.

640. Do you think the Treasury know what the cost is?—I should think they do; those things are very sharply looked after.

641. There

Mr.
Alexander
Palmer.
—
13 March
1873.

641. There is no return made for postage; why is that?—There is no charge made for postage, nor any account kept; the bags are forwarded through the Post Office, and I believe they are weighed and charged against the Council Office generally; but we have no information about that in the Department.

642. I see under the head of "Agricultural Statistics," which come under the Board of Trade, that the postage is charged at 3,300*l.*, and also that the postage of the vaccination returns under the Local Government Board is charged at 2,500*l.*; are you aware that that is so?—Very possibly.

643. Could you give the Committee no approximate idea of the cost of postage?—Not the slightest; I have no means whatever of knowing it; it is a mere matter of account.

644. Have you any item which you could furnish the Committee as to the expenses of stationery?—Not the slightest of any kind; the stationery accounts for all the departments are published by the Stationery Office every year; we are remitted directly if we exceed in any way.

645. The Stationery Department do not divide the expenses between the Departments, do they?—Not that I am aware of; I do not at all know that they do, and the extreme division that I should think that they would make would be, "Privy Council Office," because ours is a sub-department scarcely having separate accounts.

646. Are you aware that the Sanitary Commission reported in these terms: "We think that whatever central superintendence of the Cattle Diseases Act is required should be vested in a new central authority"?—I do not recollect the exact wording.

647. They made the same recommendation with regard to the Health Department, and they were transferred to the Local Government Board, were they not?—So I understand.

648. Do you know any reason why the Veterinary Department should not go there too?—I cannot see the slightest advantage in going there, because the local authorities are different, the method of working is different, the class of officers required is different, and the machinery altogether is so entirely different, that it would be only putting an additional branch as it were on to that office; I have scarcely an opinion as to whether it would work better under the President of the Local Government Board than under the Privy Council, but I should imagine not so well; there are points with regard to importation and restrictions on trade which could scarcely be properly settled, I think, without a Committee.

649. You do not think that it would be advantageous to the public service, that this department should be transferred to the Local Government Board?—I do not think so. Personally, I should prefer it, because it would relieve me of an enormous amount of responsibility, but I do not think that it would work.

650. I think it appears from the evidence which you gave on Monday, that you had been at first secretary to the Veterinary Department?—It was first the Veterinary Department, then the Cattle Plague Department, and then the Veterinary Department again.

651. That is the self-same department now, is it not, although its name has been altered so many times?—Yes.

652. At what period did you commence?—I

commenced in August 1865, privately on my own responsibility, without any hope of payment; I got my brother and some clerks to help me. It was suggested by Sir Arthur Helps, who said that Professor Simonds had got into such a lot of correspondence, that it was impossible for him to attend to it, and he asked me if I would go and help him. I said I would do so with pleasure. I then lived in Spring-gardens. I devoted a room to the purpose, got all the correspondence together, and a short time afterwards, with Mr. Baring's assistance, got the matter authorized. I can give you the first authorisation, if you please. The correspondence was then totally neglected, and it was necessarily so, because Professor Simonds had so much to do with the real professional work, that he could not attend to it.

653. But the outbreak of the cattle plague, I suppose, was the beginning of this office, was it not?—Quite so.

654. And it has been continued more or less ever since, has it not?—Ever since, under one form or another.

655. Then you were the first secretary?—Yes.

656. What was the amount of the salary then?—I was only to give a very small portion of my time to it, and I was to have then six guineas a week.

657. And then, in April 1866, I think Colonel Harness came?—Yes.

658. What were you then?—By that arrangement, Colonel Harness reported a scheme for the department, which the Treasury sanctioned, and I was made the medical adviser.

659. What were your duties as medical adviser?—Colonel Harness submitted this scheme: first, a medical superintendent and adviser, whose rate of remuneration should not exceed 12*l.* a week; then on that Mr. Baring put a note that I should be paid at the rate of at least 600*l.* a year.

660. What were your duties as medical adviser?—To advise on all general medical matters not specially relating to veterinary medicine, disinfection, and all the papers, foreign or otherwise, relating to diseases, and all correspondence relating to diseases were referred to me.

661. Mr. Cowley.] Do you mean diseases of cattle?—Exactly; not that I was at all competent to deal with them.

662. Chairman.] Why was not this office continued?—I thought myself that it was not a very useful office.

663. This was an office created which you did not think was necessary?—I did not think so, but Colonel Harness did; he recommended it strongly.

664. Then on Colonel Harness leaving the office, was this office of medical adviser abolished?—It was, on my recommendation.

665. And you returned as secretary?—I returned as secretary simply.

666. How many of the officials of your office are on what is called the permanent staff of officials?—Seven, I think; the second class clerks are not permanent; they are liable to discharge at any moment.

667. What is the advantage of being on the permanent staff?—On complying with certain conditions, eventually you get superannuation, which you do not get otherwise.

668. If the office is abolished do you get compensation?—Yes, under the Superannuation Act.

D

669. How

Mr.
Alexander
Williams.
—
13 March
1873.

649. How long have you to serve before you become permanent officials?—You are made permanent, I think, as a rule at the time of appointment, but I really know very little about it.

670. How long have you to serve before you are entitled to superannuation?—I think 10 years is the earliest time, except where an office is abolished, and then, I believe, they give compensation, but I really do not know very much about it.

671. There are not above seven permanent clerks you think?—There are only seven permanent officials as regards the clerks; I do not know whether you would consider the messengers to be so. The consequence is, that the other clerks have no interest in retaining their appointments, and they leave when they can get anything better.

672. Going to your Reports, the first Report, which was called the Cattle Plague Report, was delivered in the middle of the year 1868, was it not?—Yes.

673. This is a Report of the cattle plague in Great Britain during the years 1865, 1866, and 1867, and it was issued in 1868, was it not?—Yes.

674. I believe all the statistical portion was done the year before?—Not all; only that up to December 1866; but there was a considerable amount of work after that.

675. Was it delayed for the purpose of giving the Veterinary Report, so as to embrace all?—It was; Professor Simonds is, I think, unanswerable for that delay. It would have been useless to publish it without the Veterinary Report.

676. Then there was an absence of any Report from 1868 to July 1872, was there not?—There was; but between those times we furnished several returns giving information as required.

677. That is to say, that you furnished returns to the Metropolitan Market Bill Committee?—Yes, and to the House, but there was no regular Report.

678. Now we have another interesting Report in February 1873?—Yes.

679. Is it proposed that we shall have an annual report as early in the year as we have had it this year?—I am afraid that it cannot be got out so early without enormous labour; and its cost is a great deal increased, because we have to correct it after sending it to the press. I think you cannot expect to have it in future before some time in March, unless I am given additional hands for the purpose of pressing on that particular thing.

679*. In the Report of 1872, which you signed on the 11th of July, which was, in fact, the Report for 1871, those first 14 pages were written by you, were they not, and not by the veterinary inspector?—That was so.

680. But we have the advantage this year of a Report from you, and also of a Report from the veterinary inspectors?—Yes; I hoped to have had that last year, but the veterinary inspectors were so pressed that I could not get it.

681. Is it supposed that we shall have a repetition of those excellent Reports from the veterinary inspectors?—I hope so. Of course I am entirely under the orders of the Privy Council with regard to anything of that kind. I proposed the annual Report long ago. I wanted to continue the annual Report, but the expense has always been the difficulty. As long as we do it in overtime it is allowed, but if any extra expense is incurred we are stopped directly.

682. Referring to the Report of 1871, page 8, the second paragraph, you are talking of the foot and mouth disease. "Whether it was or was not first imported into this country in 1839, or had a spontaneous origin about that time, or had existed here long before that date, remains to be proved." May I ask you whether you are responsible for that statement, or did you get that information from the veterinary inspectors?—I am responsible for that statement, and for all contained in it.

683. I refer particularly to the "spontaneous origin" about that time; do you suppose that the foot and mouth disease often originates spontaneously?—I do not believe it ever did, or, at any rate, within recent times; but I always endeavour to test, independently of any opinion, the evidence which is brought before me, and I then thought, and I still think, that there is no evidence that it does not spontaneously arise, nor that it had not existed before 1839. My belief is that foot and mouth disease does not arise spontaneously, and that it is propagated in this country entirely by contagion.

684. We rather look to your department to instruct and guide us about these diseases; and if it arises spontaneously, what is the use of these heavy restrictions?—No use at all; but I give you the evidence as it is brought before me. At that time I received a letter from one of the highest veterinary medical authorities, from which it appeared that he did not agree with the general belief held as to its propagation by contagion, and that therefore it occasionally arose spontaneously; therefore I conceived it to be my duty to put before the House all the evidence which I had on the subject.

685. All the negative evidence?—All the negative evidence as well as the positive.

686. But there was a record of veterinary science previous to the year 1839, was there not?—That, I think, you had better ask the veterinary officers of the Department. In writing that report I merely took the evidence before me, and I could not find any evidence of its origin by contagion only, in which I thoroughly believe. It is very difficult to prove a negative in any case.

687. But it rather casts a slur upon the veterinary profession in 1839 if they had not told us this outbreak, supposing it had occurred previously?—But if they had told us that it arose spontaneously, could they by any possibility have proved it?

688. Did you ever hear of any record of its existence in this country before the year 1839?—I have not gone into that matter; I should prefer your asking Professor Brown, who is qualified to answer that question. Professor Ferguson, of Ireland, at that time believed that it might occasionally arise spontaneously. In the presence of a letter of that kind in the office, I think it was my duty to bring the matter forward in that way, simply to show that there was an opinion on the other side. What Professor Ferguson's opinion now may be, I do not know.

689. You do not put forward this history of the foot and mouth disease as a professional authority?—Not as a professional authority, but simply statistically on the evidence before me, having nothing to do with medical matters at all, but simply as a matter of history and information; I have not entered at all into the medical question in either of the two later Reports.

690. But in the Report of 1872 I am glad to find

find that we have some of Professor Brown's opinions about it?—Yes.

691. And he has been good enough to give us ideas as to how it is to be treated?—Yes generally.

692. And therein, I think, he has rather disregarded the opinion of the Vice President of the Council, who said in the House of Commons that he thought that your department was not for the purpose of giving recipes and suggesting treatment?—I do not think it should be done unless it is gone into thoroughly and done well. For us to distribute occasional recipes, and so on, I think would create a great deal of discontent among the veterinary profession. In fact, the Government would be doing for nothing what the private practitioner would get payment for. I do not think that is advisable; I do not think that Professor Brown has gone into any recipes at all, but that his recommendations relate to general treatment only.

693. But I thought that one of the duties of the department was to suggest treatment?—The Lords of the Council have on every occasion when it has been proposed to them of late years distinctly declined to do that.

694. On page 13 of your Report of 1871, I see that the duties of the inspectors are thus partly defined:—"To examine into and report upon any contagious or infectious diseases occurring amongst animals in any part of Great Britain, or upon any other diseases concerning the nature of which there may be any doubt, and to carry out any experimental or other investigations which may be considered advisable relating to these diseases;" what have you done in the way of experimental or other investigations?—I think you will find in Professor Brown's Report that there is a great deal of research connected with these diseases.

695. Not under the special authority or cognisance of this department?—For the information of the Lords of the Council.

696. Do you mean experiments undertaken by order of the Lords of the Council?—No; in this way: on being asked for a Report on any particular subject, Professor Brown would naturally go in detail into that subject, for the purpose of reporting. It is only indirectly; we incur no expense in that way.

697. Then, in fact, you have not attempted to carry out any experimental investigation under the auspices of this department?—We have not; we have no aim for this purpose. All the reports of Professor Brown on those matters are merely for the information and guidance of the Lords of the Council, and not for publication as a rule.

698. Is not this Report of Professor Brown's to be made public?—Yes, that one is; but the general reports are simply to the office. We constantly get reports on various subjects, not for publication, but simply for the information of their Lordships in treating particular cases.

699. Would you see any objection to the veterinary professors, who are a portion of your department, giving the country advice similar to that in Professor Brown's Report of this year?—I do not see any objection to the professors attached to the department giving it as their opinion, and being personally responsible for it; but I should see great objection to the Lords of the Council endorsing as their opinion any opinion of their inspectors.

Q-58.

700. I do not suppose that the endorsement by the Lords of the Council would carry any extra weight with it?—I do not suppose that it would; but it would involve them in all the consequences.

701. But when a general wish has been expressed on the part of the agricultural community that we should like to have a certain amount of information and suggestion from the Veterinary Department in the treatment of diseases, do you not think that those Reports of the veterinary professors may be continued annually?—I see no objection to that, if it is clearly understood that they are simply the professional opinions of the individuals themselves, and not an expression of the opinion of the Privy Council or of the Department.

702. And you think that would be not only advisable but extremely useful?—Extremely useful; it has always been my wish that such Reports should be furnished each year.

703. And we are likely to have them each year in future?—I think so.

704. With regard to the landing of cattle, I understood you to say that the veterinary inspectors appointed by you have no power to go on board ships?—They have no legal power to do so except under certain circumstances; I suppose they could go with the Customs officers, who could take them on board; I do not recollect that they have any real power of entry, except where they suspect that disinfection is not carried out.

705. Supposing that a vessel arrived with a dead bullock on board which had evidently died from some contagious disease, do you not think that your inspectors should have power to go on board the ship, and not only have the power of inspecting those cattle after they are landed?—I think he should.

706. It is not possible that if he found disease on board the ship you might get rid of that danger better than by landing them?—It is a very difficult question; I doubt whether you could get rid of them better; if there were proper accommodation at the ports for the destruction of animals, I believe it would be infinitely better to let them destroy them at once and get rid of them, than to leave them on board the vessel and take them to sea and move them about, and so very much increase the danger.

707. But at the same time, you think it would be well for your inspectors to have the power to go on board ship when they heard of any animal dying from disease, so that they might take extra precautions when the animals were landed?—Quite so, and for other purposes as well; for seeing the condition of the vessel as regards fittings, and so forth.

708. During the time of the cattle plague, the orders which were then in force restricting the movement of cattle had the effect, had they not, of getting rid almost entirely of the foot and mouth disease, and of considerably reducing the attacks of pleuro-pneumonia?—Undoubtedly, from the reports received.

709. To what do you attribute the outbreak of foot and mouth disease after those orders were rescinded?—To the extension of the disease from the centres which then existed; I think that is the most probable cause of it.

710. Can you give us any idea as to where it did exist except in the port of London?—I have no official information about that.

711. Are you not aware that for 12 months there

Mr.
Alexander
Williams.
—
13 March
1873.

Mr.
Alexander
Williams.
13 March
1873.

there was no case of foot and mouth disease in the country except in the port of London?—I am not at all; but I should scarcely think that that was so at the port of London. The Metropolitan Market, where all these animals went to, was entirely free for a considerable period.

712. But the fairs of the Metropolitan Market were not free, were they?—So far as my information went at the time they were; but Professor Brown will be able to give you that information much better than I can.

713. Do you consider that the order permitting foreign sheep to go into the country in the year 1869 had anything to do with the recent outbreak of foot and mouth disease?—I have not been able to trace any relation whatever between the two things, although I have carefully gone into it whenever I had an opportunity.

714. Is Holland in any way a country of transit for live animals?—Not in any way that I am aware of; they are prohibited entirely from going into Holland, and consequently could not go through it.

715. Are sheep which are imported with cattle from scheduled countries killed at the port of landing?—If they are landed at the defined port, all animals are treated the same.

716. But can cattle from scheduled countries be landed at one place, and the sheep which come with them be landed at another place?—They can; but the same regulations practically apply to the two parts of the cargo; one part of it is not released until the other is pronounced free from disease.

717. I understood you to say that we should in all probability now receive a much larger quantity of cattle from Russia than previously; is that on account of the extra price, or rather on account of the Russians growing more cattle?—I did not intend to say that we should receive more cattle; I intended to say that the supplies on the Continent are so nearly exhausted that indirectly or directly we must get our supplies from Russia; but I should prefer getting them indirectly through some other countries, to getting them directly.

718. Was there not a proposition made by some Russian dealers to quarantine the cattle on the other side of the water?—There was verbally.

719. Did they say that they could quarantine them there, and yet send them here at a profit?—They appeared to think so.

720. Then quarantine on that side of the water can be accomplished economically, but here you do not think it could?—I have no evidence that it can be accomplished there economically, and they do not know the severe restrictions that would be necessary, and the expense that it would entail.

721. I think that those gentlemen suggested that if they had a quarantine ground in Russia, near one of the ports, they would be at the expense of some of the officers of the English Government superintending it?—Yes; but probably they do not know the enormous amount of expense which would be entailed by such a quarantine station as I should consider necessary.

722. Do any Russian cattle come to this country overland by way of Lubeck?—I am not aware that they do generally, but that some came last year there is no doubt; they came by a vessel from Cronstadt to Lubeck and overland from Lubeck to Hamburg.

723. And then they were exported from Hamburg here?—Yes.

724. Have you any reason to suppose that that is the general route, or was it an exceptional one?—It was an exceptional one.

725. Was that to avoid your order as to importing cattle direct from Russia?—I believe it was; I believe it occurred after we had prohibited the import.

726. Do you suppose that those were the cattle which spread the cattle plague in Hamburg?—Certainly.

727. Did we receive any of those cargoes here in a diseased state?—Yes; there is a full account of the whole matter in Professor Brown's Report.

728. Do you think that you have guarded against that?—I think so; Germany has prohibited the import of Russian cattle, I believe, throughout the whole of the German States, but I have no certain information upon that point. Certainly it is prohibited at that part of Germany.

729. If diseased animals are imported, you would destroy the carcasses, I believe?—It depends entirely upon what the disease is, and upon the state of the animal, and the stage of the disease.

730. Would you do so in the case of cattle plague?—Certainly. Those absolutely affected are destroyed, but I should see no objection to those in contact, which are not affected, being consumed for food.

731. Do you consider it essential that at all the ports of landing there should be some apparatus for the destruction of carcasses?—Or their burial, certainly.

732. So that, in future, we should not have the uncomfortable regulations under which cattle taken to sea and thrown overboard are washed up on the coast?—Quite so; I am convinced that there should be such an apparatus, or a place for burial.

733. Should you think that there was any danger from the carcasses of those cattle being washed up upon the coast?—I think that there would be considerable danger; and if, in the late cases, we had not taken every precaution in burying them as soon as possible, and getting rid of all trace of what was likely to produce disease, I think it is very possible that they might have introduced disease; but that they did not we are quite positive.

734. Do you schedule any country at all for any other disease except cattle plague?—We have scheduled the sheep of countries where the sheep-pox has occurred, and we now schedule sheep in Russia, because of cattle plague.

735. But you would not schedule a country if you heard that there was a very large outbreak of pleuro-pneumonia?—No, we have never done so.

736. Nor yet, of course, for foot and mouth disease?—No.

737. But in those countries which are scheduled I suppose there is some form of virulent disease, or else you would not schedule them?—Either that, or the danger of getting it from other countries; Germany has no cattle plague, but she is scheduled because she might get it from other countries, and France is in the same position.

738. Therefore you would rather expect, would you not, to find more disease in the cattle imported

imported from the scheduled districts than in cattle from those which have a clean bill of health?—I do not think so as regards the other diseases; as we only schedule for cattle plague, or sheep-pox, it would be only those diseases, probably; it would not be other diseases.

733. But if you kill the whole of the cargo at the waterside when one or two animals are found infected with pleuro-pneumonia, or with foot and mouth disease, that, you think, makes them more careful not to send animals infected with those diseases?—Certainly.

740. Do you consider that it is of any use to continue to report the cases of foot and mouth disease to the local authority by the police of the district?—I consider it is of very little use, though it may be of slight use.

741. You are aware that generally now the farmer gives notice to the policeman of an outbreak of foot and mouth disease; that the policeman gives that information to the inspector, and that no further notice is taken of it?—I am not aware of it, but I presume that it is so. We get no information concerning it, except accidentally; we get some returns, but we do not call for any information with regard to it.

742. You do not consider that simply giving that notice is of very great importance, now that no further action is taken?—If no further action is taken it is of no importance, but if the local authority were to carry out the provisions, I believe it would be of great assistance.

743. What provisions do you mean; do you mean applying the pleuro-pneumonia rules to foot and mouth disease?—Or simply the rules which they can apply now in preventing the movement of all the animals which are herded with those which are affected.

744. Can they do that under one of your recent orders?—Under the General Order, Article 28: "A local authority may from time to time, with a view of preventing the spreading of the foot and mouth disease, make regulations for the following purposes, or any of them: for prohibiting or regulating the movement out of any field, stable, cowshed, or other premises in which foot and mouth disease has been found to exist of any animal which has been in the same field, stable, cowshed, or other premises with, or in contact with, any animal affected with foot and mouth disease."

745. That does not include a market, does it?—I should imagine that it included markets.

746. If a bullock is found affected with foot and mouth disease in a market there is no power, is there, by that Act and no power by that Order for anybody to restrain the movement of the animals which are herded with it?—Certainly there is, if the local authority like to make a regulation to that effect.

747. If the other cattle are perfectly healthy to all appearance, can the inspectors insist upon the whole of the herd being stopped in the market?—If the local authority have made a regulation under Article 28, saying that that is to be the case.

748. Are you aware whether any such regulation has been made by any market authority in the kingdom?—I think not; I am not aware of it.

749. And whereas the markets are generally held within the precincts of boroughs, it is not very likely to be made, is it?—I should think not; it would be almost impracticable to carry it out with the present machinery.

750. Then I think that the force of your evidence with regard to foot and mouth disease as given on Monday, was this; that you must either do a great deal more, or that it would be prudent to do a great deal less than you are doing at the present moment?—It was so.

751. Do you think that the home regulations with regard to pleuro-pneumonia show any reasonable hope of extinguishing it?—Not of extinguishing it.

752. Do you think that the restrictions now put upon it curtail it?—I should think so to some extent.

753. Notwithstanding the experience which your reports furnish us, that in 1873 there were a great deal more cases of pleuro-pneumonia than there were in previous years?—Notwithstanding that.

754. And you think that if there had been no restrictions, in all probability the increase would have been greater?—Certainly.

755. Although you have had no returns of foot and mouth disease in 1873, I suppose that you are aware that that disease has been much more prevalent in 1873 than it was in 1871?—I should think so.

756. I understood you in your evidence to say, (and in fact you give it in the report of 1871), that farmers' opinions have very much changed of late about the foot and mouth disease, and they think that it is a much more serious disease than they formerly thought it?—So it would appear.

757. Do you not think that that arises from the fact that, previously to the restrictions that were put in force by reason of the cattle plague, farmers considered that it was a disease which they could not get rid of, and that, therefore, there was no use in attempting any restrictions?—It may have been so.

758. And it is not much worse now than it was then, is it?—I can scarcely form an opinion upon that point.

759. Is it not the case that the disease was quite as bad when first it appeared, in the year 1840, as it is now?—That is very probable, I think; but that is rather a medical point.

760. Generally speaking, when we have what is termed a fresh outbreak, is it not more virulent in the earlier stages of the outbreak than it is when the disease has in a measure expended itself?—I have no statistics, and therefore I am not able to give an opinion upon that point; but Professor Brown will be able to inform the Committee upon all those points.

761. Mr. Dent.] The honourable gentleman in the Chair asked you some questions as to the transference of your department to the Local Government Board, do you not think that it might be possible to utilise the nuisance inspectors, who are to be appointed under the sanitary authorities, for purposes connected with these Acts?—I cannot suppose that they are qualified to judge of disease in any way.

762. They are to report upon the nuisances and the diseases of humanity which break out in their districts, are they not?—The two subjects are entirely separate. Medical men are, I should think, about the worst veterinary surgeons.

763. I do not mean the medical officers; but by every sanitary authority there is to be appointed a medical officer, and also a nuisance inspector, and one of the nuisance inspector's duties is to report the outbreak of any disease in his district to the medical officer. Has it ever occurred to you that the same officer might also report upon

Mr.
Alexander
Williams,
—
13 March
1873.

Mr.
Alexander
Williams.
—
13 March
1873.

an outbreak of any disease in cattle?—He might do so as a mere matter of knowledge that disease of some kind was present; but it would be necessary that the report should be submitted to a veterinary authority before it would be of the slightest use.

764. Undoubtedly; but at present the police in most districts have the duty of reporting thrown upon them, have they not?—Yes; I should imagine that it is possible that it might be done, but it has not occurred to me.

765. You think, do you not, that, in all probability, for our supply of meat from abroad, we shall have ultimately rather to depend upon Russia and the eastern parts of Europe, either directly or indirectly?—I think so.

766. Therefore it is very essential, is it not, that our regulations as to import should, if possible, guard against the probability of introducing disease?—Yes.

767. These regulations at the ports at present are not satisfactory to your mind, are they?—They are not.

768. I understand that the trade is at present from scheduled and unscheduled countries?—Yes.

769. From scheduled countries the animals are all slaughtered at the port of arrival, are they not?—They are.

770. From unscheduled countries they are slaughtered if any disease at all is found on board, I believe?—Yes.

771. Have you veterinary inspectors at the ports to which cattle are allowed to come from unscheduled countries?—Yes; and the cattle go through exactly the same detention and inspection as the others.

772. In all the ports?—In all the ports.

773. Would you not think it well to limit the number of ports to which animals from unscheduled countries should be imported?—That would be a part of my proposal for the improvement of the foreign trade.

774. Would you think it well that on the arrival of any cargoes of cattle, notice should be given not only to the Customs officers (who, I suppose, receive notice now), but also to the veterinary inspector of the port?—Practically that is the case now.

775. But he receives the notice through the Customs officers, does he not?—Or through the importer; it is done in several ways.

776. Is the importer bound to give notice to the veterinary inspector of the port that he has a cargo of cattle on board?—I think not; but as he wants them examined as soon as possible, it is his interest to let the inspector know as soon as possible.

777. After landing?—Before landing, because if he is ready to make the examination at once it sometimes saves 12 hours.

778. But there is no compulsion, is there?—There is no compulsion.

779. If animals are to be brought from dangerous localities like Austria or the eastern parts of Europe, do you think that it would be advisable to make it compulsory, on the part of the importer, to inform the veterinary inspector of the port that a cargo of cattle had arrived?—I can see very little advantage in it as long as the Customs detain the animals until the inspector sees them, and then he makes his inspection.

780. Do the Customs authorities retain the animals until the veterinary inspector has seen them on board?—Not on board, but on shore,

and the Customs are responsible for their safe keeping until they are delivered over to the inspector.

781. Supposing (as in the case of the "*Joseph Soames*") that a cargo of cattle came with cattle plague on board, and were landed under the authority of the Customs, who is to take care that there is no communication between the persons who have driven or brought those cattle to the lairs and the outer world?—First, the Customs are responsible for their safe custody in a particular part of the defined port; secondly, the local authority are responsible for the keeping of the defined port.

782. There is a clause in the Act, is there not, making the local authority to make provision for disinfection?—Yes.

783. Taking that cargo which came to Hull, and supposing that those animals had not been destroyed on board, but had been landed, who is there now to see that the drovers, or other persons who were in contact with those animals, are disinfected before they go out and come in contact with other cattle?—I am afraid, practically, that there is no one.

784. That rests entirely, at present, with the local authority to enforce, does it not?—It depends entirely as to the time. While the animals are in charge of the Customs, the Customs are responsible; when they are in charge of the inspector he is responsible, and he is assisted by the local authority in carrying out anything he wishes; so it is ordered.

785. But the cattle landed from scheduled countries, are supposed to be dangerous cattle; who is responsible that the drovers or sailors, or people who bring those cattle from the vessels into the lairs, are disinfected before they come into contact with other cattle?—No one at all.

786. I presume that you would like to see some authority or regulation in order to enforce that, would you not, if you admit cattle from those dangerous countries?—Yes, if it were practicable to enforce it. I think that under our present arrangements it might be enforced by making the local authorities do it, but I doubt very much whether it is practicable.

787. In this particular case, two or three cargoes came with cattle plague on board; was it in any person's power to insist that the sailors and others who had been in contact with those cattle should be disinfected before they had the chance of coming in contact with other cattle?—I should imagine that the Customs could do it.

788. The authority appears to be at present divided a good deal between yourselves and the Customs?—No, I think there is a perfectly clear definition between the two. The Customs have the charge of the cattle until they deliver them to the inspector, and directly the Customs deliver them to the inspector the Customs cease to have the responsibility, and the inspector has the whole of the responsibility.

789. But have you any reason to believe that the local authorities carry out the last paragraph of Clause 61 of the Act, which is as follows: "A local authority shall direct the disinfecting of the clothes of, and the use of due precautions against the spreading of contagion by, inspectors and others in contact with animals affected with cattle plague"?—Professor Brown will tell you what is the actual fact with regard to that case at Hull; I believe that they were disinfected, or that there was an attempt made to disinfect them, in that particular case.

790. You

790. You stated that you would furnish the Committee with your ideas of the regulations which should be in force with regard to cattle from scheduled countries; what, in your opinion, should those regulations be?—I have taken both scheduled and unscheduled countries together. The first thing I think should be a reduction in the number of ports at which foreign animals are landed.

791. Are you prepared to specify the ports which you would retain?—I can do so; I take an average for the last four years of the number of animals landed at the ports, and I find that in each of 16 of those ports, an average of less than 700 animals have been landed during each year. One of those ports, however, Barrow-in-Furness, has only just been licensed for the landing of cattle, and therefore I should not interfere with that at present; the other 15 ports I think might be prevented from landing cattle without any interference with the real import of our food, although each case would require further special consideration; those would be Bristol, Cardiff, Dartmouth, Dover, Glasgow, Graysmouth, Kirkwall, Newhaven, Penzance, Shields (North and South), Shoreham, Weymouth, Littlehampton, and Folkestone. At Folkestone no cattle have been landed for three years; those ports I would shut up altogether; they bring a few surplus store cattle on board, which I think should be slaughtered on board, and with which they should do the best they could; I have a return here which shows the number imported at each of those ports.

792. At some of those ports, are not a number of Alderney and Jersey cattle imported for dairies?—It might be so at Weymouth.

793. Are they treated as foreign animals?—They are. At Shoreham, in four years, they landed 445 cattle, and 260 sheep. As a supply, that is very slight indeed.

794. As a supply of food it is light; but is it not possible that there might be an inconvenience for dairy purposes in closing those ports; as I understand you, you would not allow any cattle whatever from scheduled or unscheduled countries to be landed?—No cattle whatever.

795. Would you make any further restriction as to the ports?—That might require further consideration as to each case. I think that at all ports where foreign animals are landed, whether from scheduled or unscheduled countries, there should be sufficient and proper accommodation, first, for the landing and lairage of each cargo separately, and, secondly, for the slaughter of diseased and infected animals, and for the burial or destruction of carcasses. I think that should be essential to the license for landing.

796. Would you still retain the distinction between scheduled and unscheduled countries?—Certainly; all the ports having defined parts for scheduled cattle, should have real and not imaginary boundaries.

797. And within those boundaries should be provided slaughter-houses and means for the destruction of the carcasses, and means for the disinfection of persons and things?—Yes, all ports should have that; and therefore it would be necessary included before the landing was allowed. The only thing in the scheduled ports having defined parts, should be additional slaughter accommodation for the animals. They should have the same regulations precisely.

798. Then, supposing that a cargo of diseased

animals were landed from an unscheduled country, you would take those animals to be slaughtered in the slaughter-houses set apart for diseased animals from scheduled?—If they were diseased.

799. What is the present rule, as regards animals affected with foot and mouth disease and pleuro-pneumonia; are the carcasses destroyed?—So far as my department is concerned we only take cognizance of disease; therefore if a carcass is likely to introduce disease into the country, we order it to be destroyed; if, on the other hand, it is a question of food supply, the Inspector of Unsoundness is informed, and he deals with it under the Nuisances Removal Act.

800. Do the Privy Council, before animals are allowed to be imported into any port, make any stipulations or regulations as to the provision of slaughter-houses and places for disinfection?—Always as regards a port which is newly allowed to land animals; but with regard to the old ports our stipulations are rather difficult to enforce.

801. I think you cannot yourself give us much information about the ports locally?—I cannot.

802. You know that remonstrances have been made, as to the inadequate separation of the defined part from the general cattle-market in the port of Hull?—I do.

803. Are you aware that persons pass from the defined part by merely crossing a street, or walking 40 or 50 yards to the cattle market?—I believe so.

804. Do you know anything about the landing of foreign cattle at Liverpool?—Not practically; merely from the reports of Professor Brown.

805. Professor Brown has probably visited the ports and can give more detailed information?—He has visited all of them, I think.

806. Do you know what suggestions were made at Hull as to the improvement of the defined part of the port?—We have had a large amount of correspondence about it.

807. Do I understand you to say, that the expenses of the burial, and the disinfection of carcasses, were provided for by the Board of Trade, and then repaid by you?—Yes; by the Board of Trade, through the receivers of wreck, who are, I believe, officers of Customs.

808. Then, as I understand it, when those foreign animals are diseased, a report is made to the Customs that a cargo has arrived; the Customs make a report to you; the local authority sees that the animals are slaughtered and buried, and then the receiver of wreck pays the expenses?—Not in that case, but in the case of carcasses thrown up by the sea.

809. But suppose that they were landed, and slaughtered, and buried, and disinfected, then who pays the expenses?—The local authorities, I believe, then are the proper parties to pay under the Act.

810. Supposing the cattle plague does get into the country; as I understand, then you propose that animals which are likely to introduce the disease anywhere else, should be slaughtered under the recommendation of a qualified inspector?—Yes.

811. What is done with the carcasses of home animals which are unaffected with the disease?—I am scarcely able to tell you what is practically done with them. The local authorities have power to deal with them.

812. I presume that in the case of the slaughter of animals which were not affected, and which were only likely to introduce disease, you would have

Mr.
Alexander
Williams.
—
13 March
1873.

Mr.
Alexander
Williams.
—
13 March
1873.

have their carcasses, after proper and careful disinfection, used for human food, and not destroyed?—If they were fit for it; the local authority does all that.

813. You suggested that you thought that the officers from your department might very well make the returns of cattle for the agricultural statistics, did you not?—I scarcely suggested it. I said that it would be a great advantage for the same officers as made the inspection under the Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act to make the agricultural returns with regard to cattle.

814. Do you know how these returns are obtained at present?—Not in detail.

815. They are obtained by sending out circulars to every occupier of land from the Inland Revenue Office, which the occupier fills up or does not fill up, and if he does not reply to the second circular the policeman, or somebody else, gets the information, and so the circular is filled up; but that does not really give the person obtaining those returns any accurate knowledge of the stock which is kept on the farm?—Probably not; but if an inspector were appointed for a district which was not too large, and of which he could have a thorough knowledge, I think he could get those returns very well from the occupiers.

816. What would you call a district which an inspector could manage?—I should think not more than a radius of 10 miles.

817. That is about the size of an ordinary Poor Law union, is it not?—I cannot say.

818. You would have a qualified veterinary inspector, I presume, for each of those districts?—Yes.

819. Would you pay him by fees or by salary?—By salary. I would make him independent of all local circumstances.

820. Have you any idea of the sort of expense that would be incurred by that?—It would be very large indeed.

821. Would you be surprised to hear that in the West Riding, during the three months when the pleuro-pneumonia rules were applied to the foot and mouth disease, the veterinary surgeons' accounts amounted to 1,500 £, and that for the whole of the next two years, when the police were employed, the accounts only amounted to 800 £, including the calling in of a veterinary surgeon in all cases of pleuro-pneumonia?—I was not aware of that.

822. That shows the enormous expense of employing veterinary surgeons as inspectors, does it not?—I think that men of sufficient knowledge might be got for these appointments at a moderate salary, varying from 100 £ to 300 £ a year. I admit that it would be an enormous expense, but I do not see any other method of efficiently carrying out what is proposed.

823. You would like to have a return made of the births and deaths on the farm, and of every acquisition of new stock?—Perhaps not so much in detail as that, but a general knowledge of the stock of the district.

824. If we are to eradicate the foot and mouth disease we must resort, you think, to some such stringent measure as that?—Quite so.

825. And, from your own showing, the expense would be enormous?—Yes; I should think it would be 100,000 £ a year at least.

826. Have you considered exactly who would have to pay for it?—I have not.

827. Do you agree with Professor Brown, who, I think, in his report at page 21, calls the foot

and mouth disease a "benign" disease?—Our returns prove that the per-centage of deaths from foot and mouth disease was very small, and therefore I should imagine that that would be the meaning of the expression.

828. Has not the per-centage of deaths been considerably larger this year than it has been in previous years?—Yes.

829. You are not of opinion that at present we are doing much good in checking pleuro-pneumonia?—We are doing good indirectly by preventing its rapid extension, I think; but I could not prove that we are doing much good generally, although in certain localities I think we might produce evidence that we have done a great deal of good.

830. I was strongly of opinion for the first two years of the Act, that it was checking the disease very much; but I have a return here showing that in the West Riding of Yorkshire they determined to slaughter and give compensation, and obtained powers from the Privy Council last October to do so. Should you be surprised to hear that for the four months preceding their having this power there were 153 cases, and that in the four succeeding months there were 131 cases; that is to say that they have had 69 more cases in the four months since the compensation was given, and comparing those four months with the corresponding period of last year there were only 43 cases, making an increase of 152 cases?—Probably that is because notices have been given in many cases where no notice would have been given but for the compensation.

831. There are no returns, are there, as to the prevalence of foot and mouth disease and pleuro-pneumonia before the cattle plague?—I do not think there is any reliable information.

832. Do you think that Professor Brown, or anyone in your office, would have any idea of the prevalence of these diseases before the cattle plague?—Professor Simonds could give that.

833. The Honorable Chairman rather indicated that foot and mouth disease was extinct in England when the cattle plague restrictions were taken off; have you any records in your office to show that the disease was extinguished then?—We have not; I do not myself believe that it was; in fact, I have information that it was not.

834. You were rather surprised, were you not, to hear such a statement?—I was.

835. Your suggestion to get rid of foot and mouth disease would be, would it not, to put in force all the stringent rules which were in force during the cattle plague?—Not nearly so stringent. At the time of the cattle plague, licenses were required for the movement of every animal, whether healthy or unhealthy; I should propose that those licenses should only be required in infected places, where the disease absolutely existed.

836. The returns of the number of infected places are very large, are they not?—They are, but they might gradually be reduced, and the staff might be afterwards reduced.

837. You do not think that the granting of those licenses should be left in the hands of the justices, or of persons appointed by them?—No, a responsible veterinary authority should grant them.

838. Still, during the cattle plague, I think that the licenses were not given indiscreetly or injudiciously, were they?—I believe they were; in fact I know from evidence that they were.

839. As I understand, you would appoint permanent salaried veterinary authorities to carry out the Act?—Or they should be appointed by the local authorities, under the control of the Central Department.

840. But if the local authorities are to appoint, how are the Central Department to control?—I think that they might be controlled by the Central Department seeing that the regulations were properly carried out.

841. The central authority do not see, do they, that the regulations made by the local authority are carried out at all now?—As a rule, they do not.

842. For instance, if the local authority makes rules about the movement of diseased stock, and their exhibition in the markets, the central authority does not send any inspector into the markets to examine whether those rules are carried out, does it?—On very rare and special occasions that is done.

843. Do you not think that it might be a good thing if the veterinary inspectors of the central authority occasionally visited the largest markets, such as Liverpool and Bristol and others, to see whether the Act was carried out?—I think it would be an advantage, but that would not at all affect the carrying out without power to force the local authority to carry it out.

844. Supposing that one of your inspectors went into the Stanley Market, at Liverpool, and found a number of diseased cattle exposed there, he would have no power, would he, to summon the owner before the magistrates?—He would have the same power as the inspector of the local authority would have; but I do not think it would be an advisable proceeding to take it out of the hands of the local authority.

845. I do not mean for the inspector of the central authority to go regularly there; but it is said that in some markets there is very little attention paid to these matters, and that the local inspectors wink at the disease, and do not summon the persons who infringe the law. Would it be possible, or would it be advisable that your inspectors should go down occasionally to the markets and summon the offenders?—It would be very little use, I think; there must be constant supervision.

846. Do your inspectors at any time now examine markets, or railway tracks, or steamboats, in the home trade, Irish and English?—Occasionally.

847. Do they, for instance, at Holyhead, or Bristol, or Liverpool, interfere about the cleansing of steamboats?—Only so far as reporting to the local authority the fact of an order not being carried out, and requesting them to carry it out.

848. Supposing they find that the owner of a steamboat did not clean out or disinfect his vessel, would your inspector consider it a part of his duty to summon that man before the magistrates for an infringement of the order?—Certainly not. His instructions are to report the fact to the department, and then the department writes to the local authority, and call their attention to the fact. If a case for prosecution, we should request a prosecution to be instituted; if it were a case for improvement, we should request them to make such improvement.

849. Your department has no power, has it, to compel the local authority to carry out the improvement, or to institute the prosecution?—Not that I am aware of.

850. In the scheduled ports, would you confine the importation of cattle to boats entirely meant for the importation of cattle?—I should do so, if it could be practically done; but I fear it could scarcely be done practically.

851. Still, if you limited the ports very much, and a larger number of cattle were brought into each of these ports, might not that be more practicable?—I think it might.

852. The danger arises not only from the cattle, but also, to a great extent, from the rest of the cargo, does it not?—It does.

853. As I understand you, the boats that come to London, are exclusively cattle boats?—To a great extent, they are.

854. Do you think the boats employed in the foreign cattle trade are generally cleansed and inspected?—I think to a great extent they are.

855. Do your officers or the Customs officers look to that?—Our officers, the inspectors of the ports, look to that.

856. Have you any officers belonging to you that inspect cattle abroad?—None at all.

857. Do you receive any reports from abroad except through the Foreign Office?—Privately, but not officially; I am acquainted with some of the heads of the departments in various countries, and I get private information, but none officially, except through the Foreign Office.

858. In the case of a cargo of Russian cattle being sent from Cronstadt, would your department be communicated with by the consul?—The consul telegraphed in the last case, and we waited for the cargo.

859. If the consul gets information, or has reason to believe, that a cargo has left the Continent with diseased cattle, would it be his duty to telegraph to your department or to the Foreign Office?—To the Foreign Office; it goes through the Foreign Office. The consuls have instructions to report weekly from such country when cattle plague exists there; and each month under any circumstances, to say that the country is free; and to telegraph immediately on any fresh outbreak of cattle plague or sheep-pox.

860. Do you believe that you get on the whole accurate information from abroad as to the state of the cattle plague in foreign countries?—Pretty accurate, I think.

861. If there were an outbreak of cattle plague would you be able to close the ports to cattle, from any country before there was danger of cargoes coming?—Scarcely so with regard to the near countries, but with regard to Russia, I think, we should, as we did, in fact.

862. There was a good deal of foot and mouth disease imported from Spain and Portugal in 1871, was there not?—Yes, it was only for a short time.

863. Those cattle, to a very great extent, came to Liverpool, did they not?—Out of 14,372 cattle from Portugal, and 15,389 from Spain, 3,850 came to Liverpool from Portugal and 2,503 from Spain.

Mr.
Alexander
Williams.
13 March
1873.

THE RIGHT HONOURABLE WILLIAM EDWARD FORSTER, TOOK THE CHAIR.

864. Chairman.] THE principal port at which the cattle from Spain and Portugal arrive in Southampton, is it not?—Five thousand three hundred and fifty-four from Portugal and none
058.

from Spain arrived at Southampton. They are divided principally between London, Liverpool, and Southampton.

E

445. Mr.

Mr.
Alexander
Williams.

13 March
1873.

865. Mr. Dent.] You have no particular control over the Irish trade in your department, I think?—None whatever, except when the cattle are landed in England.

866. Then you have just the same control over them that you have over English cattle, I presume?—Quite so.

867. You cannot interfere at all with the lairs and places to which the Irish cattle are taken in England any more than you have over English cattle?—No.

868. The 57th clause of the Act provides that in the case of animals found in the markets, the local authority may take them away, and isolate them, but there is no means given to provide places of isolation for those cattle, I think?—I think under Part VII. of the Act it might be done.

869. If they chose to go to the expense of buying land they might do so?—I think it might be done under that part of the Act.

870. Your opinion, I think, clearly is, that foot and mouth disease and pleuro-pneumonia introduced from abroad are checked at the port of disembarkation, and that the animals being all slaughtered, there is not any reason to suppose that those diseases are introduced into the country in that way?—They may occasionally be introduced, but not to any great extent.

871. You have had at the office at different times several complaints as to their being introduced in that way, have you not?—We have had many.

872. You have endeavoured to trace those cases, and I understand you to say that you had not been able to do so?—We have taken very great pains to trace the disease from the foreign animal, but we have never on any one occasion been able to do so clearly; the evidence has broken down; the animal might have caught the disease after its arrival in every instance.

873. Have you ever turned your attention to the idea of importing store cattle into special ports, and keeping them there in quarantine?—I have, and it was always a favourite idea of mine; but I believe the expense of carrying it out would render it impracticable to do so, because you would want such enormous premises, and would incur such enormous expenses, that I do not think as a private undertaking it would pay.

874. Any lengthened period of quarantine would also require enormous premises, would it not?—Enormous.

875. Each cargo would require to be kept isolated for a lengthened period, would it not?—Yes.

876. And if disease broke out in one of those places it could not be used for some time afterwards?—That is so.

877. Mr. J. Berkeley.] Your experience in dealing with cattle plague, and cattle diseases, has been confined to what passes through the office, has it not?—Entirely so.

878. You expressed certain opinions about compensation on your former examination; you said, did you not, that you were of opinion that the value of the cattle should not be paid in full?—Certainly.

879. Do you think the proper proportion of compensation is paid under the existing Act?—Since my conversation with you I have again considered the subject; and on careful consideration I think that it would be an advantage to increase the compensation.

880. It is of very great importance, as regards putting down the disease, to discover it, is it not?—It is.

881. Would not a somewhat higher scale of compensation induce the farmers to report the disease more quickly?—Provided it does not extend to full compensation.

882. Under the present regulations, by which a man not only risks the animal affected, but all those in contact with it, the local authorities having power, not only to kill the animal affected, but to kill all those in contact, paying three-fourths value, is there any inducement to the farmer to report the disease?—If he knew the exact results, taking averages, I think it would be to his interest to report the disease.

883. Do you expect farmers to take such a far-sighted view of the question as that?—I can scarcely do so.

884. Would it not be of more advantage to a man to kill the animal and bury it, and not let his whole herd under the power of the local authorities?—It would not really be so, though he might think so.

885. Supposing the local authority kills the animal and pays a certain amount of compensation, and further, has the power of killing the whole of the rest of the stock, paying only three-fourths compensation, would it not be for the man's own interest to kill the animal affected and bury it himself, and say nothing about it?—I think it would, but I do not think he is likely to do it; I should think he was likely to keep it on the chance of its getting well.

886. Then he would not report the disease at all?—That, I should think, would be the result.

887. He would very likely think of getting clear with the rest of his stock, would he not?—Yes, or he might think that they might not be attacked, as has occurred in many instances.

888. You spoke of certain negotiations which have gone on with certain parties for importing cattle from Russia; was that fat cattle, or store cattle?—I should imagine that it was fat cattle.

889. Do you know the length of the voyage from Cronstadt to this country?—Five days, I think.

890. You stated, did you not, that they represented that they would import a thousand animals per week into this country?—I am not sure as to the number, but it was some large number.

891. Have you any idea what quantity of cattle formerly came from Russia?—Very few for many years.

892. Have you a statement of the various countries from which live cattle are imported into this country?—It is in the last year's Report, at pages 70 and 71. The countries are given at the head, and the ports to which they come are down the sides.

893. Can you speak as to certain statistics as regards the import and export to other countries, which I see in the Board of Trade returns?—I have applied to the Board of Trade for those statistics of late years, and have not been able to obtain them; I obtained them up to 1869, I think it was.

894. Are you aware that there is a statement in the Board of Trade Returns of the quantity of cattle imported into Belgium, and of the quantity exported from Belgium?—Sixty-seven thousand five hundred and sixty-one cattle were imported into Belgium in the year 1870, and the number exported was 38,484.

895. Whereof

895. Whereof to the United Kingdom came 582?—That does not accord with our return.

896. What are stated to be the imports into Austria for last year?—The number is divided; there were 157,567 imported, and the exports are 111,910 in the year 1870.

897. Those figures would show, would they not, that Austria imports about 46,000 more animals than it exports?—Yes.

898. Chairman.] Does that return apply to Austria, or to the Austro-Hungarian dominions?—It is Austria, exclusive of Dalmatia; but it does not say that it includes Hungary.

899. Mr. James Barclay.] From any information that you have obtained at Vienna or elsewhere, have you reason to believe that Austria imports more cattle into her dominions than she exports?—It is possible; but I have no correct information upon the subject; the evidence at Vienna was very contradictory in all ways; it was said that the returns were comparatively useless, because most of the cattle were smuggled over the frontier, instead of passing through the quarantine station, as they ought to have done.

900. Then that would make the imports still greater than the number in the official account, would it not?—I should like to know where the import was from.

901. You have given in the returns and estimate of the foreign supply and the home supply of beef; upon what authority is that estimate made?—I think you will find it stated in the report itself; the proportion is stated at page xxv of the Report of 1872.

902. Are the figures from the Journal of the Chamber of Agriculture?—Some of them are; but they are taken from various sources; it has been calculated under a number of heads; first I will take the foreign-produced meat exported, so as to deduct it from the imported; that is taken from the annual statement of the Board of Trade for 1870; the number of foreign animals exported to foreign countries in 1870 is taken from the same annual statement, and the foreign meat also.

903. I quite understand how you can get at the exports and imports from the Board of Trade returns; but I wish to know the data for the home supply?—We take the cattle population as reported by the agricultural statistics.

904. How do you base it upon that?—It is fully explained at page xxx of the Report.

905. Do you estimate the weight, or is it simply the number that you take?—First the number.

906. How do you arrive at the weight of the Irish cattle, so as to make them 27½ per cent. of the supply?—The statements at page xxv are made with regard to number only, but in the other estimate, I take the weight of the Irish cattle to be the same as that of the foreign cattle. Mr. Bead gave an estimate to the Journal of the Chamber of Agriculture which I accepted as correct. He gave the weight of the foreign and English cattle, and I took the weight of the foreign cattle as the weight of the Irish cattle. This may probably lead to an error in the estimate, of which I am perfectly aware, but it does not materially affect the general statement.

907. The great bulk of the foreign supply is fat cattle, is it not?—Yes.

908. And the bulk of the Irish supply is store cattle, is it not?—I am not aware; I explained to

the Chairman when the question was asked, that it was a mere estimate of numbers.

909. You have a table of the price of beef in the Metropolitan Market, that is taken from the market returns, I presume?—From the market returns.

910. It appears from this table, does it not, that the price of beef, second quality, has increased on an average, 2½d. per pound, during the last three years?—Quite so.

911. The first quality has advanced on an average five-eighths of a penny?—Yes.

912. The average price of mutton has advanced in the same period, 1½d. per pound for second quality, has it not?—Yes.

913. And for first quality, one and five sixteenths of a penny?—Yes.

914. The average price of pork, second quality, has fallen on an average, 1½d. per pound, and the first quality has fallen on an average, 1d. per pound; the average price of veal has advanced from five, fifteen-sixteenths, to seven, three sixteenths of a penny, an increase of 1½d. second quality, and 1d. first quality; while lamb during the same time has advanced three, thirteen-sixteenths of a penny; are those figures correct?—Yes.

915. Do you think that all the present statistics ought to continue to be kept in your office?—If you want to know anything about diseases, I do not think anything can be done away with.

916. You have done away with the feet and month statistics, have you not?—Yes.

917. In speaking of diseases imported in foreign vessels into the ports of Hull and London, would it not be advantageous for the inspector to go on board along with the customs officer?—I doubt it.

918. Assuming that diseased cattle are found on board, you suggested that they ought to be landed, and the carcasses destroyed; might it not be more advantageously done by the carcasses being put into barges, and destroyed on board the barges?—Recent experience would lead me to suppose that it would not.

919. The most of your evidence has been given with reference to fat cattle, has it not?—I treat all cattle in the same category; they are merely so many animals to me, and I make no particular distinction between the two classes.

920. Would it not be very desirable to have a difference between fat and store cattle; those that are to be killed at the port of landing, and those which are to go inland?—We endeavour to make a distinction, but it is impossible to define, because anyone might say, "This is fat," and "This is store;" there would be no proof.

921. Is there not a very considerable risk even with the unscheduled countries (the cattle of which may be taken inland, as I understand,) in landing such cattle at a port where the cattle from scheduled countries have to be slaughtered?—Not if they are landed perfectly separately, and the two places kept distinct, as they ought to be, at every port.

922. Then you suggest that there ought to be two separate places for every kind of cattle?—There are at present, for scheduled and unscheduled cattle.

923. But you think it impossible to quarantine the store cattle at such places?—It would not be impossible if you had plenty of money, and carried out a perfect design, but it would be impracticable.

Mr.
Alexander
Falkner.
—
13 March
1873.

Mr.
Alexander
Williams.

15 March
1873.

924. Would the work of your department be very much simplified if there was only one local authority for each county?—Considerably, I should think.

925. It would be only necessary for you then to correspond with the officers of the local authorities; one in each county?—Yes.

926. Do all the local authorities appoint inspectors at present?—They are obliged to do so by the Act, and I believe all of them have done so.

927. Is it in many cases anything more than nominal; that is to say, do they give the inspectors any fixed salary?—I have no information upon that point; that is entirely arranged by the local authorities. I have already landed in a return of all the inspectors, and all the information we have connected with them.

928. Assuming that we had only one local authority for each county, do you think it desirable that there should be an inspector appointed for each of those local authorities who should devote his whole time to the duties of the office?—Not if the boroughs remain local authorities, but I think the county inspector might do for the borough in a great many instances.

929. I am assuming that we have only one local authority in each county, including boroughs; do you think it would be desirable that the inspector should devote his whole time to the duties of the office, there being one inspector in each county?—I think so, certainly.

930. Have you any means of knowing whether the inspectors, or many of them, are appointed on that condition at present?—I have not, and I am not aware how that is.

931. Mr. Tipping.] Supposing that all cattle were slaughtered at the landing port, have you at all considered what would be the effect of that upon the price of meat generally?—From all the information I have obtained, I believe it would tend to increase the price.

932. You were saying that in a normal state of things we imported cattle from Holstein, and that the vacuum from Germany was filled up by Russia?—I believe so.

933. Do you consider that a preferable form of commerce to importing direct from Russia?—I do; because I do not think we can depend upon Russian inspection or information.

934. Inasmuch as you consider the future foreign import will be almost confined to Russia, would it not pay (to use a plain phrase) to have a serious inspection and a serious system established, at some special Russian port, for our supply, if it could be arranged diplomatically?—No doubt.

935. Would it not be much safer to have a check at once upon the port of export, rather than upon the port of import?—Certainly.

936. I suppose you would consider that by diplomatic arrangement that would be perfectly feasible?—I think so; but I do not think that is the opinion of the diplomatic authorities.

937. Sir H. Selwin-Ibbetson.] Following out the question of the honorable Member, was it attempted during the prevalence of the cattle plague to carry out that suggestion, and to establish an inspection on the other side of the water?—I do not think that it was attempted. It was suggested and dropped, I think; but I am not aware of any absolute attempt having been made, though I suggested it myself on several occasions.

938. It was not carried into effect in any one instance?—It was not, I think, or certainly not by the officers of the Privy Council.

939. It would entail the establishment of an officer or inspector of the Privy Council at each of the export ports to England, would it not?—Yes.

940. I see by those Returns that the total importation of cattle into the London market from abroad has fallen off rather considerably in the year 1872 as compared with previous years; can you tell me whether the import of foreign cattle into the port of London has fallen off in the same proportion?—That will be found in these Tables.

941. Is there a decrease on the previous importation into the metropolitan markets of foreign cattle?—You can only compare London with London at the two times.

942. We have here a statement that in the year 1872 the diminution of the import of foreign cattle was the difference between 108,985 and 122,036 in the year previous, and of that, you state, in a note, that 38,426 was the importation for the London market at Deptford?—Yes; and you find at Table 30, page 69, the cattle imported into London for the years 1869, 1870, 1871, and 1872, that is, into the port of London.

943. Then the diminution is from 130,944 cattle in 1871 to 98,732?—It is.

944. Have you observed that the increase in the home supply in that year very largely overbalances that deficiency?—I should imagine that it would.

945. And that whereas the home supply in 1871 was 146,335, the home supply for last year, 1872, was 178,989, and that, in fact, the total number of foreign and home cattle in the metropolitan markets for the year 1872 was larger by nearly 20,000 than in the previous year?—Yes; but less by a considerable number than in 1869.

946. Less by 7,000?—Yes.

947. Can you trace the diminution in the importation in 1870 to any idea that this market was to be established?—I think not.

948. Therefore the falling-off in the foreign supply had taken place before the establishment of the Foreign market, where the slaughter was necessary?—Quite so; because the circumstances of 1869-70 at home allowed us to supply more home stock, on account of the climate and other circumstances.

949. But what I wanted to arrive at was that the supply for the metropolitan market had not fallen off in consequence of the establishment of a market where all foreign cattle had to be slaughtered?—The supply to the metropolitan market has fallen off, as you must deduct Deptford.

950. I do not think you quite understand my question; what I wanted to bring before you was that the general supply (which, of course, includes the home supply and the foreign supply) had increased rather than diminished in the last two years?—Quite so.

951. And, therefore, the idea which was put before us, that the establishment of a market where slaughter was compulsory would produce a diminution in the food of the people of London has not been carried out; is not that so?—A considerable falling-off has taken place in the import of foreign cattle into the port of London.

952. True; but the whole argument at the time of the discussion on the establishment of a market where animals must be slaughtered was, that

that the supply for the people would be diminished, whereas the argument on the other side was, that if the supply of foreign cattle diminished, the supply of home cattle that would be thrown into the market would be increased and would make up the deficiency; that has been the case, has it not?—Yes.

953. That being the case, do you believe that we are protected in any way from the importation of disease from foreign countries by the establishment of a market where foreign cattle when imported are slaughtered?—I think so, under the present regulations.

954. Would you extend that belief to saying that you think that that system which is established, and which, as you say, is successful under present restrictions in the port of London, could be carried out in the other ports?—I think it could, and it ought to be.

955. And you are of opinion that if it was so carried out, we should be protected in a larger degree than we are at present from the introduction of disease?—I think so.

956. And that the present system with regard to other ports of landing, which depends upon the reports of inspectors, and upon the action which may be taken on those reports, affords nothing like the protection that we should arrive at in that case?—Theoretically, it is carried out now in all other places, but not by such efficient means as it is at Deptford.

957. When you say theoretically, it is practically dependent upon the action of the local authorities, is it not?—I think more depends upon our own inspectors, and upon the Customs officers, than upon the local authorities.

958-59. But are you not in a great measure dependent upon the local authorities as regards the defining parts of ports, and the carrying out of the instructions of the Privy Council with reference to the isolation of cattle?—Only as regards the keeping of the area of the defined part.

960. Would you see any great difficulty in carrying out the establishment of ports for the slaughter of foreign cattle at your ports of importation throughout the country?—Not if any one can be found to pay for it; but I do not know who would pay for it; it would be a large expense, and it would interfere very much with trade.

961. Have you found that, practically, it interferes so seriously with trade in the Deptford market?—No; because there proper arrangements were made; but at Hull, for instance, they have no place for such a thing.

962. Do you mean that, in your judgment, it would be impossible at Hull to establish what has been found practicable in London?—With unlimited money it would not be at all impossible; it is entirely a question of money.

963. Do you believe that the Deptford market is a complete loss?—I do not consider that it pays. I think scarcely any other body could be found to expend so large a sum, or anything like so large a sum, upon such an undertaking.

964. Would it require so large, or anything like so large, a sum to establish at Hull, for the cattle imported there, a similar market?—It is a question of size, and that should be adapted to the importation. Hull imports a great many animals, and it would require a considerable space for a slaughter place at Hull.

965. At the same time you admit that, supposing you could arrive at the sum of money required—

quired to establish those markets, you would by doing so have secured the best guarantee that we could have against the importation of foreign disease?—Yes, provided the present regulations are kept up in their entirety.

966. *Chairman.* Referring to your answer to the honorable Baronet, that the Deptford market was a loss, do you mean a loss taken absolutely by itself?—As an investment of money, it will not return 5 per cent.

967. In making that answer, you do not take into account the advantage that the Corporation may obtain by animals that do not come to Deptford going to the Islington market, do you?—I do not; but merely as an investment.

968. Nor do you take into account the fact that the tolls have been increased?—I do not.

969. *Sir H. Selous-D'Evelon.* Notwithstanding that the tolls have been increased, it has by no means stopped the home supply, for that has increased largely since that time, has it not?—Yes.

970. With regard to the home trade and the foot and mouth disease, do you consider that any restrictions placed upon the numerous fairs and markets throughout the country, would help you in checking the spread of that disease?—Certainly I do; but at more cost than what I propose. I should rather prevent their getting to the fairs from the infected places than stop markets and fairs, in which such a large amount of money is invested.

971. Do you consider that the present number of fairs, largely increased as it is compared with the number which existed a few years back, is absolutely necessary for the trade of the country?—I am unable to judge upon that point.

972. There is no doubt, I suppose, that if you could reduce the number of those markets and fairs, you would reduce in that way the travelling and the hurried travelling of cattle, which is of itself a very fruitful source of disease?—Certainly; the smaller the number of centres from which they can meet and be distributed, the less the danger.

973. I suppose there is no question that there was not the same amount of disease before the increase in the rapidity of transit of cattle?—I think that Professor Brown is more acquainted with that than I am.

974. Do you think it would be possible also to put a certain restriction upon the movement of cattle, by levying a license upon what they call the middlemen?—It would be exceedingly difficult, I think, to define who they were.

975. Could you not define it that the license should be on anyone wishing to trade for profit in these animals?—Every farmer trades for profit, I think; it is exceedingly difficult to define.

976. What I meant was, that if you could get a restriction upon the middlemen who deal, in this case the veterinary department would have a great check upon the history of those sales, would they not, and you would probably get a better class of men into the trade?—You may do so; but I see enormous difficulties in carrying it out.

977. But you think it would be very possible to increase our security by giving power of inspection, and a power when disease broke out, of declaring infected districts, and stopping movement in those districts?—I do.

978. And you would make that general throughout the country?—General and compulsory.

Mr.
Alexander
Williams.
—
13 March
1873.

979. In your answer to the honorable gentleman the member for Scarborough, I think you stated that you would make the licenses in that case issue from the inspectors instead of from the magistrates, as before?—Certainly; first on account of the trouble given to the magistrates, and, secondly, because I think that the man who is responsible for the spread of the disease should also be responsible for the movement of the animals; that is to say, if he would not allow the license that movement must be considered unsafe, whereas if he did it might be considered safe.

980. Are you aware that when those licenses were required for the movement of cattle, it was often exceedingly difficult to procure one, from the difficulty of finding magistrates within a reasonable distance?—It was.

981. Do you not think that that difficulty would be very much increased, so far as distance was concerned, if there were only one person to issue such licenses instead of a number throughout the country?—I carefully avoided saying that a license was to be required in every case. I should allow the inspector to instruct the officers of the local authority in charge of the infected place what animals to allow to go and what not.

982. My reason for putting before you the difficulty which I thought would arise from the issue of such licenses by only one person in the district, is based upon my knowledge of how those difficulties arose when the licenses might be issued by a number of people?—I think they might be issued by a number of people, the inspector being responsible.

983. He would classify the animals, and say that animals, under certain conditions, might be licensed by the local authority, whoever he might be; is that your idea?—The people in charge of the infected place, the police, I presume. I should not, under certain circumstances, require a license; but a verbal permission, I think, would be sufficient to facilitate the movement of animals that were not really dangerous.

984. What record would there be of the verbal permission?—The inspector would be solely responsible.

985. Mr. [Lusk.] You mentioned, did you not, that you had done away with the statistics of the foot and mouth disease?—We have.

986. For what reason?—From the complaints we received of the expense and alleged uselessness of them, and from the very imperfect statistics that we obtained. Numbers of local authorities refused to give them, and very few gave them properly.

987. That being the case, do you think there is any truth in the statement that the disease is infectious?—Certainly.

988. You think it is a serious infectious disease, and yet you take no notice of it at all?—We took no notice of it during the last year, but at first we took great notice of it. Then so many complaints were made of the expense and uselessness of our taking the notice we did of it that we reduced and reduced this notice until eventually we took comparatively no notice of it at all, but left it all to the local authorities.

989. Are the regulations that you make of any use to the public as all?—If they were carried out by the local authorities they would be of use, but they are not carried out.

990. Then are the Committee to draw the inference from that, that your Department is not of

much value to the public?—We have no power of enforcing regulations.

991. I do not want to make any intimation, but from what you state it seems to me a matter of little importance whether a thing is reported at all; is that so?—The foot and mouth disease is not the only disease with which we have to deal; there are a number of other diseases contained in the Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act, in all of which I think we do some good, though perhaps not quite so much as was anticipated.

992. But you are not very sure about it?—I am quite sure that with regard to cattle plague and sheep-pox in this country, and also with regard to the importation of all the other diseases from abroad, we do a great deal of good.

993. You mentioned, did you not, that you had no such place at some of the outports, for carrying on your operations, as you have at Deptford?—Not a place similar to Deptford.

994. What protection have the public against diseased animals coming into those places?—We have the protection of defined parts out of which they cannot move; we have the local authority to guard those defined parts; we have a veterinary inspector to examine every animal, and every animal is examined twice, and is detained a considerable time for that examination; and I think that it is very rarely that any disease is passed by the inspector. If disease is found by the inspector to exist, all the animals of the cargo, and all the animals that have been in contact with them, are slaughtered.

995. But you mentioned a little while ago, that the local authorities would not act upon the reports, what do you do in that case?—They will not do everything we wish, but they have done a great deal. There has been a vast improvement in the arrangements during the last five or six years.

996. You have been asked about ships reporting when a cargo comes into port; I suppose you know something about the reporting of a ship?—Not much.

997. Are you aware that a captain must report his cargo to the Custom House before he can discharge it at all?—I believe that that is so.

998. Are you aware that he must produce his manifest of his cargo, and of the cattle, or any other thing whatever there is on board?—I am aware that he has to give a manifest of cattle.

999. Are you aware that the manifest includes everything on board the ship?—So I understand.

1000. Therefore you think that it would be of no use that there should be any other persons authorised to go on board the ship except the Customs officers?—I think it would be of use in many cases, but I think it would not be advisable or necessary that they should go on board in every case.

1001. Your officers have never been hindered from going on board a ship, I presume?—I know of no instance in which they have been hindered.

1002. You have been asked whether you would disinfect all the people connected with a ship that is coming in; do you think it would be possible to disinfect all the sailors and everybody else when they come in?—I should say that it was possible, but impracticable.

1003. That is pretty much the same thing; if a cargo of animals is landed at a wharf, and disease is found to exist in the cargo, are other cargoes allowed to be landed at the same wharf before the whole of the first cargo has been taken away?—If

—If they are, they are put under precisely the same regulations as the first cargo, and they are treated as one cargo. But usually the place is disinfected before another cargo is allowed to be loaded; if not, they come under the same regulations. It may be impossible to do it.

1004. It is usually done, is it?—Usually it is done, certainly.

1005. Are there any means of trading foot and mouth disease to be an imported disease, or do you think it is indigenous to this country?—At the present moment it is.

1006. You think it is not imported at all?—Numbers of cases of the disease have been brought in vessels; but I never have been able to trace a single case that has got from the foreign animals into the country, to the best of my recollection.

1007. You think the number of ports for landing should be reduced, do you not?—I do.

1008. Have you a staff at each of those ports for landing, or is all left to the local authorities?—We have an inspector only; the keeping of the regulations is left to the local authorities; the landing of the animals is left to the Customs.

1009. The public have to pay for the staff at each of those ports of landing, I presume?—There is in no case more than one inspector at an outpost, and sometimes the same inspector attends to two or three ports. I have given in the Appendix to my Report, page 38, a list of the inspectors, and of the ports to which they belong.

1010. You mentioned the office hours of your office. We have no doubt looked at it sometimes, and it must have cost a good deal of money. The office hours are six hours a day, are they not?—They are.

1011. As the head of a department, do you think that that is a fair time for a man to work in a day?—I think he might possibly work longer; but I do not think that, for the pay the Government gives, the men ought to work even so long as that.

1012. That is not exactly an answer to my question. I asked you whether you thought six hours' work was a fair amount of labour for a man to do in a day?—No; they have to do other work, for the purpose of making up their incomes.

1013. We hear a good deal about the eight and nine hours' movements; do you think six hours' a day is a fair time for a man, receiving a salary (I do not say whether it is big or little) to work?—Not in manual labour, but certainly in mental labour, it is a fair day's work. To go on all the year round, I should say it is as much as a man, with due regard to his health, can possibly do.

1014. Are the Civil servants very healthy?—Not that I am aware of.

1015. Are they not as healthy, for example, as clerks in the City, in the banks?—I have no information about that.

1016. As a medical gentleman, I thought you perhaps might know; are you aware that clerks in City establishments, where there are six times, or ten times, or perhaps twenty times, all the Civil Service put together, work more than six hours a day?—I should think it very likely.

1017. I am not saying anything about the pay, but I am merely asking you whether you think that six hours a day is enough to give to the public service?—I have myself averaged 14 hours a day for a long time at the office work.

1018. If you, being a medical gentleman, think that the labour is so heavy that six hours a day

is abundance of time, I am satisfied with the answer; is that your opinion?—I think it is enough for the pay.

1019. Should you think it better to employ the clerks a little longer and to give them a little more pay?—Yes, I should, instead of their going to other work, as they are obliged to do.

1020. Then it is not at all from physical inability to do the work, but because they are not paid enough, that they do not work longer hours?—I think so; and they get too few holidays.

1021. Mr. Jacob Bright.] With regard to the time of working, you say that they come at 11 o'clock and stop at five?—They do.

1022. Do they take any time out of that six hours for lunch?—They are allowed to eat something in the office, but not to go out and get lunch.

1023. Is it contrary to rule for them to go out to get lunch?—It is. A record is kept if the junior clerks waste over 20 minutes in any way.

1024. You spoke of the mental labour of their duties, and you said you thought six hours' work was enough where so much mental labour was involved; is there serious mental labour with regard to most of those who are employed in the office?—I think that anybody would consider that the getting of returns such as we get into anything like form would be severe mental labour; they are so incorrect and so very badly returned.

1025. Then it is not with most of them mere routine work, but there is really a good deal of mental strain?—With the exception of a few of them, there is a good deal of mental strain. It is a higher class of work than mere copying clerks' work.

1026. You evidently think that they are very much underpaid; what salary do the majority of the clerks of whom you speak get?—The majority, that is to say, those of whom there are the greatest number, get from 20 s. to 30 s. a week; those are the writers and temporary clerks. There are five writers and 17 temporary clerks.

1027. Do you find that those whom you get at those prices are fully qualified for their work?—The 17 are generally men who have been in the office for years, and are acquainted with at least a part of the work, and therefore very valuable. The new ones require a considerable time before they become at all useful to us.

1028. Although I should be very glad to see everybody getting more money, still, if they remain there for many years, and are very competent, it is quite clear that at that price we can get very competent persons?—We are getting gradually reduced. We had 110, and we have now 17; 11 have left since 1869. Directly they see anything better they go, of course.

1029. You stated, did you not, in the first place, that the hours are six per day, and in the next place, that in order to get through the work they have to work at nights and on Sundays?—Occasionally.

1030. How often in the course of the year do they work on Sundays?—I said, at hazard, 12 or 13 Sundays during the past year; but I can, if you wish it, correct it afterwards. That is a mere guess.

1031. About how many hours on each Sunday do they work?—I have a Return of the whole of it, if you would like to have it, but I cannot recollect.

1032. Do you suppose that they do as many hours' work as

Mr.
Alexander
Watkins.

13 March
1873.

Mr.
Alexander
Williams.

13 March
1873

hours' work on Sunday as they do on week-days, that is to say, six hours?—I am unable to say.

1033. How often do they work overtime at nights?—Sometimes for a long time they are without any such work, sometimes they do it very often.

1034. Do they sometimes work a week or two together at overtime?—Yes. I endeavour, however, not to have more overtime day after day than I can possibly help; but sometimes one particular man has been at a particular kind of work, and then he is obliged to go on with it.

1035. Do they get increased pay for their overtime and work on Sundays?—Except during the late outbreak of cattle plague, neither the temporary clerks nor the permanent clerks received any extra pay.

1036. What is your reason for doing the work at night and on Sundays, instead of working earlier in the morning?—Because at the time above referred to, the letters came in on the Sunday morning, and required to be attended to on the same day.

1037. *Chairman.* At the time of the cattle plague, I think, arrangements were made for letters being delivered through the Foreign Office on Sundays?—Yes; and the clerks were then paid an extra sum for attending.

1038. *Mr. J. Bright.* That was at the time of the cattle plague; but is there now often any urgency of that kind?—Very rarely indeed.

1039. In that case Sunday labour must be very rare, I suppose?—Very rare; I only mentioned incidentally that during the last year we have been compelled to resort to it.

1040. *Sir H. Selwyn-Edelston.* During the last year was not a great deal of that overtime due to the breaking out of the cattle plague in Yorkshire?—It was.

1041. *Mr. Casely.* Did you not state in your previous examination that a good deal of that Sunday work was for the preparation of your annual report, and of this report?—Only to a small extent. The report was principally done in the evenings, but not all of it. The Sunday work was principally during the time of the cattle plague.

1042. *Mr. J. Bright.* I think you stated that a country might be scheduled not only for cattle plague but also for sheep-pox?—The sheep of a country have been scheduled for sheep-pox, and the cattle were scheduled for cattle plague.

1043. How is it that sheep-pox is selected from among other diseases for that exceptional treatment?—Because it was a very troublesome disease on several occasions in previous years.

1044. Is there then a strong reason why sheep-pox should be treated in that exceptional way?—I should be myself disposed not to treat it in that exceptional way; but it has hitherto been done.

1045. You would not have a country scheduled with regard to sheep owing to sheep-pox?—I would not.

1046. In your opinion, then, the department is unnecessarily interfering with the freedom of trade?—It has not done so for a considerable time; not since the present Government have been in power.

1047. Do I correctly understand that sheep have not been interfered with owing to sheep-pox of recent years?—Not since February 1869, I think.

1048. Then, in fact, that idea of interfering

with the importation of sheep owing to sheep-pox has been given up, I presume?—I am not at all sure of that, but it has not been noted upon; our arrangements are now very much more nearly approaching perfection than they were with regard to the ports.

1049. I understand it to be your opinion that there is quite as much reason to prevent the importation of sheep with reference to various other diseases as with reference to sheep-pox?—I do not think so.

1050. I understood you to say that you yourself objected to the importation of sheep being interfered with owing to sheep-pox?—I did.

1051. And, therefore, you think that sheep-pox should be treated like those other diseases, and not exceptionally?—It is exceptionally treated under the Act.

1052. I thought you were of opinion that that was a mistake?—No; I referred to the scheduling of the country on account of it.

1053. *Chairman.* Was not the question which I asked you, in answer to which you stated that you thought that a certain regulation ought not to be introduced, this, whether you thought that it was advisable that sheep-pox should be put in the same position as cattle plague?—It was so.

1054. *Mr. J. Bright.* You thought that it should not?—It should not, and it is not.

1055. You stated, did you not, that one of the highest veterinary authorities believed that foot and mouth disease might arise spontaneously?—The latter referred to went scarcely so far as that, but the inference was to that effect; he also stated that it was a general impression in Ireland.

1056. I suppose that at some time or other it must have arisen spontaneously somewhere?—I presume so; somewhere at some time.

1057. Therefore, what has once happened in the world might happen again in this country, might it not?—Under the same circumstances; but I believe that those diseases are produced by gradual development, and not by sudden generation.

1058. Did you say that we had no foot and mouth disease before 1839?—I think not.

1059. Did you not say that that was a remarkable year for the foot and mouth disease?—I do not think I said so.

1060. I understood you to say that until 1839 there was not much public attention paid in this country to that disease?—I have no information upon that subject; I have a return which would have shown all those points, but it is not in the committee-room.

1061. Are you aware that in the year 1840 we did not import cattle, the Customs restrictions preventing it?—I cannot recollect the year, but I think it was in 1842 that the restriction was taken off.

1062. I think the Committee will be aware of that; in your report I observe that it is stated that, "During 1840 and 1841 Great Britain suffered to a most serious extent from it" (that is to say, from foot and mouth disease); "the malady was more malignant at that time than it has ever since been; in 1842 and 1843, and the early part of 1844, notwithstanding that the prohibition on the import of foreign cattle was removed in July 1842, the foot and mouth disease was not so prevalent;" it would appear that before we imported cattle, we had a most malignant attack of foot and mouth disease, and that soon after beginning

Mr.
Alexander
Williams.

13 March
1873.

to import cattle, that disease became very much modified; that I think appears from your report, does it not?—I think so.

1063. How do you arrive at this statement?—From information in the office from various reports; I have no doubt that I can refer you to all the authorities; I have no opinion myself about it, but I have authority for stating all that I have stated.

1064. It is really quite recently, is it, that we have interfered with foot and mouth disease?—Since 1869.

1065. And yet, I suppose, for the greater part of the time since the year 1840 meat has been cheap and farmers have been prosperous?—I cannot say that meat has been cheap.

1066. Has it not been cheap for the greater part of the time since 1840; I admit that it has been dear lately?—The price of meat has been steadily increasing.

1067. The farmers have been generally prosperous, and their prosperity has not been interfered with much by the foot and mouth disease, is not that so?—I am not capable of giving an opinion upon that point, as I have no information upon the subject.

1068. You stated, did you not, that you thought it was not wise for the department to advise farmers with respect to remedies and the cure of cattle?—I did.

1069. I do not know whether you have been a veterinary surgeon?—No; I know nothing about it.

1070. I was going to ask you whether it was easier to treat the diseases of cattle than those of men?—I do not know. I have treated the diseases of men, but I know nothing whatever of the diseases of cattle.

1071. Would you not suppose that if it was the duty of the Government to teach farmers how to cure cattle, it should also probably be their duty to teach men how their diseases should be cured?—I should think so.

1072. You stated, did you not, that Germany was now a scheduled country?—Yes.

1073. I think I understood you to say, that it was not scheduled because there was disease in Germany, but because Germany, not taking all the precautions which it might take, was open to suspicion?—It is so.

1074. In that case we are interfering, are we not, with the trade of cattle from Germany simply from that suspicion?—From the absolute

danger of cattle getting through Germany into this country without our having any intimation of the disease existing in Germany, or in the district from which the cattle come.

1075. Although, so far as we know, Germany is free from disease?—Germany is free from the cattle plague, I believe.

1076. Then all the cattle which now come in from Germany are slaughtered at the ports?—Yes, they are.

1077. I think I heard you state also, that when cattle have to be slaughtered at the ports, they sell for less than when they may be introduced freely into the country?—So it is alleged, but I have no proof of it.

1078. I thought you stated that it tended to raise the price of meat when there was compulsory slaughter at the ports?—That is my opinion, but I have no proof of it.

1079. Then of course it is your opinion that the effect of putting Germany in that position is to diminish the quantity of German meat?—Not necessarily. It depends upon whether it will pay.

1080. But you expressed the opinion that the slaughter of cattle at the port tended to raise the price, and it can only tend to raise the price the quantity being somewhat diminished owing to that policy?—Yes; but if the price in this country is greater than the price in Germany, it will come under any circumstances. It depends entirely upon the price here, and not upon the actual amount obtained; that is, upon the relative price.

1081. But surely more or less would come according to the embarrassments, or the absence of embarrassments on the import; how many ports of landing are there?—There are 32.

1082. I think you expressed an opinion that it would be well to diminish the number of ports of landing?—I did.

1083. Of course that would be an interference with the freedom of ports with regard to the cattle?—Scarcely, I think, in the way that I propose it.

1084. It was said that pork had fallen very much in price, and that other kinds of meat had risen; what, in your opinion, is the reason of that?—I can scarcely form an opinion.

1085. Is it because we have greater freedom in the trade?—I should think not; but from the great quantity of dead pork which is imported.

Thursday, 20th March 1873.

NUMBERS PRESENT:

Mr. James Barclay.
Mr. Jacob Bright.
Mr. Callan.
Mr. Cawley.
Mr. Clay.
Mr. Dent.
Mr. Dodson.
Mr. William Edward Forster.

Mr. William Johnston.
Mr. Kavanagh.
Mr. Lusk.
Mr. Mansell.
Lord Robert Montagu.
Mr. O'Connor.
Mr. Ridley.
Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson.

THE RIGHT HONOURABLE WILLIAM EDWARD FORSTER, IN THE CHAIR.

Mr. ALEXANDER WILLIAMS, called in; and further Examined.

Mr.
Alexander
Williams.
to March
1873.

1086. Mr. W. Johnston.] WITH regard to the calculation made in page xxv of your Report for the year 1872, published in 1873, as to the supply of cattle which was referred to in Question 347; will you be kind enough to say how you calculate the per-centage of the supply; do you consider that the whole of the 27½ per cent. of Irish imports were available for meat purposes?—I explained to the Right Honourable Chairman a short time ago that there is an error in that item, because I did not attempt to estimate the weight of the animals when exported from Ireland, or the amount added to that weight in this country; I simply took the numerical value of the animals; I should, therefore, say that the Irish supply should be rather less, and the home supply rather more than is estimated.

1087. Is there any communication between the Veterinary Departments of London and Dublin?—There are occasional communications; we inform the Veterinary Department of Dublin of all the reports of diseases in foreign countries, and there are frequently private communications relative to orders about to be passed in either country affecting the other in any way.

1088. Of this total number of cattle exported from Ireland to Great Britain in 1870, being 453,969, are you aware that 38,296 were calves. The number of calves is taken from page 850 of Thom's Directory for this year, and is furnished by Professor Ferguson?—There is a return in the Report of this year obtained from Professor Ferguson, up to December of last year, page 69, Table xxvii.

1089. When was the first appearance of pleuropneumonia in this country?—I am unable to tell you; Professor Brown will be able to tell you.

1090. It is stated in Professor Brown's Report that it appeared in Ireland in 1840 for the first time, and that it was introduced into Cork by an importation of Dutch cows imported by a friend of the English consul?—Probably so.

1091. In reply to a question put by Mr. Jacob

Bright, you seem to think that it was not the duty of the Veterinary Department to teach farmers how to cure the diseases of cattle?—I think that it is not.

1092. But you do furnish a means of prevention and the treatment of the foot and mouth disease in the Report, at page 18?—Professor Brown does so personally, but only in general terms, not prescribing. I think, in any way, so far as I am aware.

1093. There seems to be a very full account of the symptoms and the treatment of foot and mouth disease at page 18?—That is general treatment; I do not see anything in the form of a prescription there at all; it gives the general principles of treatment.

1094. Do you think it would be desirable to have more frequent communications between the Veterinary Departments of Ireland and England as regards the existence and treatment of disease?—I think it would; we furnish information to Ireland, but Ireland does not furnish information to us, as a rule, unless it is asked for.

1095. Have you any information as to the number of cattle arriving from the different Irish ports into England?—I am not aware that we have any detailed information.

1096. The largest number of cattle exported from any port in 1870 was, of course, from Dublin, being 182,905, and from Belfast 78,420?—Yes.

1097. Are you aware of what system of inspection, if any, exists in these Irish ports?—I am not.

1098. What was your idea with reference to inspection at the ports of embarkation and debarkation?—My idea was that a thorough inspection should be made, and that the whole of the animals herded with any suffering from contagious disease should be detained.

1099. Do you think it is possible for perfectly healthy animals to leave Ireland, and be put on shipboard, and become infected with the disease in transit?—Yes; if the germs of disease existed

Mr.
Alexander
Wilmess.
—
so Much
1873

in any part of the vessel with which they came in contact during the passage, but not from any conditions otherwise.

1100. Have you any evidence as to the importation of diseased animals from Ireland. It is stated, at page xxi of the Report, that it is probable that more animals infected with a disease of a contagious nature are imported from Ireland than from all foreign countries; have you any actual statistics relating to that?—Not compiled. There are a few returns collected on this matter.

1101. Of course the importation from Ireland so largely exceeds that from all foreign countries, that it is possible that the disease might be in excess in the total number of cases, but do you think that the proportion of disease imported is larger?—Considerably larger.

1102. To what do you attribute that?—It is very difficult to assign any cause, except the absence of care in exporting healthy animals only. I am led to believe that even if disease is detected among animals in the Irish ports, they only detain the affected animals, and send the others on. I have no information upon the subject, but I believe that that is the case.

1103. Do you believe that it is necessary to slaughter all the animals infected by the foot and mouth disease?—Certainly not.

1104. It is not generally a fatal disease, I believe?—Certainly not.

1105. Have you any suggestions to make to the Committee as regards a better arrangement with regard to the cattle imported from Ireland, either on the Irish side or upon this side?—I can scarcely offer any suggestions as regards Ireland, because I am not sufficiently acquainted with the circumstances, but I think that our regulations in England should be carried out with regard to Irish animals as they ought to be with regard to home animals; that is to say, that if any animal coming from Ireland is affected with any contagious disease, the regulations at present in force should be insisted upon with regard to them. Some means should be adopted by which that could be provided for. This could not be done under the present arrangements at all, because it would stop the trade entirely.

1106. Do you think that the Irish Veterinary Department should procure and keep statistics with regard to the foot and mouth disease?—I think that with their means of obtaining statistics, they might get really good ones, and therefore I think that they should do so.

1107. But you have given up doing so with regard to the English Department?—Yes; because the local authorities did not give them practically.

1108. Mr. Kavanagh. Are you aware of what returns are furnished or kept by the Veterinary Department in Ireland?—Not in the slightest degree.

1109. You stated on the first day of your examination that there were 1,500 local inspectors employed in Great Britain, or somewhere about that number?—There were employed during that year from 1,800 to 1,700, I think, but all were not in office at any one time.

1110. Out of what fund are their salaries paid?—The local authorities pay them out of the local rate.

1111. The local inspectors are paid out of the local rates, are they not?—Yes.

1112. In Section V of your Report you say that Irish animals are not inspected previous to

embarkation from Ireland nor in England, on landing?—Yes.

1113. You would recommend such inspection, would you not?—Yes, I would recommend such inspection.

1114. Where would you recommend it to take place; at the port of embarkation or debarkation?—I think a very small amount of money, expended at the port of embarkation would produce a greater result than a larger amount at the port of debarkation or landing.

1115. Do you not think that an inspection at the port of embarkation would be a far wiser system than that of inspecting cattle on board ship when they arrived at the port at which they were to be landed?—It would be a cheaper and a better system.

1116. Do not you think, that it would have a very deterrent effect upon dealers if the cattle were to be subject to inspection at the port where they were to be landed, and were to be liable to be turned back upon them?—I believe that it would be enough to stop the trade.

1117. With regard to the supply of meat; in your Report in 1871, page 7, you say, that England is totally unable to furnish sufficient for its own consumption, and your answer to Question 203 is, that you apprehend that the supply from Germany will fall short?—Yes.

1118. And you also say that that supply is our main source of foreign supply?—Yes; I think Germany and Holland are our chief sources of each supply.

1119. You also stated, that you apprehended that Germany would have to import to supply its own want in future?—I do.

1120. In page 11 in your Report you say that imposing additional restrictions on importation, would have the effect of increasing the cost of production, and that a difference of from 5s. to 10s. a-head, would put a stop to the import trade altogether; that is in page 11 of your Report?—Yes, it is there mentioned that it has been so stated.

1121. From 5s. to 10s. a-head would be enough, if added to the expense, to put a stop to the importation altogether?—That is referring to the foreign animals.

1122. I think you say that that applies to Ireland as well, in almost the same paragraph?—I do not recollect that.

1123. I thought you stated that in one of your answers?—I do not recollect that; it is a mistake if I did say that; I did not refer to the Irish animals at that time, so far as I am aware.

1124. In fact you have said now, that inspection at the port of debarkation would be sufficient to stop the Irish trade?—I think so.

1125. Would not that fact, or the fact of stopping the trade, involve a serious consideration from the consumers' point of view?—Decidedly so; and that, I presume, is why the Lords of the Council have not insisted upon the regulations being carried out with regard to the Irish supply.

1126. At present you have stated that England can only supply 60 per cent. of their own consumption?—Yes.

1127. And the restrictions that I understand you propose, as likely to prevent the spread of disease, are the slaughter of cattle at the port of landing, or subjecting them to detention?—Not with regard to Irish, but with regard to foreign cattle. With regard to Irish cattle, I simply say that the regulations which should be applied in

England

Mr.
Alexander
Wilkinson.
—
20 March
1873.

England should also be applied to Irish cattle, and I believe the result of that would be, that although it might for a time interfere very seriously with the trade; the Irish authorities or the dealers would take such precautions as to let us have healthy animals only.

1128. Are you aware what inspection is kept up in Ireland now?—I believe there is no general inspection at all.

1129. I think I gather, from the whole of your evidence, that local district inspection would be about the best plan that could be adopted, and putting in force the rule preventing any animal being removed from a diseased centre without a license?—I think so.

1130. If that could be done, and you could find means to carry that out, do you think that it would greatly remove any objections which now exist as to the importation of Irish cattle?—I think so, certainly, if it is really carried out.

1131. With regard to inspection before embarkation, might it not be subject to this objection, that cattle bought at fairs in the country by dealers and jobbers, and sent to a port for shipment to England, might, to the great detriment of their owners, be stopped by the inspectors at the port of shipment, and considerable expense incurred there?—Not if they were healthy, I presume.

1132. But I was presuming that they were found, on arriving at the port of shipment, diseased or suspected of being diseased; is it not quite possible that they might have been sold sound and healthy, and become infected in the transit?—That could not cover if the regulations you have already mentioned were strictly carried out, because they could not get out of the infected port.

1133. I am supposing that those regulations are not established; I wanted to ask you whether you did not think the restrictions of inspection before embarkation at the port, would be liable to the objection that it might be a hardship upon the dealers?—It would be an interference with the trade undoubtedly.

1134. A man might buy cattle at a fair apparently sound, and when they came to the port of shipment they might be found affected, and it would be hard upon him either to lose his market or to have the cattle detained at some bad place?—It would be a hardship upon him personally, certainly.

1135. It would greatly check enterprises, upon a dealer's part, in sending cattle to England?—I doubt whether it would eventually. If we take the foreign trade, I do not think the restrictions now much interfere with foreign import; it is said so, but it is a mere question of price.

1136. It is, of course, a mere question of price; then the plans that you are most in favour of is an efficient district inspection and the application of Article 28, I think it is; that is with regard to preventing the removal of diseased cattle?—Yes, preventing movement in an infected place, not universally all over the country, but simply in the place where the disease exists.

1137. That would, I presume, be a very expensive system to carry out efficiently all through the country?—Undoubtedly.

1138. I understood you to say, in your first examination, that you believed the disease could be stamped out by isolation; I am referring to the foot and mouth disease and pleuro-pneumonia; I thought you applied the remark to both?—

If you could make isolation perfect, foot and mouth disease could undoubtedly be stamped out, and it would be very materially checked by isolation under any circumstances. Pleuro-pneumonia, I should think, might be quite stamped out by isolation, if carried out.

1139. Is it not rather an open question with some authorities, whether the foot and mouth disease is not capable of spontaneous origin?—I should doubt whether, at the present day, any authority would hold that opinion; it has been expressed.

1140. In your answer to Question 683, you say that there is no evidence to prove that the foot and mouth disease does not spontaneously arise?—I say so simply because you cannot prove a negative.

1141. There is no evidence to prove that?—No, of course not.

1142. In answer to Question 688, you say that Professor Ferguson was of that opinion?—I am not quite sure that that was reported correctly; I have not been able to refer to the papers at present to see whether that is repeated correctly; I am not quite sure whether he simply said that that opinion was held; that is my opinion, but I said that Professor Ferguson informed me that it was held in Ireland; not that he held it himself.

1143. In page viii of your Report of 1871 it is stated that the foot and mouth disease existed in this country in 1839, and that in 1840 and 1841 it was more severe than it has ever been since, although at that time a prohibition against the import of foreign cattle existed; in 1842 and 1843, and the early part of 1844, after the prohibition was removed, it decreased; in after years it varied, sometimes decreasing when the importation was largest, and, of course, vice versa; I want to know would not these facts tend to prove that the origin and spread of the disease cannot be altogether due to contagion; that it may be capable of spontaneous origin, and that its origin and development may be due to atmospheric and climatic influences; I think these are the very words used in one of the Professor's Reports?—I am decidedly of opinion at present that it could not be, and that it is not spread by anything but contagion.

1144. Surely it must have originated at some time or other?—So did small-pox, and other diseases which we do not find originate spontaneously at the present day; the same remark applies to all that class of diseases.

1145. Is it not found that at certain periods of the year both pleuro-pneumonia and the foot and mouth disease are more severe and more prevalent than in others?—Yes.

1146. And would not that be due to climatic influences?—It would be due to movement; I should say, to additional communication between animals.

1147. From the statement set out at page 17 in the Appendix of the Report of 1872, it appears that after stating the various causes of foot rot and oozema in sheep, it states the fact that oozema in the foot of a sheep will by inoculation produce foot and mouth disease, which is sufficient evidence of the identity of the two forms of disease?—I believe that statement to be right as regards oozema, which is foot and mouth disease, so far as I can judge.

1148. In that case, if sheep are driven any long distance on hot roads and their feet get sore, so that oozema is produced, cattle put into the field where

where they have been grazing would probably take the foot and mouth distemper, would they not?—I should prefer that Professor Brown should answer those questions; they are strictly medical; I am scarcely capable of judging of all the circumstances.

1148. Is it not the case that dogs, hares, and rabbits, wood-pigeons, and crows, are all by competent observers stated to be liable to the disease?—I think so.

1149. If such things are facts, how would it be possible by any amount of isolation entirely to check its spread?—To keep it within moderate bounds, I think, is all you could do, that is to say, it should not exist as a general epidemic at any period.

1150. Still, you could not say that however strictly these rules were carried out you could guarantee entire freedom from the disease?—Very nearly so; the experience at the time of the cattle plague would prove that the disease was very nearly eradicated; there were no doubt a few isolated centres of disease.

1151. But I imagine that the cattle plague is hardly a fair analogy; the disease could not have been conveyed by these small animals?—No, but I am speaking of the foot and mouth disease having been checked on account of the cattle plague regulations.

1152. Does the foot and mouth disease render the flesh of the animals infected with it unfit for human food?—I should say not, although that question does not come under my department.

1153. Mr. Monell.] With regard to the effect upon this country of the Irish import, I think you stated that, so far as pleuro-pneumonia goes, you had very little evidence of any cases of that disease coming over to this country from Ireland?—Very little absolute evidence, but a great number of assertions to that effect.

1154. I wish to hear from you, if you will be kind enough, how far, from the evidence you have before you and the reports that come before you, you are in a position to give a decided opinion as to whether pleuro-pneumonia to any extent has been imported from Ireland?—Yes, I have a decided opinion, after consultation with the medical officers of the Department, and I have no doubt that it is frequently introduced from Ireland, but Professor Brown will be better able to speak to that than I am.

1155. As to the statistics?—Not as to the statistics, but as to his personal experience in all parts of the country.

1156. With reference to the foot and mouth disease, you say lately that it has been imported from all parts of Ireland?—Yes, we have evidence of that.

1157. But you say that you have utterly failed in carrying out the regulations for preventing its spreading in this country, on account of the local authorities not wishing to carry out for the prevention of that disease any stringent regulations?—Yes, I may say so.

1158. Would you be able to give a return of all animals exported from Ireland officially reported as being diseased on their debarkation in Great Britain for the last year or two, and do such returns set forth the nature of the disease?—We have no information whatever upon the subject; we take no cognisance, statistically, of animals from Ireland landed here.

1159. It would be set out, would it not, by your inspectors?—They do not examine Irish

cattle; they occasionally see the vessels, but there is no regular inspection and examination in this country, so that we have no information as to the disease except in cases where special examinations have been made. In Bristol, for instance, I have heard of a good many Irish animals which arrived there diseased, but the information is not worth anything, as the number reported upon is so small compared with the import.

1160. Have you any accurate statistics as to the number of outbreaks of disease, either of pleuro-pneumonia or of foot and mouth disease in this country?—You will find the statistics of the foot and mouth disease for 1871, and of all the others for each year in the Reports.

1161. In Ireland I think we shall be able to state accurately every single case which has taken place in the country during the last year, but I want to know whether you can give the Committee some information upon Great Britain?—I think so, except with regard to the foot and mouth disease during last year; we stopped the returns at the commencement of last year.

1162. The tendency of your evidence has been to this effect, that it would be impossible to carry out a system for the repression of disease thoroughly unless the central authorities have considerably more power than they have; in fact, you are for centralisation rather than for local government in that particular?—For centralisation so far as seeing that the regulations are carried out.

1163. That is to say, that the local authorities, the persons whose duty it was to carry out these repressive measures, should be responsible to the central authority and not to the local authority?—I do not exactly take that view.

1164. Perhaps you will kindly explain your view to the Committee?—I can scarcely define exactly how it should be done; I have not entered into it so far as that. I believe the local authorities cannot be left entirely to themselves for carrying out these regulations; that is proved, I think, by our past experience; and I therefore say, in the first place, that the inspectors should be independent of local circumstances, and that they should be responsible to the central department; but how that is to be done is more a political than a departmental question.

1165. Are you aware that the Irish system is very much more centralised than the English?—Yes.

1166. Therefore your desire would be rather to assimilate the English system to the Irish, than the Irish system to the English?—If the Irish system be well carried out; but I am not aware that that is the case.

1167. It would assist the deliberations of the Committee very much if we could get accurate information upon that subject?—With regard to the Irish imports into Bristol, the Committee could get the information from the local inspectors there if it was wanted. I doubt whether such information would be accurate; it is so very difficult to get accurate information.

1168. Do you agree with me that the important information to get would be with regard to pleuro-pneumonia, because I have found that it is almost impossible to deal with the foot and mouth diseases in England, as cattle are constantly moving about from one place to another. It is not of very great importance to discover how much of that comes from Ireland; but with re-

Mr.
Alexander
Williams.
20 March
1873.

Mr.
Alexander
Williams.
—
20 March
1873.

guard to pleuro-pneumonia it is a matter of very great importance, and if you could point out any way of arriving at anything like accurate information upon that subject, it would be very useful?—It is exceedingly difficult to follow a case through, and get evidence that the disease could not have been caught in this country in any particular case.

1169. Lord Robert Montagu.] I think you allow free import from Schleswig Holstein into England?—Not at present; it was only allowed for a very short time.

1170. Are the cattle imported thence now killed at the port of landing?—Yes, they are killed at the port of landing.

1171. From what port in Schleswig Holstein are they exported?—Tønning and Husum. Geestmünde is not within Schleswig or Holstein; it is a considerable distance on the other side of the Elbe, in Hanover.

1172. The German cattle, and all the other cattle from the east, come to Geestmünde, do they not?—I am not very well up in that matter. Professor Simonds will give you that information; we merely treat the cattle as coming from the country in which the port is from which they are embarked, so that really I have nothing to do with the cattle before they get to the port.

1173. Therefore, whether the cattle came from Bohemia or Galicia, or the Russian Steppes, you would still put them down in your report as coming from Geestmünde?—Yes; that is the way the Customs keep their reports.

1174. You stated, I think, on the first day of your examination, that the cattle plague was not indigenous in Galicia?—I think it is not indigenous there.

1175. There is a particular type of cattle plague which is indigenous to Galicia, is there not?—Professor Simonds will be very much better able to answer that question, as he has been in Galicia.

1176. Do you remember the case of an outbreak of cattle plague in May 1867, caused by some animals which Gebhardt imported from Galicia?—I have some slight recollection of it, but I do not remember the exact circumstances.

1177. I think that Professor Simonds pronounced it to be a new outbreak of cattle plague from the difference of the type; is not that so?—I think that is so.

1178. You stated your belief that in future Germany would import Russian cattle, and that we should get German cattle?—Yes, or rather that if we get German cattle, Germany will be obliged to get cattle from somewhere else, and probably they will get them from Russia.

1179. Upon what do you found that opinion; why do you not say that we should have to go to Russia for our cattle, seeing that Germany produces only as much, or very nearly as much, as it requires itself?—I found that statement upon information received at Vienna, and from statistics I have received, and from the impression which I received from the discussions at the Congress. I think that eventually arrangements would be made with Russia by which an import can be secured into Germany, and then we can make arrangements with Germany.

1180. But what makes you think that the Austrian farmers would buy their cattle in Russia, and then sell us their cattle, rather than that importers, such as Messrs. Gebhardt & Robinson and others, should go direct to Russia?—I wish

rather than think that we should get them in that way; I prefer an indirect to a direct import from Russia.

1181. Do you not think it more likely that those cattle which the Germans require will be killed upon the spot without moving the cattle required for their food, and so deteriorating them?—I do not think so; the cattle of Western Germany, such as those of Schleswig and Holstein, are not wanted there, and they would have to be sent into Central Germany if Germany requires them for consumption, but ours is a better market for those cattle, and therefore we get them. I may also mention that the general movement of cattle in Europe is from east to west.

1182. Do the eastern portions of Germany produce more cattle than they require for their own consumption?—They say they do; but I doubt it.

1183. Then they would be likely to kill the cattle they require, and not send them over to us?—The prices in different parts of Germany differ; I think you would find that Eastern Germany would get a better market by sending them to the interior and large towns, and selling them there, and then getting a fresh import over the frontier.

1184. You think the German cattle are a better description of cattle, and fetch a better price, than the Russian cattle?—Yes.

1185. Then the Germans will be content with eating bad beef and not good beef?—Yes, towards the Russian frontier.

1186. They prefer selling their own cattle and buying the Russian cattle to eat, taking the difference in cash?—Yes; I should think so, except in the large towns.

1187. Then if, as I believe, the cattle plague is indigenous in Russia, would not that tend to bring the cattle plague from Russia into Germany?—Not if the regulations proposed at that Congress were carried out; it is only under those circumstances that the disease could be stopped.

1188. By regulation, inspection, and certificate?—Yes, by very stringent regulations.

1189. I believe that in May 1867 the regulations in Prussia were those very regulations; namely, stringent inspection and a certificate?—Those regulations were not carried out.

1190. Those very cattle which introduced the cattle plague from Galicia had been inspected by foreign inspectors, and the certificates were produced before the Committee of 1868 by Mr. Gebhardt himself?—That was so.

1191. By which we learnt that the certificates of the foreign inspection could not be trusted to in the least?—No, nor could it be, without the additional safeguards which were proposed at Vienna.

1192. What additional safety would there be then?—Because Russia would be stopped in her cattle trade entirely unless she does give this guarantee.

1193. Who insists upon that?—The Germans do, and the Austrians are now about to do so, I believe.

1194. You stated that the Germans have enough for their own consumption; then why should they wish to import?—I should think the trade was worth a good deal to the country; that is, the transit trade.

1195. From the amount received for the freight of cattle?—And the amount received by the individuals who deal in it.

1196. The profit out of the price of cattle?—Yes.

1197. Do

1197. Do you think that would be sufficient inducement to the country to keep up the trade?—Yes; I may say that Russians, as represented at the Congress, were extremely anxious to keep up the trade.

1198. I am talking of the Germans; would not the Germans, rather than impose all those restrictions for the sake of one country, namely, England, kill their own cattle, and keep the Russian cattle out?—I think they seem very anxious to meet our views upon this matter, and from correspondence with Austria and Hungary they seem to be so too.

1199. With regard to the slaughter of all foreign cattle at the ports of landing; do you object to that; do you think it would be a bad measure to slaughter all cattle at the ports of landing?—I think so; I think instead of being a safeguard it would be more likely to bring disease into the country.

1200. Why so?—Because we should get an increased proportional number of cases of disease, and I should think you could scarcely keep up the present regulations under those circumstances, that is to say, detention for 12 hours or more. Therefore, the diseased animals would be slaughtered without discovering the disease, and anybody might carry disease with him from the market all over the country.

1201. Do you mean that you would have to abolish the restrictions with regard to disinfecting persons who come into the places where foreign cattle are slaughtered?—I do not think that has been put into practice much, I mean the restriction as to detention before slaughter. I think it would be difficult to keep up that restriction. If every animal were slaughtered, the disease would get into the slaughter-house without being detected.

1202. Would not an inspection of meat, and the destruction of all unwholesome meat, be sufficient to prevent the importation of any animals that were diseased?—I think not, but Professor Brown and Professor Simonds will give a better opinion about that than I can.

1203. If you do not slaughter the animal at the port of landing, supposing that a cargo were to come over, and there were two or three diseased beasts in that cargo, they would communicate the infection to the other animals, and the captain, in order to prevent the inconvenience which would ensue, might pitch the two or three diseased ones overboard, and sell the rest?—Yes.

1204. And as the disease is three weeks or so incubating, they might get into the country before it is discovered?—We have a careful inquiry made as to any animal disappearing in any way between the embarkation and landing; the ships manifest is carefully compared with the cargo upon landing, and if there is reason to believe that there has been disease on board, the cattle are detained sufficiently long to detect it.

1205. Do you think that is sufficient?—It might be improved, but it has been successful hitherto; I have no reason to believe that disease has got in in that way without detection.

1206. Do you think that under the present restrictions it is possible for foreign cattle to import disease into this country?—It is quite possible, but not at all probable.

1207. Why not probable, if it is possible?—The chances are so very small; it must be by indirect communication as a rule; I think there is no other way.

0.58.

1208. Do you think it is quite impossible that an animal that has the contagion of cattle plague in its blood, though it is not apparent, should get into the country?—Upon the whole, assuming that we know where disease exists, considering the length of the voyage and all the circumstances, I think it is very improbable that it would not be detected.

1209. I believe the trade in foreign cattle, and the trade in English cattle, are two quite separate trades?—I am not cognizant of that.

1210. The foreign cattle go entirely to the carcass butcher, I believe?—I think that matter is scarcely understood thoroughly. I have not been able to understand it.

1211. Was not that the evidence before the Committee in 1868?—I believe it was.

1212. Mr. Rudkin was asked, "What percentage of home cattle is killed by foreign butchers?" and his answer was, "Very small." Then he was asked, "And how much of foreign cattle?" To which he replied, "A very large proportion." And then Mr. Woodley, a very large carcass butcher, says, "The foreign meat goes principally to the wholesale trade, and the carcass parts go chiefly to the poor populous districts?"—Yes, I believe so.

1213. Do you think it would make any difference to the price of the meat if the dead meat was imported instead of the live animals, or if the live animals were killed at the port of landing; do you think the price of meat would be raised?—I should think it would have a tendency to reduce the price if that could be done.

1214. I think you showed in your tables here that during the severe restrictions of the cattle plague the price of meat did not vary, or varied only imperceptibly; is not that the case?—Yes, I think so.

1215. But before the cattle plague came, I believe the amount of losses in British cattle were greater than the amount of imports from abroad?—It has been so stated, but I have no evidence whatever of it.

1216. There is the estimate of Professor Simonds and Professor Brown, of the Veterinary Department, and they state that the probable number of cattle lost from July 1842 to December 1867, from contagious diseases other than cattle plague, were 1,375,000; and from the cattle plague, 500,000; making a total of 1,875,000 beasts which died from imported disease; and that the total importation into the United Kingdom during that period was 2,590,395?—That is correct.

1217. Could you verify those figures, and state on the next occasion of your being present whether they are correct?—Professor Brown will be examined himself, and he can speak to that.

1218. There are some other things I wish to ask about. In the Report to the Veterinary Department in 1862, it is stated that the actual number imported during the previous six years was 553,048 head; and the total loss from disease other than cattle plague, during those years, was 2,555,100, or four times the number imported. The value of the cattle imported during those six years was 4,424,264*l.*, and the value of those losses was 25,933,650*l.* That is before the cattle plague. The total number of cattle imported from the year 1842 to 1867 into the United Kingdom was 2,590,395; so that in two years we lost more than one-eighth of the total importation from the year 1842 to 1867. Will you endeavour to verify these

r 4

Mr.
Alexander
Williams.
—
30 March
1873.

Mr.
Alexander
Williams.
—
30 March
1872

these figures?—Those figures are not from any Report of the Veterinary Department, but appear to be taken from a Report of Professor Gamgee to the medical officer of the Privy Council; I cannot accept them as being correct.

1210. You state at page 88 of Appendix to your Report of 1872 that the estimated consumption per head of the population in a year of each class of meat per head of the population is as follows: of British production 52 lbs., and of Irish 16 lbs., and taken together they amount to 68 lbs.; of foreign meat 10 lbs.; but that 10 lbs. of foreign meat has to be thus divided: 5·5 lbs. imported in a live state, and 4·5 lbs. in a dead state?—I do not see the latter statement; the proportion is stated to be 7·096 per cent. of live animals, and 5·708 per cent. of foreign dead meat; I have not calculated it for pounds.

1230. If that be so, out of 78 lbs. consumed per head, only 5·5 lbs. would be due to foreign meat imported in a live state?—If the calculation is correct, that would be so.

1221. Does that include pork?—Yes, all meats, and deducting the exports.

1222. The question that I was coming to was this; do you think that for such a very small supply of foreign meat imported in a live state, it is worth while to risk such great losses in British cattle, which is of such a much better quality?—Not if you do risk it, but I do not think you do under the present regulations.

1223. It is merely a question whether there is any risk at present or not?—Whether there is any amount of risk worth considering, and it must be recollected that the import bears an increasing proportion to the total quantity; I have calculated the same items for 1869 and 1861; I find that the proportion of foreign meat consumed is an increasing one; the per-centage for 1861 being 3·692 of foreign live meat and 4·648 of foreign dead meat.

1224. Are you referring to foreign dead meat?—Foreign live meat.

1225. And that increases in proportion to the amount of foreign dead meat from abroad?—Yes.

1226. Do you think if we had to fetch our cattle from a greater distance, namely, from Russia, that the increased cost in consequence of the greater distance would tend to make the foreign supply even less than it is now in proportion to the home supply?—I think not, because our price is a gradually increasing one.

1227. If you say it is such a very small proportion, you might say it was not worth while to allow foreign animals to come into the country alive?—I fear we can scarcely do without them.

1228. With regard to the question of my right honourable friend beside me, as to making the central authority responsible instead of the local authority; I would ask, do you think that the local authorities in towns and ports have the same interest as the country population?—Certainly not.

1229. So that they might be likely to do things which the country population might object to?—Quite so.

1230. Therefore, you think it is necessary to put it into the hands of some central authority?—Certainly.

1231. Sir H. Scherren-Fibben.] I understood you to say just now, that you objected to the slaughter of foreign cattle at the ports of landing as likely to increase rather than diminish our risk of disease?—At present.

1232. I understood you to say, in answer to question put to you before, that the protection we derive from disease from foreign countries by the establishment of a market, such as Deptford market, where foreign cattle, when imported, are slaughtered, was greater than without it; then I asked you, that being the case, do you believe we are protected in any way from the importation of disease from foreign countries by the establishment of a market where foreign cattle, when imported, are slaughtered; and the answer is, "I think so, under the present regulations?"—That is the saving clause. I do not think we could keep up the present regulations if every animal was slaughtered.

1233. I asked you if you thought that could be extended to other ports, and your answer was, "I think it could and ought to be;" and that rather is in favour of slaughtering the cattle at the ports of landing?—Not all the cattle; I say "under the present regulations;" that only applies to scheduled countries.

1234. Mr. (Cory.) I understood you to say, on the first day of your examination, that your department considers that it has some special cause of complaint against the local authorities at Hull?—Yes, I think so.

1235. You were asked, "Is it not the case that the department has considered that it had great ground of complaint, as regards the port of Hull; particularly the port of Hull?" May I ask with whom you have been generally in correspondence; whom do you look upon as the organ of the local authorities?—The clerk to the local authority; the town clerk of Hull, I believe.

1236. You are aware that there is a sub-committee of the Corporation, called the Contagious Diseases Committee; but the town clerk, no doubt, would be for that, as well as for all other committees, the official organ; will you be good enough to specify a case; the cause of complaint, as I understand, was that suggestions or orders from your department had not been carried out?—I am not prepared to go fully into the matter, as I am not at all acquainted with the local circumstances; but Professor Brown, who will be examined shortly, would be able to go into the whole particulars; he knows the circumstances, and he has reported upon all the matters. I think it would facilitate matters, if he were examined instead of me on this point.

1237. There is one point upon which you can give some information to the Committee; I believe there has been a very lengthy correspondence between your department and what we will call the town clerk as to the defined area of Hull; are you aware that the area has been altered as many as three or four times?—Three or four times, I believe.

1238. Were all those alterations in the sense of a reduction of the area?—I really cannot speak to that; it was upon Professor Brown's recommendation that it was done, and the matter has become so complicated that I cannot understand it, not knowing the place sufficiently. When this matter was submitted to the Lords of the Council lately, Professor Brown attended the Committee upon that account; it is impossible to understand it properly without knowing the locality.

1239. The great difficulty would be examining Professor Brown in reference to answers made by yourself?—I can furnish you with anything connected with that.

1240. The

1240. The first question I ask you is, whether you can give me any specific case in which the orders of your department have been neglected or disobeyed by the local authority?—I could get that.

1241. It is better that I should postpone this examination until Professor Brown is here; what power has a local department of compelling compliance with any regulation of yours?—I refer to one particular instance in which the local authority could, I think, compel compliance, namely, the keeping of the defined part, which is left entirely to them. The local authority of Hull undertook to do it, and they either failed or did not do it on one or two occasions, for the animals escaped, but the particulars I can scarcely go into.

1242. You cannot specify any occasion upon which they failed to do it?—Professor Brown will be able to do that.

1243. And a deputation from Hull, I think, saw you, and I think they also afterwards saw Lord Ripon and yourself upon the question?—Yes, with Professor Brown.

1244. It having been suggested that there should be altogether a new area, do you recollect any of the circumstances as to what the new area was to be?—By referring to my papers I could find it, but I cannot recollect.

1245. Would your recollection serve you if I reminded you what the suggestions of your department were; it was proposed, I believe, to have altogether a new area taken on what was called the garrison ground, and that would have involved the making of a new pier, and that was discussed at the meeting with the deputation, and it was stated, that to begin with, it would render entirely valueless an outlay of about 9,000 £ incurred by the Corporation in making lairs, and that it would entirely destroy the value of 24 slaughterhouses included in the defined area, and which were valued at from 12,000 £ to 15,000 £?—I have a recollection of some of the circumstances.

1246. And besides that, the new expenditure upon erecting all those things in another part, slaughterhouses and lairs, &c., made upon what was called the old garrison ground, would be an expense of from 50,000 £ to 60,000 £, and that the new pier for which it would be necessary to get a private Act, would be most strongly objected to, and probably not permitted owing to its interfering with the navigation of the river; under all those circumstances, if I am rightly informed, it was agreed at that interview with the deputation that the scheme proposed by you was really impracticable owing to the expense, and possibly to the impossibility of being able to carry it out; does your recollection enable you to say that that is a tolerably accurate representation of what took place?—I think so.

1247. *Chairman.* Of what was stated by the authorities?—Yes.

1248. *Mr. Clay.* And admitted by those who heard it?—I have a perfect recollection that the Lords of the Council did not insist upon the proposed new arrangements being carried out; that part of the question was so decided by their Lordships.

1249. Under the circumstances they did not insist upon that, and they consented to an alteration of the then existing area, which was very large, upon the local authorities coming under certain engagements?—I recollect that.

1250. The principal engagement was as to the

watching of the defined area, and the words of the engagement under which they came in this respect were, that, to enforce the regulations, there would be, day and night, seven policemen within the defined area, with six others on boats immediately adjoining, who would have special instructions to see that the orders were strictly enforced; that no cattle should be allowed to leave the defined place, and those officers will be visited from time to time by the magistrates and inspectors on duty. In addition to this, a sergeant in uniform and a policeman in plain clothes will be told off specially to superintend and watch the removal of cattle within the defined part. It is too much to ask you, perhaps, whether that was considered a sufficiently stringent engagement by the Privy Council?—I presume so.

1251. Have you any reason whatever, complaints, letters, or anything else, which leads you to suppose that that arrangement has not been honestly and strictly carried out?—I think so.

1252. You think that you have?—Yes, I think so.

1253. Will Professor Brown, when I have the pleasure of examining him, be able to give me some special instances?—I should imagine so.

1254. And also, I should be glad to know if there is any instance, known or reported, of an infringement of those orders where the offender has not been prosecuted?—That is information which can only exist locally, I think.

1255. You do not know how many have been prosecuted and convicted?—I do not know.

1256. Are you well acquainted with the circumstances of the "Joseph Soames"?—Yes, generally I am acquainted with them.

1257. When did you first hear of the diseased cattle on board the "Joseph Soames"?—It is impossible to say exactly without referring to the papers.

1258. From whom did you hear it?—I am not quite sure, but as far as I recollect, I think that the "Joseph Soames" was a vessel of which we received information from Russia that it was coming, and I think we told our inspectors to be on the look-out for it.

1259. Then, in that case, the immediate information to you would come from your inspector?—Yes.

1260. Do you know what the inspector did, immediately?—I suppose he went on board; I really cannot tell you exactly what he did.

1261. What was the legal and proper course under that order?—The ordinary course for him to pursue would be to allow the cattle to be landed, and then to take charge of them.

1262. But would not the first duty be with the collector of customs to prevent the landing of the cattle?—They were instructed to do so.

1263. There is an order that prescribes what shall be done; it is the collector's duty to prevent the cattle from landing, and the inspector's duty does not begin until the cattle are landed; is not that so?—Yes.

1264. The duty of the collector of customs is to prevent the landing, and in the case of disease, to destroy the animals?—I do not think that is so; I recollect that he has the power, but I do not think there is any order requiring him to do it.

1265. It is paragraph 19, "Where it appears to the principal officer of Her Majesty's Customs at a port, with respect to any foreign animal (including a horse or other animal not within the definition

Mr.
Alexander
Williams.
30 March
1873.

Mr.
Alexander
Williams,
—
26 March
1873.

definition of animals in the Act of 1869, or any hay, straw, fodder, or other article, brought by sea to the port, that contagion or infection may be thereby conveyed to animals; he may seize and detain the same?—It says "he may," not "he shall."

1266. And he shall forthwith report the facts to the Commissioners of Her Majesty's Customs, who may give such directions as they think fit, either for the slaughter or destruction, or the further detention thereof, or for the restoration thereof to the owner on such conditions, if any (including payment by the owner of expenses incurred by them in respect of detention thereof) as they think fit; that means, surely, that the first step should have been for the collector of Customs to have detained them?—No; not when the Inspector of the Department was there; he would naturally consult him.

1267. Your Inspector went on board and took the matter into his own hands; was there any official communication made to the local authorities as to the case of the "Joseph Soumes"?—I presume so.

1268. You cannot say that there was?—I could not say positively.

1269. Professor Brown, probably, would be able to tell us that better?—Yes, I think so; Professor Brown was there at the time, I believe, or shortly afterwards.

1270. Of course you are aware that there is a difference of opinion upon this particular matter of the "Joseph Soumes"; whether, whatever responsibility attaches to those who acted, that responsibility is with your Department or with the local authorities?—I believe the question has been mooted; one of the duties of our Inspector at the port would be to report to the Inspector of the local authority.

1271. But you could not say that that was done?—I could not say so.

1272. I think a charge has been made against your department, of about 1,200*l.*, for these cattle?—I do not recollect that; there has been a petition, or memorial, or something of that sort, but no charge.

1273. And that was passed on from your department, as I am informed, to the local authorities?—Most probably it would be so.

1274. Have you any recollection of their answering to the effect that they had nothing to do with it; that the whole thing was done by your officers, and that they were not responsible?—Yes, I recollect that.

1275. I think I am possibly only taking up the time of the Committee by further examining you; and Professor Brown, when I examine him, no doubt will be able to give the Committee all the information connected with that matter?—He will be able to give you all the information.

1276. Mr. Dent, I wish to ask a few questions about a disease upon which there have been no questions put, that is glanders; I see in the Reports of 1871 and 1872, that attacks of glanders in this country have considerably increased during the last year, have they not?—It is so.

1277. In 1872 there were 303 cases of animals attacked in 254 different places?—Yes, in England.

1278. And in 1871 there were 169 attacks in 146 places?—Yes, in England.

1279. And most of those attacks are in the Metropolis, or rather a large proportion of them; in the Metropolis, in 1872, there were 184 attacks

in 187 places; in the Metropolis, in 1871, there were 92 attacks in 78 places; in your opinion are the present restrictions with regard to glanders sufficient; Professor Brown appears to think that they are not sufficient to control it; if you refer to page 25 you will find that?—They certainly might be improved, I should say.

1280. It is supposed that animals so affected are largely kept for night-work in omnibuses and cabs in London, and used when they are in a diseased state, and quite capable of infecting any horses with which they may come in contact during the night; for instance, if a glandered horse be used, and he drinks at any watering-place, or rubs against another vehicle, there is considerable risk of infection, is there not?—Yes.

1281. Therefore there should be some more stringent regulations with regard to the supervision and suppression of those animals?—Yes, the same as I propose for all diseases; by suppression of movement.

1282. But you understand that a horse suffering from glanders is a much more serious thing than cattle suffering with the foot and mouth disease?—Yes, that is so.

1283. And more serious measures ought to be adopted with regard to a horse suffering from glanders than in the case of an animal suffering from the foot and mouth disease?—Yes, that is so with regard to the seriousness of the disease.

1284. Is it your opinion that a horse suffering from glanders ought at once to be slaughtered?—I think so.

1285. Do you think that the great increase of the disease has arisen from the importation of French and Belgian horses, for the use of the cabs and omnibuses in the Metropolis?—I have had no information to that effect.

1286. With regard to Hull, has your department ever made any suggestion to the authorities at Hull to remove the cattle market for English animals from the defined part of the port?—I cannot recollect that, but I can easily get that information.

1287. Mr. Barclay, are you aware of any case of glanders having been communicated from animals to human beings?—I have no personal knowledge to that effect, but I believe it is the case.

1288. At page v, I believe, there is a mistake with regard to the compensation; you say it is "one-half the value of the animal immediately before being slaughtered"; should it not be "attacked"? There is a very considerable difference between "immediately before being slaughtered" and "immediately before being attacked"?—Certainly. I suppose it is an error in copying; I was not aware of it.

1289. You state at page xxiv of your Report that the loss by foot and mouth disease is on the average 2*l.* per head of the average of animals attacked?—I made such an estimate as regards cattle, I believe. I have taken a number of English and foreign statements, and put them together; I think that is a very fair average of the whole of them. I am not aware whether they are correct or not.

1290. Do you think 2*l.* per head is a fair estimate of the loss per head to the animals attacked?—Yes, of the cattle attacked.

1291. That would be about one-seventh part of the value of the animal?—I think that the value of the animal would be a little higher than that; I merely speak of cattle in this calculation.

1292. And

Mr.
Alexander
Williams.
—
30 March
1873.

1292. And calves?—Yes; cattle including calves.

1293. Then as the number of cattle in Great Britain amounts to over five millions, this would be a total loss of over one million sterling?—I have not calculated it, and therefore I cannot speak to it.

1294. That would be about one million sterling of loss by foot and mouth disease, upon the assumption of the accuracy of the Table upon page 67, in which it is reported that very nearly 10 per cent. of the animals in Great Britain were attacked with foot and mouth disease?—Yes.

1295. In page 44 I see there is remaining a considerable number of animals, suffering from pleuro-pneumonia, which have not been killed; is that in consequence of the local authorities not having carried out the order of the Council?—There is no order for slaughter in the case of an animal suffering from pleuro-pneumonia.

1296. It is not compulsory to slaughter in that case?—It is not compulsory to slaughter in that case.

1297. On page xxvii of the Report, you speak of the various proportions of dead meat imported; in the calculations there, you take into account bacon and hams, and pork?—Yes, I do.

1298. The dead meat does not affect our present inquiry, does it?—I think not, except as to the possibility of getting the whole of our foreign supply as dead meat.

1299. Referring to page 86, it does not appear from the Table that there has been any material increase in the import of dead meat under the head of "beef, salted or fresh"?—It does not appear so.

1300. For instance, in 1860 there was a greater import of beef than in 1872?—Yes.

1301. Under the head of "beef" do you include "mutton"?—No; I should imagine not. These figures are taken from the Board of Trade statistics, in which, I presume, they did not include mutton.

1302. You give a certain quantity of "bacon and hams," and "meat not otherwise described"; you do not mention mutton?—I presume that would come under meat "preserved otherwise than by salting."

1303. Then the large increase of dead meat has been, according to this Table, almost exclusively of late years in bacon and hams?—Yes; it varies, but that appears to be the case; but there is also a considerable increase in meat preserved otherwise than by salting.

1304. The increase of the total of dead meat in 1872, as compared with 1871, was about one million hundredweights?—Yes; that is two million odd against one million odd.

1305. About 1,900,000 cwts. against 2,800,000 cwts.; and the increase in bacon and hams amounts to 800,000 cwts. of that?—Yes, it does.

1306. The beef includes mutton, I presume?—No; I think it is included in "meat not otherwise described."

1307. That is principally beef and mutton imported from Australia, preserved, during the last two years?—Yes. I have not gone into the Table myself.

1308. The increase of dead meat, exclusive of bacon and hams, is almost exclusively of preserved meat from Australia; it is shown upon the second column from the last, that whereas the quantity in 1869 of preserved meat amounted to 36,000 cwts., it amounted in 1872 to 352,000 cwts.?—Yes; that is correct.

0.58.

1309. Your total other quantity of beef, either salt or fresh, is only 226,000 cwts.?—I assume that is so.

1310. So that we got in 1871 from Australia, in preserved meat, as much as we are getting from all other quarters, excluding always pork, bacon, and ham?—It appears so.

1311. Upon page 88 you have given certain proportions of the foreign supply to the home produce?—Yes.

1312. You include therein the dead meat?—Yes.

1313. That is not of importance in this present inquiry, I believe?—Except as regards the possibility of getting all our foreign animals in the state of meat.

1314. There is no risk of disease being brought by the dead meat, is there?—There is a very limited risk.

1315. If you were to make up an estimate of the real proportion which the live foreign cattle supply bears to the home cattle supply, it would be very materially different from what you give upon that page?—It is given at page xxv of the Report.

1316. I should like to have a statement for cattle alone, and for cattle and sheep?—I can give it you in any form that you wish.

1317. Mr. Ridley.] Is your department in official communication with the Irish Department of the Privy Council?—Yes.

1318. Could you say you might depend upon information being received by your department of any outbreak of pleuro-pneumonia in Ireland?—We could not; we never get it unless we ask for it.

1319. Do you get any information from the Irish Department?—When we ask for it we do.

1320. If you had any reason to suppose that there was an outbreak of pleuro-pneumonia in Ireland, and you asked for particulars you would get them, I presume?—Yes.

1321. But it would not be the practice upon the part of the Irish Department to supply you with any information?—Certainly not.

1322. Upon receiving that information, what would be the action of the Department in London with regard to sending inspectors to visit the ports?—There would be no action whatever.

1323. Then cattle so attacked might, as far as the English Department is concerned, be landed at any of our ports, and proceed to the interior without inspection?—Yes; but if the local authorities, whose duty it is to see to that inspection, carried out their duty, their inspectors would inspect the cattle.

1324. And I suppose, upon your receiving information of that, you would inform the local authorities of the ports at which the cattle would be likely to be landed?—I cannot assume that, because we have not received the information, but when we hear that any case has arrived at a port we should inform the local authority of it.

1325. You are aware that there is no inspection at any of the ports in Ireland?—I believe the Irish Department has lately appointed inspectors.

1326. Mr. Cullen.] Did not you state that there has been a very considerable import of cattle from Ireland with the foot and mouth disease, and that Bristol and Liverpool are the worst ports?—Yes.

1327. Are you aware of there having been any prosecution for moving about cattle so diseased?—I am aware that there has been.

1328. Where has that occurred?—At Bristol certainly.

a 2

1329. And

Mr.
Alexander
Williams.
20 March
1873.

1329. And at Liverpool?—I do not recollect as to Liverpool.

1330. Although that is one of the worst ports, according to your own evidence?—Yes, I believe so.

1331. Yet there has been no prosecution?—Not to my knowledge, but we rarely receive information as to prosecutions, which rest with the local authority.

1332. Are those ports also the worst in respect of the steamers plying between those ports and the Irish ports neglecting to carry out the orders regulating the disinfecting of steamers?—I do not think so as regards Bristol.

1333. Has Liverpool?—I could scarcely say with respect to Liverpool, but Professor Brown is well up upon all those points, and could give you the information.

1334. Has there been a single report to you that the disinfection of steamers has not been carried out?—To the best of my recollection there has, when I called for reports from the local inspectors, but I cannot recollect at the moment what they were.

1335. Will you furnish the particulars of that to the Committee?—I will, with pleasure, if it is called for.

1336. Mr. Leek.] You handed in to the Committee a Paper here; the first memorial which is here mentioned is from the County of Chester; it is mentioned that great losses have occurred in Cheshire from the foot and mouth disease during the last three years, and a number of gentlemen, evidently very respectable, say—“Your memorialists, therefore, urge that greater care be taken by inspectors in Ireland in the inspection of animals carried in railways and steam boats to this country.” Do you think there is any just and substantial reason for the complaints these gentlemen make?—Do you mean so far as regards that part of the memorial which relates to Ireland?

1337. I am referring to the memorial you handed to the Committee?—Taking the prayers of the memorial separately, I think with regard to losses in Cheshire, Professor Brown will be able to inform you much better than I could.

1338. You do not know whether any good and substantial reason exists for the complaint; it is signed by many respectable gentlemen?—I know that the foot and mouth disease has been imported from Ireland, and therefore there is a substantial reason for the complaint.

1339. Do you think there is any good and sufficient reason why the Chamber of Agriculture should make the same complaint?—It is said, in Resolution 3 of the Central Chamber of Agriculture, that unless Ireland be subject to safeguards against disease similar to those imposed upon this country, it would be necessary to impose restrictions upon the import of Irish stock. I think the restrictions upon Irish stock when they arrive in this country should be similar to those imposed upon English stock.

1340. The Report for 1871, page 7, with regard to the importation of beef, which you mentioned, is a very valuable report. It says, that “There is another means by which it is possible that the price of our beef may be kept down, and an increased supply obtained without, however, increasing our import of cattle, and this is by the larger importation of beef in a fresh, preserved, or salted state.” Now the progress of science is going on, do you think there is any hope held out that by any means we may have

a larger importation by preserving or salting, or other means?—There have been hopes held out month by month almost, but certainly I know of no successful process; and I think the Society of Arts have decided in the same way, that there is no process efficient at present.

1341. Do you think that beef from America would be as good as that of this country if it could be imported in any shape?—If you could get it imported alive.

1342. If we could get it imported in any shape, would it be as well fed as the beef in this country?—I should imagine so.

1343. Perhaps you are not aware that the Government or the Admiralty goes to the Metropolitan Meat Market and purchases with us for fresh beef for salting purposes; do you think that that is a desirable thing, seeing they could get as good beef in America salted?—I should not like to give an opinion upon that.

1344. I wanted to know if salted beef would not be as good if salted in America, as if salted in Deptford?—I should imagine so.

1345. Mr. Monell.] You were asked by the honourable Member for Northumberland, with regard to the safeguards against the importation of Irish cattle in case of disease; the local authority at Bristol has authority to visit and to inspect cattle coming in from Ireland, and ought to do so, ought it not?—It is a very expensive thing to do.

1346. It is his duty, is it not?—Under the general terms of the Act, the local authorities are required to carry out the regulations with regard to the prevention of disease.

1347. In the event of any special outbreak of disease in Ireland, the local authority at the ports at which Irish cattle were landed in England, would neglect his duty if he did not inspect them?—The duty is not absolutely thrown upon the local authorities by the Privy Council; it is merely a part of the general terms of the Act.

1348. They have the power to do so, have they not?—Yes; they have the power.

1349. Therefore, it would be a neglect, in carrying out that power, if they did not do so?—It would.

1350. Now with regard to a question asked you a minute or two ago; you were asked whether Ireland ought not to be subjected to safeguards against disease similar to those which may be adopted in this country; but I think I understood from the answers you gave to the questions that were put to you a few minutes ago, that it is your opinion that in Ireland the safeguards against disease are more efficient than they are in this country?—They have a more effective machinery for carrying them out, but whether they are carried out or not, I am unable to say.

1351. (Witness.) What you mean is, I suppose, that the Irish Government has more power of carrying out the orders of the Central Department than the English Government has?—I believe so.

1352. With regard to my right honourable friend's question as to the power of the local authority at Liverpool, the local authority at Liverpool or at any other port, is in the same position as the local authority in any place in England; it is their business to stop the disease, according to the provisions of the Act, when they find that such disease exists?—It is so.

1353. But it has no special duty or special obligation to inspect animals more than the local authority

authority of an inland town would have?—Just so.

1354. Representations have been made to the department by those local authorities, that it was unreasonable to expect them to make the same inspection of Irish animals as would be done by inspectors appointed by the Central Department of foreign animals?—Yes.

1355. Their ground being, I imagine, that they look after their own towns, and can hardly be expected to make the necessary inspection for the inland trade?—That may be the reason.

1356. The honorable Member for Forfeishire asked you a question with regard to the loss from foot and mouth disease; he assumed that it might be 2*l.* a head. That calculation, I suppose, is upon the supposition that the animal, if it had not had the foot and mouth disease, would have been in perfect health all the time?—Yes, and have laid on a certain amount of meat.

1357. And, therefore, to say that there would be a loss of 2*l.* would be similar to stating that the loss which a man incurred by illness was the loss of his power for the time of the illness, but upon the supposition that he would have had no other illness, and would have been free from any other attack during that time?—Yes.

1358. How long does an attack of the foot and mouth disease last?—That question I think had better be asked of Professor Brown.

1359. Some questions were asked you with regard to the work of the office, have you any remark to make with regard to any of your answers upon that subject?—I have gone through my answers since I received the proof, and I find they give a very faint and an almost incorrect idea of the actual work; I think it would be impossible for this Committee, by any amount of questioning, or statistics, or reports, to arrive at it; I think it could only be obtained by the Committee or somebody deputed by them going to the office to see the absolute work done. There is a large amount of work done which cannot be described in detail.

1360. You would consider it a very unfair estimate of the work to measure it simply by the number of letters that are written?—Very much so; as there are many thousands of letters and papers which are not returned in the paper handed in.

1361. It is the case that I am, or anyone in my position is, obliged to obtain accurate information as regard to all matters affecting the nature of the disease or such subjects, and to do so very quickly?—Yes.

1362. The Treasury found the same difficulty in ascertaining the work of the office, and they appointed three members to inquire into it?—Yes. And after that Committee had in 1859 inquired into it, the Treasury appointed Mr. Low to visit the department and again to inquire into the work; he did visit the department and

stayed a considerable time, and went into all the details in every room, and it was after this visit that the Treasury sanctioned the staff then employed, which has now been reduced by seven clerks.

1363. With regard to the pressure, you stated that the extra work which has arisen has been from different causes while I have been connected with the department, but the two cases in which it was most strongly felt were last year arising from the cattle plague, and this year in requiring to have extra work done in order to get out the Report in time for this Committee?—That is so; we could not commence the Report until the middle of January, because the materials were not in the office, and it was in the hands of the printer in the middle of February. With regard to the extra work, it has been very nearly a thousand hours since the first day in this year, and was performed by an average of eight clerks.

1364. In your answer to my question in regard to the foot and mouth disease, on the first day that you gave evidence, you stated that you thought that either much more ought to be done to effectually stop the disease or much less?—I did.

1365. And you stated if more should be done what were your suggestions with regard to each action?—I did generally.

1366. Supposing it was found impossible to take those steps and you thought that less should be done, would you go so far as to say that it should not be acknowledged as a disease at all?—I fancy that is the only way in which it could be met, and there would be a great objection to that in regard to foreign animals.

1367. I suppose I am right in interpreting your evidence to mean that such precautions against the spread of the foot and mouth disease are of little avail unless they are much increased, and in the direction which you suggest?—In that or is a somewhat similar direction.

1368. The honorable Member for Forfeishire asked you a question with regard to the table on page 88 in your Report, in which dead meat is included with live animals; I suppose I am right in thinking that the fact of dead meat and live animals being reckoned together in that table, does not, in any way, affect your calculation upon page xiv of your Report, with reference to the proportion of the home supply of cattle to the foreign supply of cattle?—That calculation shows the relative supply of live cattle including calves.

1369. Have you got the name of the local authorities who applied for regulations with regard to the foot and mouth disease?—I have.

1370. Will you hand in a Paper to that effect?—I have three Papers which relate to that matter—(The same were handed in, vide Appendix).

PROFESSOR GEORGE THOMAS BROWN, called in; and Examined.

1371. *Chairman.* You are a Professor in the Veterinary College, I believe?—I am.

1372. How long have you been an inspector appointed by the department?—I have been connected with the department since its first formation; I began with Professor Simonds on the occasion of the outbreak of the cattle plague in 1865.

1373. And you had been extensively engaged in

pursuit of your profession as a veterinary surgeon up to that time?—Yes, certainly up to that time.

1374. Now first with regard to the foot and mouth disease; how long do you consider that has been known upon the Continent?—I am quite certain that it has been known there for more than a century; it is referred to by one of our older writers in 1711 as a disease then prevalent in Germany.

G 5

Mr
Alexander
Williams,
— :
30 March
1875.

1375. As—

Professor
G. J. Brown,
—

Professor
G. T. Brown.
—
30 March
1873.

1375. As affecting cattle or affecting sheep?—The writer speaks of it as only affecting cattle.

1376. It first appeared in England, as far as you know, in 1839?—Yes, it first appeared in England in 1839.

1377. And it is a matter of dispute whether it was indigenous or introduced at the time?—The statement is to the effect that it was introduced from Holland, and it is matter of history that it was very prevalent in Holland in the same year.

1378. It first appeared at a fair near Norwich, did it not?—I believe it first appeared in the London dairies, but it shortly afterwards appeared at Norwich.

1379. At St. Faith's fair?—It was not until 1845 that it attacked animals at St. Faith's fair.

1380. Since then there have been various outbreaks of violence?—Up to the present outbreak we may reckon six.

1381. But during the whole of the time, I suppose, it has existed to some extent in the country?—I believe during the whole time, the country has never been absolutely free from it.

1382. When the disease first appeared, was it confined to cattle, or did it also appear among sheep?—I believe it very early appeared among sheep and pigs, and at one time I believe also among poultry.

1383. Was not there an outbreak at one time which was exceedingly violent?—The outbreak which occurred in 1802 was exceedingly violent, and led to considerable mortality among sheep at Harrow.

1384. I remember seeing a statement that the roads were strewn with the heads of pigs?—I have seen the heads fall from pigs when they lifted them into the carts, during the time of the old Smithfield Market, and it was not uncommon to see the heads of sheep fall off while they were standing there.

1385. Therefore it would be too much to suppose that the outbreak last year was very exceptional, either as regards extent or violence?—I am not prepared to say so.

1386. There was an outbreak in 1869, was not there?—That outbreak commenced in the winter of 1867.

1387. Which lasted to 1869?—Yes; and became much more severe in the spring of 1869.

1388. Then there was a cessation, and it broke out again last year?—It did so; but in saying that there was a cessation I do not wish to be understood to mean that it entirely ceased; there was always a large number of cases. In 1867, in the spring and summer, the disease almost ceased, and for nearly six months, in the hire of the Metropolitan Market, there was scarcely a case to be discovered.

1389. Have you any mode of explaining to your own satisfaction this variation in the disease; its getting so much better at one time, and then breaking out again?—I believe those periodical variations in the extent of the prevalence of disease are due to the operation of the laws which regulate infectious diseases generally, precisely as we see in relation to small-pox, which always exists, but which during certain seasons prevails extensively, but I believe that the occasional decline of the disease in some years is due to the movement of the cattle at certain seasons more than at others.

1390. It has been more violent this last outbreak, and generally is more violent with milch cows, is it not?—In this country among English

stock it is generally more violent with milch cows, but it is more fatal always among young animals.

1391. Do you consider that there has been more mortality in this last outbreak than in former times?—Yes, in some districts, especially among calves and pigs; but may I add that taking the entire loss, I do not think the mortality has been greater than has been observed in previous outbreaks.

1392. Does the disease cause much loss by abortion in breeding stock?—Yes, it does; especially among the higher class of shorthorns and well-bred animals generally.

1393. I suppose there is this similarity between this disease and the cattle plague, that it is more destructive to the higher-bred animals than it is to the others?—It is certainly more destructive; but the same remark applies to all diseases to which the lower animals are subject.

1394. Do you think it is more fatal to the higher-bred animals?—Certainly all diseases act more energetically upon the systems of higher-bred animals than they do upon those which are in a natural condition.

1395. When they catch a disease, do you think it is not only likely to be more fatal, but that they are likely to be more susceptible to it?—Speaking generally, I should think so; but, as regards the foot and mouth disease, there is very little difference in the degree of susceptibility, because, generally speaking, all animals exposed to the infection take the malady.

1396. The foot and mouth disease is exceedingly infectious, is it not?—Yes.

1397. There is great difference of opinion as to how far this last outbreak is due to foreign import; what is your opinion upon that subject?—My opinion is that it is not to any extent due to foreign import.

1398. Do you think that if we had had no foreign import at all since 1868, we should have had very much the same amount of foot and mouth disease?—In my own mind there is no doubt at all of it.

1399. Does the same remark apply to Irish imports?—No, because I have positive evidence of the frequent import of those animals infected with that disease from Ireland.

1400. When you say positive evidence of the introduction of that disease, to what ports do you refer?—Chiefly to the port of Bristol.

1401. In consequence of complaints which came to us from country districts near Bristol, we sent you down to examine into the disease near Bristol?—Twice at least each year during the recent prevalence of the disease, and on only one occasion did I go into Bristol Market without finding the foot and mouth disease among the Irish cattle.

1402. I suppose it is a very large market with a great number of animals?—They sometimes have 3,000 or 4,000 cattle on market-day.

1403. It is a market for store cattle almost as much as for fat cattle, is it not?—It is considerably more for store cattle than fat cattle.

1404. I believe you made representations to the Bristol authorities upon the subject?—I did so.

1405. And what was the result?—They were urged to make regulations for preventing not only the removal of the animals diseased, which they were bound to do by the Act, but those which had been herded with them, but they replied that they really had no convenience for the detention of those animals, and that it would be impossible to prevent their removal.

1406. When

1406. When you said you urged them to provide for the safe keeping of the animals which had been herded with those which were attacked, there is nothing which obliges them to do so?—No; but there is an Order of Council which gives the local authorities power to make those regulations.

1407. There is a general Order of Council which enables the local authorities to make such order if they think fit?—Yes.

1408. But it is left to the discretion of the local authorities whether they will make such an order or not?—Yes.

1409. And I suppose the Bristol local authorities have never made such an order?—They never have.

1410. In 1869, I think, we made it compulsory for a short time throughout the country that an order of that description should be enforced by each local authority?—Yes, I remember that.

1411. And in consequence of finding great difficulty in getting that order enforced, and the representations which were made by various local authorities, especially by the counties, we revoked that order, and made the present permissive order instead?—Yes, that was so.

1412. Are you aware whether the local authorities of the counties of Gloucester or Somerset have issued such an order?—The local authorities both in the cases of Somersetshire and Gloucestershire, issued such regulations almost immediately upon the passing of the order.

1413. That being the state of the case as regards the Irish import, and especially as regards the part of Bristol, what would be your suggestion, or have you any suggestion to make for the prevention of disease from that import?—I do not believe that anything could be done in Bristol in the way of detaining animals which were brought over with those affected with disease, because there is no space at all on the landing place.

1414. Do you know what amount of Irish animals are imported weekly?—There is an average of 2,000 or 3,000 weekly; the market is chiefly supplied from Ireland.

1415. Are you aware that it has been stated that the disease as some persons suppose is caught in the vessels, and was not existing in the animals before their leaving Ireland; do you think that that is the case?—That is possible in the event of the vessel having previously carried diseased animals, but in all the cases that I have investigated myself, the animals which I saw suffering from the disease, had been landed the previous evening, and in several instances the affection was in a state which it must have occupied two or three days to arrive at.

1416. What is the length of incubation of foot and mouth disease?—We have produced it in 36 hours; it is seldom prolonged beyond four days.

1417. If an animal arrived at Bristol with evident symptoms of foot and mouth disease, you would suppose that it must have caught the disease but a very short time before it left Ireland?—We should judge by the stage of the disease; it has well marked stages, and we could decide almost to a day when the infection took place.

1418. Generally speaking, would you imagine that the animal had caught it just before it left?—In the cases I saw, the animals certainly must have been diseased when they were put on board the vessel; in the last instance which was reported to us, a number of pigs were landed with their feet in an exceedingly bad condition from the disease.

1419. Then if there had been a sufficient inspection before those animals left Ireland, the disease must have been discovered?—It certainly must have been discovered.

1420. Does the disease break out quicker with pigs than with cattle, or is it much the same?—The period of incubation appears to be about the same.

1421. You do not think that inspection at the port of arrival would be a sufficient security as regards the Irish export?—Not unless powers were taken and means were afforded for the detention of the whole cargo.

1422. On the whole you think it would be sufficient if we had the same regulations with regard to Irish import that we have with regard to foreign import; that is, that if one animal has the foot and mouth disease, all the other animals are slaughtered at the port of landing?—Certainly that regulation would be sufficient.

1423. Do you think that any regulation short of that would be sufficient?—I do not see that security could be attained without that.

1424. I suppose a long quarantine would not be sufficient?—A long quarantine would simply mean that we should always have foot and mouth disease at a certain part of the shed. In cases where we have tried it practically, 20 animals were required to be kept about a month before the inspector allowed them to leave.

1425. Am I not right in supposing that, if we went upon the principle of quarantine, such an immense area would be required, and such a large number of animals would have to be kept in it, that it would probably be a great interference with the trade, and more costly altogether, than if they were obliged to be slaughtered?—Practically, it must stop the import of store stock from Ireland altogether.

1426. So that, if we are to rely upon the precautions taken in this country, there is not much use in relying upon any precaution except that which we have found necessary in the case of foreign import, that is, the slaughtering of all animals?—It would be of no use at all.

1427. And that would, so far as concerns the store animals, stop the Irish import?—Necessarily.

1428. Although we have been much inconvenienced owing to the introduction of this disease from Ireland, it is the case that we are greatly dependent upon the Irish import, especially for store cattle?—Very much so indeed.

1429. Mr. Dent.] Are there any figures anywhere showing the quantity of store and the quantity of fat cattle that come from Ireland?—I do not think we have any such figures, but probably Professor Ferguson has.

1430. Chairman.] So far as your personal investigations go, what is your notion of the proportion of import of store to fat animals?—I am afraid that my opinion upon the subject would not be of the least value. I know that a considerable number of fat animals are imported from Ireland, but I have no idea what proportion they bear to store animals.

1431. Are you aware that there is a considerable import of store animals from Holland?—Yes, certainly.

1432. It is the fact, is it not, that but few cargoes arrive from Holland with foot and mouth disease on board?—As a rule, I apprehend, however,

Professor
G.T. Brown.

to March
1873.

Professor
G. F. Brown.
—
so March
1873

over, that animals are sent from that country with the disease.

1433. It is supposed that the very stringent regulation which obliges all the animals to be slaughtered in case one has the disease, leads to very great care in Holland, and prevents such animals being exported?—Yes; but there have been cases in which animals have been sent over in such a condition that they must have been affected when they were shipped, and these animals I have seen landed at Hull.

1434. Nevertheless, this stringent regulation has not stopped the import of store cattle from Holland, but has rather tended to make that import safe?—Certainly.

1435. Why might we not expect the same result to follow, if the same rule was applied to Ireland?—I think there would be a very great difference in the number of animals which the two countries could supply us with. Holland, I believe, would, at almost any risk, send as many as they could spare, if we would consent to pay a sufficient price for them.

1436. Would not Ireland do the same?—I imagine, if there were no other way of getting rid of them, Ireland would be absolutely compelled to do so.

1437. Is not the Irish producer more dependent upon the English market than the Dutch producer is?—Certainly; but in all probability it would lead to the import of more fat cattle from Ireland, and a decrease in the amount of store cattle during the time that foot and mouth disease prevailed in that country.

1438. Gathering from your answer that you do not think that anything but very stringent regulations enforced in England would interfere with the Irish trade, have you any suggestions to make with regard to regulations in Ireland before export?—I should adopt one of two courses; I should either apply restrictions very much like those which were found necessary for the eradication of the cattle plague, with the exception of the slaughter of diseased animals, or I should treat the disease as one of the ordinary calamities of farming, and let the farmers deal with it themselves.

1439. That is an answer which refers to what you would recommend to be done in England as well as in Ireland?—As well as in Ireland.

1440. My question was whether you would suggest any special regulation with regard to the inspection of animals at the port of export in Ireland?—I think a great deal might be done in preventing the exportation of disease if they had an efficient inspection upon the other side, and were prepared to detain the whole cargo in the event of any single animal being found to be the subject of disease.

1441. Before I go to the prevention of the disease in England or Ireland, have you any suggestion to make with regard to the foreign import; do you think that we have done all that we could rightly be expected to do with respect to preventing animals affected with this disease coming from abroad?—I think the results show that we have.

1442. Then as regards the prevention of the disease in England itself, I rather gather from your recent answers that you agree with Dr. Williams in thinking that we must either leave it to the owner to stop it as best he can in his own wish to take care of his property, which means that we should strike it out of the Act, and not pay any attention to it in our orders, or that

we should adopt much more stringent measures to stop it?—That is the view I hold.

1443. What are the least stringent measures that you think would be likely to be effected?—I do not think that there can be any middle course adopted which would be so efficacious as to compensate for the amount of trouble and expense that would be entailed.

1444. My question is now to ask you what would be your precise suggestion as to what would be most effectual, of course not making that more stringent than you think necessary?—It would be impossible to have any less restriction than the absolute prevention of the movement from the premises on which the disease appeared, of all the animals which formed part of the farm stock; that is to say, all animals which were liable to the disease.

1445. You would have the same prevention of movement for the foot and mouth disease as there was during the height of the cattle plague, for animals affected with the cattle plague?—Certainly, for the same reason that the disease is equally infectious.

1446. In fact, you would have the cattle plague restrictions without the compulsory slaughter?—Certainly.

1447. You were very much engaged during the cattle plague, in seeing that the measures of the Department for rooting it out were carried out?—I was.

1448. Did not you find much difficulty, even with the great fear that there was of the cattle plague, and the great acknowledgment of its danger, and the loss it occasioned in carrying out the regulations as to the prevention of movement?—Yes; even in the last outbreak, in some of the districts which had suffered from it before in Yorkshire.

1449. And you found that also in the height of the previous outbreak?—Considerably more than during the last.

1450. Would that not lead you to suppose that with a disease less destructive, such as the foot and mouth disease, there would be greater difficulty in having those regulations enforced?—Speaking from my experience of the farming community, I am perfectly satisfied that such regulations would never be tolerated.

1451. I need hardly ask you, you do not think that the mere issuing of regulations, unless care was taken that they were carried out, would be of any use?—Not the slightest use.

1452. It has been often stated that the prevention of movement to stop the cattle plague did, at the same time, stop the foot and mouth disease?—Yes.

1453. Was the foot and mouth disease especially virulent at the time the cattle plague broke out?—It was prevalent in 1865, and it was very severe indeed in the Metropolitan Market; there were hundreds of animals on the market day there affected.

1454. It diminished and almost disappeared during the action of these regulations?—During the action of the regulations in the latter part of 1866, and the beginning of 1867, it almost disappeared.

1455. That was after the regulations had been in force for several months?—About six months.

1456. Are you aware that strong representations were made last year in several parts of the country to stop movement for six weeks?—Yes.

1457. Do you suppose that stopping it for six weeks

weeks would have had the slightest effect?—Not the slightest.

1438. You say, that to do anything which was worth doing, you must have the same restriction with regard to movement as you had during the cattle plague; would you also think it necessary to have the same restrictions with regard to fairs and markets?—If the restriction upon the premises where disease existed could be strictly enforced, I do not think that the same restriction would be necessary on fairs and markets, but in order that animals might be confined to the locality where disease prevailed, an extensive staff of inspectors would be necessary.

1439. The disease nearly disappeared during these restrictions, did it not?—It did.

1440. When did it reappear?—It first reappeared in the fair of the Metropolitan Market, in the winter of 1867, among some animals which came somewhere from the north-western counties.

1441. Is there not this difference between the foot and mouth disease and the cattle plague, that not only is the former disease hardly to be compared with the latter in virulence, being so much less virulent, but that while we have great hope of being able to absolutely stamp out the cattle plague, we should have very little hope of absolutely stamping out the foot and mouth disease?—It is my conviction that we should never succeed in getting rid of it; and that is the experience of the whole of Europe.

1442. Therefore in fact to preserve ourselves against the foot and mouth disease we must look forward, not only to such stringent restrictions as you say were found very difficult during the cattle plague, but we must look forward to the continuance of them as a general rule, and not to their being laid down as a very severe remedy for a temporary disease?—Undoubtedly the restrictions must be permanent.

1443. You have paid a good deal of attention with reference to the extent of disease in foreign countries, I think?—Yes.

1444. Is there any foreign country in which they have successfully attempted to stamp out the foot and mouth disease in this way?—I believe not.

1445. Are you aware that Dr. Williams stated that they were endeavouring to do so, or had issued regulations for that purpose in Switzerland?—Yes; I read the regulations, and I noticed in one part of them that they call upon the farmers of the country to aid them in carrying out the regulations, and suggest, that if they do not they will be entirely imperious.

1446. But these regulations were only lately issued?—Only lately.

1447. And now with regard to pleuro-pneumonia, do you think we have more or less pleuro-pneumonia than we used to have in England?—I think that it prevails now as extensively as it has at any time prevailed during my knowledge of the disease, particularly in large towns.

1448. Am I not right in thinking that there is a much better organised mode, by which the department is made aware of the disease than there was?—Decidedly.

1449. Therefore, the fact that we hear of more disease is not an absolute proof that there is more disease existing?—Not at all.

1450. How long has pleuro-pneumonia been known as an English disease?—I believe it was first seen in this country in the year 1841. It was introduced into Ireland in 1840.

G.58.

1471. Do you suppose that we got it from abroad?—It is supposed to have come from Holland, where it certainly prevailed at that time, to Ireland, and from Ireland to Great Britain.

1472. Since that time, I suppose, it has existed in this country more or less?—It has always existed since that time.

1473. And not merely a regulation of foreign import, but even the total stoppage of foreign import, would not get rid of pleuro-pneumonia now, I suppose?—Certainly not.

1474. With regard to its present existence, do you, or do you not, think it is owing to foreign import?—I have no reason to believe that the importation of animals from abroad has had any very great effect upon the extension of the disease.

1475. Is it the opinion of the profession that it always arises from contagion?—It is the opinion of all authorities who are worth listening to.

1476. As much so as the cattle plague?—Quite so, only it is not so rapidly spread.

1477. It is not so contagious?—Not nearly so contagious.

1478. It is much more fatal than the foot and mouth disease?—Yes, much more fatal.

1479. It takes a long time in incubation, does it not?—The time appears to vary from 14 days to six weeks, and there are cases in which three months have elapsed before the appearance of the disease.

1480. What is the time of the incubation of the cattle plague?—From four to six days.

1481. Then pleuro-pneumonia is more difficult to root out than either of the other diseases, on account of the length of incubation?—Infinitely more so.

1482. Do you mean it is possible for an animal to have the disease lurking in its system three months before it breaks out?—That opinion is based upon the fact that an animal which was exposed to the disease at a certain date, has been found to be affected with it three months afterwards; the possibility of infection in the interim, must be admitted, of course.

1483. The cattle plague can be, and you have reason to believe often is, conveyed by human beings?—Yes.

1484. Do you believe pleuro-pneumonia can be conveyed by human beings?—As far as we have been able to ascertain by experiment, pleuro-pneumonia can only be communicated by association with the diseased animals.

1485. Is it especially from coming into contact with the breath of a diseased animal?—There is reason to believe that it is; we have not succeeded in producing it by inoculation.

1486. And you have never had any well ascertained case, in your opinion, of its being spontaneous?—Certainly not.

1487. Does the carcase of an animal that has died of pleuro-pneumonia communicate the disease?—We have not found it so. The diseased lungs taken bet from a recently killed subject have been kept by animals without producing the disease.

1488. What is the percentage of mortality from pleuro-pneumonia?—It is difficult to say, because the majority of animals affected with it in large towns are killed as soon as the first symptoms appear; but taking the cases I have met with, I should say 80 per cent. is the very least mortality.

1489. When an animal is slaughtered, having been affected with pleuro-pneumonia, is the

H

carcase

Professor
G. T. Brown,
—
20 March
1873.

Professor
G. T. Brown,
—
20 March
1873.

carcase sold?—Certainly, if it is passed by the meat inspector.

1490. Would you consider it especially dangerous?—Judging from observation, I should say it would appear not to be so.

1491. Supposing an animal recovers, when would you consider it safe as being free from conveying infection?—My advice always is, that animals which are likely to recover should be at once fattened off as quickly as possible, and never be allowed to mix with the stock of the farmer again; but if I am compelled to fix a time, I should fix two months at least, and then I should have them thoroughly disinfected before being sent again on to the farm.

1492. You would not allow a farmer to put recovered stock alongside of uninfected stock; during what period?—At least two months; my advice always is, that they should put them underground as quickly as possible.

1493. Pleuro-pneumonia has existed in Ireland for a considerable time, has it not?—Since the latter end of 1840 or 1841.

1494. Do you get many animals affected with that disease from Ireland?—I have reason to think we do.

1495. Do you think that more animals come from Ireland with the disease than go from one part of England to another with the disease?—No, not so many.

1496. Therefore, there is no special reason why the prevalence of the disease should be said to be owing to the Irish import?—Certainly not the prevalence of it.

1497. A good many of the Irish store animals arrive in a very poor condition, do they not?—They do.

1498. That poor condition arising from the hardships of the journey, and also from their not being well fed before they left?—I believe chiefly from their treatment before they are shipped.

1499. What do you mean by their treatment before they are shipped?—The want of sufficient food in the country from which they come.

1500. Do you consider they are more liable to catch the disease in consequence of being kept in that way?—It does not appear that there is any difference in the degree of susceptibility on that account.

1501. Have you any suggestion to make to the Committee with regard to the better prevention of pleuro-pneumonia, first as regards the foreign import?—I have no reason to believe that we get any important extension of the disease in consequence of the imports from abroad.

1502. Do you think that we could do more than we do in the matter?—I think not, unless we place those countries at present unscheduled in the Schedule upon the bare suspicion that some of the animals may have come from infected herds.

1503. Of course if an animal is imported with leave to go into the interior, it is possible that the animal may have pleuro-pneumonia, because, as you say, it may have caught it before it left the Continent, and may appear to be quite well for weeks afterwards?—It is quite possible; but in the investigations which I have made, while I have traced numerous outbreaks in Cheshire to the purchase of Irish cattle, I have only in very few instances met with a clear case where the disease could be traced to the importation of cattle from Holland.

1504. But unless there was special reason to

believe that pleuro-pneumonia was imported from abroad, and that it was very prevalent in the country from which it came, there would be no more reason in stopping such an animal which appeared to arrive healthy, than there would be in stopping an apparently healthy animal going to the London market?—There would be no more reason for doing so.

1505. With reference to the Irish import, have you any suggestion to make to the Committee?—I believe the only efficient method would be an efficient system of inspection in Ireland. I do not believe that in the case of pleuro-pneumonia, inspection at the ports would be a sufficient safeguard.

1506. An inspection of what ports?—Either the ports of import or export.

1507. When you say inspection in Ireland, do you mean that there should be some supervision on the sale of an animal?—Upon the premises where they are fed.

1508. You would not have a stronger regulation in Ireland than you would have in England in that matter?—No; but I would apply the same regulations in England.

1509. What would you suggest?—I should take means, first of all, to ascertain the existence of the disease, and then I should prevent the movement of diseased animals, and those which have been banded with them, from those premises, until a reasonable time had elapsed after the diseased animals had been destroyed.

1510. In the first place, would you take any step with regard to being informed of the disease beyond what is now taken; the step now taken is that the local authorities are instructed to discover, if they can, the disease, and to not accordingly; would you take any further steps?—I should certainly organise a system of inspection in each county.

1511. To find out where there was disease?—To find out where the disease existed.

1512. You are speaking now of England?—Yes.

1513. You think it would be necessary to have a constant surveillance over farms, to find out whether the disease existed upon them?—Certainly.

1514. It would not be sufficient to trust to knowledge arriving to the local authority when such disease had broken out?—Practically that does not answer.

1515. How could we have that general system of inspection?—We should require to establish a certain number of inspectors to take parts of the country as districts, and it would be their duty to ascertain the condition of the various herds throughout those districts.

1516. Do you think we could rely upon the local authorities in the matter of inspection?—I should never rely upon the local authorities; it should be done from the central department.

1517. You think it would be necessary to have inspectors appointed in London, whose business it would be to find out throughout the country whether there was, or was not, disease, especially pleuro-pneumonia?—Certainly.

1518. Would not that require a large army of inspectors?—Decidedly, it would.

1519. Take one county, for example: you mentioned how many such inspectors would be wanted for Cheshire?—Cheshire would be an exceptional case, and I should think you would want 20 or 30 men there; of course, only during the time the disease was known to prevail.

1520. My

Professor
G. T. Brown.
—
30 March
1875.

1520. My question is this: I understand you to say that you think it would not do to wait until the disease was known to prevail; but that you must be constantly trying to find out whether it does or does not exist?—Quite so.

1521. For that purpose you would not want anything like the same number of inspectors as would be necessary when the disease was known to prevail?—No; the existing authorities might be made available.

1522. Counties vary as to the inspectors they appoint; in some cases they appoint the police, and, in some other cases, veterinary surgeons?—In many cases they appoint the police, and they give them the opportunity of employing veterinary surgeons, if they find it necessary.

1523. In such a case, to find out whether there is or is not pleuro-pneumonia on a farm, a policeman would be of no use, would he?—No.

1524. The only man who would be of any use would be a man who had some veterinary knowledge?—That is so.

1525. That would imply a right of entry upon every farm?—Yes.

1526. Do you find that there is a general desire on the part of farmers to keep to themselves the existence of disease?—Undoubtedly so.

1527. Consequently, such inspectors must not expect any assistance from the farmers in the performance of their duty?—Quite the reverse.

1528. Short of such a very strong measure as a constant inspection of every farm in the country to find out whether there is or is not disease existing, would you suggest anything else with regard to pleuro-pneumonia?—Short of that it seems to me that the only course would be to induce the farmers to make the complaint known by paying full compensation for an animal that was attacked upon the understanding that it should be immediately destroyed.

1529. What do you consider is the worth of an animal which really has pleuro-pneumonia?—I should say generally that it would be worth nothing at all.

1530. Your suggestion really means that out of the taxes, or out of the rates, the farmer should be obliged to give information by a large present of money?—That is what it amounts to really; I should do that for the purpose of being able to find out the disease which I could not ascertain in any other way.

1531. You would not fear that that would lead to recklessness, by a farmer thinking that he would always have a sure market for his beast?—No, I am quite sure there would not be that danger, as the farmer is too well aware of the consequences of an outbreak in his herd to do that.

1532. Would you give full compensation?—My own feeling is, that I should pay the owner the amount of money which he would require to obtain a similar animal in its place.

1533. A similar healthy animal?—Yes, a similar healthy animal.

1534. That is to say his inducement to report the fact to the authorities would be that he would get a healthy animal in the place of a diseased one?—That is so, and I should add that the mere fact of my knowing where the disease existed would enable me to apply the necessary regulations.

1535. The Act does not require the animals affected with pleuro-pneumonia to be slaughtered?—It does not.

1536. Some of the counties have asked us to enable them to issue orders to slaughter the cattle?—They have.

A.68.

1537. Do you know at all how that has worked?—In Scotland, I forget exactly in which locality, it seems to have worked exceedingly well.

1538. How long has it been in force in any county that you know of?—I think about a year; I am not certain.

1539. Would you suggest that that should be made compulsory throughout the country?—I do not think that alone would be sufficient unless we had other means than we have now of ascertaining where the disease exists.

1540. The 55th section of the Act says that a place which has been declared an infected place in consequence of pleuro-pneumonia shall continue so for 30 days after the last case; would you suggest any alteration with regard to that time?—I think the period might be extended with advantage.

1541. If you extended it at all, to what would you extend it?—Something like six weeks would be better than 30 days.

1542. Are you aware that the period of 30 days was inserted after much discussion in the House of Commons?—Yes, I am aware that it was.

1543. Dr. Williams stated that he thought that the present system by which, as regards pleuro-pneumonia, and as regards the foot and mouth diseases also, counties or local authorities were enabled to pass more stringent regulations than the-a necessarily enforced by the Act, did not work very well, because if one county made those regulations, and another county did not, the good effect of such regulations was not very evident upon the county which did make them; is that your opinion?—I was speaking with particular reference to one locality in Scotland where the results have been favourable. I am not aware of other instances where similar results have been obtained.

1544. Do you think that that is owing to the regulations themselves being not of much use, or is it at all owing to the fact that although they are enforced in one county, they are not enforced by its neighbour?—I have no doubt it is owing to the fact that the application of the rules in any one county would be ineffectual if the disease could be constantly re-introduced from the surrounding counties.

1545. Now with regard to the cattle plague, I need not ask your opinion as to the history of the late outbreak, because it is all stated in your Report, which is printed in the Veterinary Report of this year; you have no correction to make with regard to any statement in that Report, I believe?—None at all.

1546. You were sent down from the department immediately on our hearing of the outbreak?—A telegram was sent down to me directly, to Bristol, where I was then, and I proceeded to Poekington.

1547. On arriving, you at once did your utmost to press upon the authorities and all persons interested, the strict carrying out of the rules for slaughter?—I did.

1548. Are you not of opinion that there ought to be an alteration with regard to those rules; in the first place I will ask you this question: you are aware that the rules make it imperative to kill an animal affected, but they leave it optional to the local authorities to order the slaughter of those that I may call infected, that is herded with animals affected; would you so far alter the Act, so as to make that case to be optional, and become obligatory?—I would certainly make it obligatory.

1549. You

Professor
G. T. Brown,
—
20 March
1872.

1549. You have found I believe a great wish to support you in stamping out the disease?—Generally that has been so; with one or two exceptions everybody was very anxious to carry out the regulations.

1550. On the whole, there was more anxiety shown to do so than there was at the former outbreak?—Certainly.

1551. But notwithstanding that wish, there was a good deal of difficulty, was there not, in getting the animals which were herded with those affected, slaughtered?—Yes; the chief objections coming from the owners of the animals.

1552. Do not you suppose, that if that order could have been stringently carried out at the very first we should have stamped it out much more quickly?—I think the evidence shows that the disease would have been stopped the day after I arrived at Pocklington, if the three heads standing in fields near Mr. Berriman's cattle had been slaughtered at once.

1553. The rules do not give power to the local authorities to order the slaughter of cattle in a neighbouring field?—They do not.

1554. Should you suggest that they should have that power?—I would suggest they should have that power.

1555. You would not make it compulsory upon the local authority, but you would give them power to do so?—If I were to carry out my own views, I should make it a point for the consideration of the officers of the Central Department.

1556. What you mean is, that the Inspectors of the Central Department should be responsible for drawing a cordon round the outbreak, and ordering the slaughter of all animals within that cordon?—If the Inspector thought it desirable.

1557. That has been done in Germany, I believe?—It has been.

1558. Am I not right in supposing, that although it was quite possible for the Central Department to send you down to this outbreak in the East Riding, yet that if it had spread all over England as in the previous outbreak, it would have been impossible for us to send Inspectors from the Central Department?—It would be quite impossible to do so in every outbreak.

1559. Then you would give the power to the local authority?—Certainly.

1560. At last you and the magistrates together, succeeded in inducing the owner of the neighbouring lands to allow the slaughter of them?—Yes, after cattle plague appeared among the animals; in two of the districts the authorities were very ready to carry out the regulations at once; I may say there was no opposition, but there was a disinclination; there was no positive assertion that what was suggested should not be done.

1561. Have you any other suggestion to make to the Committee with regard to the cattle plague?—I do not think that anything further would be necessary if the local authority or the Central Department had the power to slaughter animals, as far as might be deemed necessary, around the infected area.

1562. I suppose that everything that you have heard since has induced you to imagine that we were quite right in our fear that if a case had happened in the Metropolitan Market, we should have had it all over England directly?—There can be no doubt about that.

1563. Have you any suggestion to make with regard to sheep scab?—I think the present regulations would be quite sufficient if they were carried out.

1564. But are they carried out?—No, they are not.

1565. The local authorities not thinking them of sufficient importance?—Apparently not.

1566. With reference to sheep scab, should you consider it as destructive a disease as the foot and mouth disease?—It is not a fatal disease, but it produces considerable loss of condition owing to the irritation it causes; it is a local affection due to the presence of scab on the skin.

1567. It is pretty easily cured, is it not?—Yes, it is.

1568. With regard to the treatment of disease, you say that sheep scab is easily cured; the foot and mouth disease is easily cured, is it not?—The foot and mouth disease is far better left alone, as I stated in the report.

1569. It comes to an end naturally?—It usually terminates favourably when not interfered with.

1570. But pneumonia almost defies your skill?—A certain percentage have recovered under the most opposite systems of treatment, and a larger percentage have recovered without any treatment at all.

1571. And with regard to the cattle plague, the medical profession are almost unanimous that nothing but killing the animal would put an end to the disease?—Decidedly, with regard to the extinction of the disease.

1572. With regard to the slaughter of animals at the landing port; in the first place, am I right in supposing that the arrangements at Deptford for the slaughter of animals coming from scheduled countries in the port of London are very good indeed?—Decidedly, they are very good.

1573. You would not suggest any alteration there?—Not in the arrangement of the market, certainly.

1574. With regard to the outports, would you make the same remark with regard to them?—In nearly all the outports the arrangements are very incomplete.

1575. What do you think an outport ought to be required to do with regard to animals which come from scheduled countries, which have to be slaughtered at the port of landing, or rather within the defined area at the port of landing?—I think they ought to provide proper landing places, which should be perfectly isolated from the other landing places in the same port; they should have proper lairs for the reception of animals, and sufficient slaughter-house accommodation, and means for the destruction or burial of carcasses.

1576. And in addition, that the defined area should be easily isolated from the other parts of the port?—Certainly.

1577. As regards cargoes which arrive infected with cattle plague, there were one or two ports, I believe, in which there was no means of slaughtering them upon the land?—There were no means of slaughtering them at Hull and at Leith.

1578. Why could they not be landed at Hull and there slaughtered?—The ship came into the dock, which was crowded with vessels at the time, and in order to get them to any place where they could be slaughtered, they must have been taken into the streets of the town.

1579. Which would have been very dangerous?—Decidedly; it would have been very dangerous.

1580. There were no means of burying them within the defined area, was there?—There were no means at all, and no ground available.

1581. The

Professor
G. F. BAKER.
—
20 March
1873

1581. The pier upon which they were landed being a stone pier?—They were not landed; they were kept in the boat.

1582. The pier upon which they would have been landed?—They must have been landed upon the dock wall.

1583. Did it occur to you that it might have been the best way to burn them?—I suggested that, but there were no means of burning them. I also suggested that they should be taken out in the same vessel and then have some pig-iron tied to their legs and tumbled overboard, but the Customs collector refused to allow the vessel to be moved; it was in the defined port, and the cattle could not be moved, and the owners of the iron were not willing to sacrifice the iron, as it had been already sold.

1584. What was done?—It was decided to slaughter them on board, put them in old lighters, and take them out to sea, in accordance with the order, more than three miles from the British coast, and sink them, and a firm in Hull undertook to carry that out, under the direction of the local authority.

1585. Do you know whether any attempt was made, by rigging up the animals, to make it easier for them to sink?—I believe not.

1586. However, although the carcasses were washed ashore, you do not suppose any infection was thereby communicated?—It is a matter of absolute certainty that nothing of the kind occurred. When I became aware of the fact of bodies having been turned adrift I stated that there need be no great apprehension, as our previous experience did not lead us to anticipate any evil results.

1587. The sea water being a disinfectant?—And the further fact that the cattle were thrown up on the beach, where no cattle would be in the habit of grazing.

1588. But sea water is a disinfectant?—Decidedly it is a disinfectant.

1589. What you think an outpost ought to provide is, first, a lairage for the animals which come from the scheduled countries; and, secondly, the means of slaughter within the defined area; and, thirdly, the means of disposing of the diseased carcasses?—I think so certainly.

1590. And there ought to be great care that there should be no communication between the defined area and the other parts of the port?—Certainly.

1591. We have heard a good deal about Hull; was there much danger of communication there?—According to the present arrangement, English cattle can be landed at the Corporation Pier, and the foreign cattle at the Minerva Pier, which is close to it; there is not a hundred yards between them. The defined port is not bounded by any positive lines, but merely by imaginary lines drawn along streets, and the animals are obliged to travel some considerable distance, in order to get first to the dépôt in Bath-place, where they are detained 12 hours, and then to the various butchers' slaughter-houses within the defined part.

1592. Do you know the number of ports at which scheduled animals are allowed to arrive in Great Britain; I make it 16 English, and three Scotch; is that correct?—That is correct.

1593. Are there any of those ports in which there are such arrangements as you desire?—There are none in which the arrangements are absolutely perfect, but there are some which do possess the facilities which I consider necessary, to some extent.

0.58.

1594. You mean that naturally they possess them?—Naturally, mainly; and there are none in which any special arrangements of a sufficient kind have been made.

1595. Would it not require those ports to go to great expense to carry out those arrangements?—Undoubtedly; very great expense indeed.

1596. Are you prepared to go so far as to say that you think, that unless those arrangements are carried out, the scheduled animals ought not to be allowed to arrive at their ports?—No; I will go so far as to say, that unless they are carried out we incur the risk of the introduction of the cattle plague every time animals affected with that disease are landed in those ports.

1597. But, after all, the risk cannot be considered very great, because we have the power of prohibiting the import of cattle from any country in which cattle plague exists?—Decidedly the risk is not very great.

1598. Do you not think that, measuring the cost and inconvenience against the risk, it is a matter which we ought to enforce?—If I took a commercial view of the matter, I should say certainly not; but, speaking medically, I should be bound to say that any cost would be well expended in preventing the introduction of disease.

1599. If I were to ask you, as a veterinary professor, what course, in your opinion, should be taken to prevent disease, you would consider that the question of cost was not involved in your reply?—I always take that view of the matter.

1600. With regard to the conveyance of animals in ships and on railways, you are well aware of the transit orders which have been issued by the department?—I am.

1601. And in fulfilment of your duty, you have more or less tried to find out to what extent they were put in force?—I have been specially engaged upon several occasions in examining into that question.

1602. As regards the vessels engaged in the foreign trade in the port of London, do you think that those orders have been carried out?—I have every reason to believe that they were carried out at the time I was engaged in the inquiry.

1603. When you give so guarded an answer, do you mean to say that the orders have not been carried out since?—No; I did not mean to imply that.

1604. The ships conveying cattle to the port of London are generally fitted up for the cattle trade only, are they not?—Generally so.

1605. Would you consider that they have now paid considerable attention to the comfort of the animals in bringing them over?—I think, so far as it is possible to fit up ships for that purpose, they have done it, excepting in the one matter of ventilation.

1606. The ventilation is still very bad in the holds, is it not?—Very bad indeed.

1607. Do you think you could remedy that without any great cost?—I think it would require very considerable engineering skill to fit up proper apparatus.

1608. Has there been any improvement with regard to that?—There has been some improvement by the introduction of some fresh wind sails, but the atmosphere in the holds is always very bad indeed.

1609. Do they bring many animals upon the dock?—To some extent, during some seasons.

1610. Not during the winter?—No; not during the winter.

21 3

1611. There

Professor
G. T. Brown.
—
20 March
1872.

1611. There are one or two days in the week in which cattle ships generally arrive, are there not?—They arrive generally for the Thursday market upon Tuesday and Wednesday, and for the Monday market on the Saturday or Sunday.

1612. Coming from Hamburg, how long is the voyage upon the average?—To London, I think it takes about 40 hours.

1613. And what provision is made in the first place for water for the animals?—They are watered by means of buckets which are carried round.

1614. And food?—Bundles of compressed hay are carried on board, and they are distributed among the animals.

1615. Upon an average voyage would an animal be likely to eat much during 48 hours?—Animals seldom eat much during the first 24 hours, and in rough weather it is the experience of owners of Spanish ships that the cattle will not eat anything for four or five days.

1616. How long is the Spanish trip?—Four or five days.

1617. In spite of that the Spanish animals generally arrive in good condition?—In good condition; but they are remarkably tranquil animals, and come in small numbers.

1618. Do they arrive in ships built specially for that purpose?—They generally arrive in ships as part cargo, but they are well fitted for the purpose.

1619. Do you think that animals are appreciably in a worse condition for sale if they come in rough weather than in tolerable weather?—They are certainly in a much worse condition at the time they are landed.

1620. We tried to prevent over-crowding, were we at all successful in that?—It is very difficult to decide what over-crowding really is, because unless the animals are placed close together they suffer considerably more in consequence.

1621. If one of them tumbles down, the others tread upon it?—That is so.

1622. The Danish animals come over in most comfort, I believe?—Yes, they are always well treated.

1623. Is it not the case that there is always a good deal of sand in the holds in which they are, and that they imbed themselves in the sand?—Yes, I believe so.

1624. As to disinfesting vessels, we found it necessary to issue rather a stringent order with regard to that, did we not?—Yes.

1625. Have those orders been carried out by the foreign vessels coming into the port of London?—When I made the inquiry, I found that they were carrying out the arrangements satisfactorily, and I have no evidence since that time which would lead me to doubt it; there is no reason why they should not.

1626. Going to another subject, we tried to make some regulations with regard to landing, to make that less accompanied with hardship to the animals; do you think that those regulations were successful with regard to animals coming from foreign countries to London?—I do not think that any very great change has taken place, but usually there is no more force used than is absolutely necessary. I had also to inquire specially into that subject, and I have stood on the bridge while the drovers have been landing pigs, and I have rather had to admire the very great patience with which the men bore the annoyances to which they were subjected; it is a very trying process.

1627. I will leave the port of London and go to the outports, still keeping to the foreign trade; do you think much has been done with those ships?—Excepting in the direction of making certain fittings in order to comply with the terms of the order; I do not think that anything has been done.

1628. Is it the case at Hull and Newcastle, and most of the northern ports, all the cattle come over in ships which bring a large quantity of other cargo?—Quite so.

1629. Would that apply to cattle coming to Harwich?—It does apply to cattle coming to Harwich, but the ships running to that port are remarkably well arranged.

1630. The voyage is short, is it not?—Yes; it is 12 or 14 hours.

1631. Leaving the foreign import, have you any remark to make with regard to the Irish import; in the first place, do you think there has been much attempt to prevent overcrowding in the Irish vessels?—As far as I have seen, the animals on the boats which run into Bristol are always very comfortably placed; the fittings are excellent upon all the ships.

1632. Have you seen the vessels arriving at Bristol?—No, I have not seen the vessels arriving at Liverpool.

1633. Nor Holyhead?—Nor Holyhead.

1634. What size are the vessels coming into Liverpool?—I can state precisely from my notes, but I forget exactly; I should think something like 800 tons.

1635. From what ports do they come?—From Waterford and Cork chiefly.

1636. What is the length of the voyage from Waterford?—From 18 to 20 hours.

1637. With regard to Irish import, do you think means have been taken to disinfect vessels?—There has been some difficulty with regard to the application of the lime-wash to the sides of the bulwarks, because they are always painted in those ships, and the captain does not like them to be smeared over with a lot of white-wash; but as far as I have seen at Bristol, they have always been thoroughly well cleaned.

1638. You have not much fault to find with the vessels engaged in the Irish cattle trade, as far as you have seen them?—As far as I have seen them, referring particularly to those coming to Bristol.

1639. With regard to the transit by railway, you had to see that our order for furnishing water has been complied with?—It has been complied with in most of the stations that are enumerated.

1640. The water has been provided, but do you think it has been of much practical use in providing that the animals be watered?—Very little indeed.

1641. Why is that?—Because the drovers have a very great objection to allow them to drink at all; they generally drive them away from the water.

1642. Do you think the drovers have any reason for that?—I have no doubt that for the safe transit of animals they are much better without food and water.

1643. For how long?—For, say 12 hours.

1644. But the transit in many cases is much longer?—Yes; certainly in the case of animals coming from Aberdeen.

1645. Would the animals be watered and fed before they left Aberdeen?—They certainly ought to be.

Professor
G. T. Brown.
20 March
1877.

1646. Are not animals frequently sided and fed in the siding?—That is done sometimes.

1647. If they remain at the sidings for some time, is water given to them?—Those which are placed in the station yards where the water troughs are, may take it themselves if they desired; but excepting under very rare conditions, no one takes water to them.

1648. Many people suppose that there is great suffering from the want of water at present, notwithstanding our order for water to be supplied; do you think that is the case, or not?—I believe it to be the case in hot weather, when animals require a large quantity of water.

1649. Can you make any suggestion with regard to that?—I do not think, unless some arrangement can be made for watering animals at particular places while they are upon the trucks, that it would be possible to insure a supply on the journey.

1650. At present, are you aware that the order is that the railway companies have to provide the water; that the person in charge of the cattle is liable to a fine if he does not ask the railway company to provide the water after a certain time, and that the railway company is liable to a fine if they do not give water when asked for; now it has been suggested that railway companies should be made responsible not only for providing water, but for giving it to the animals?—I think it would be exceedingly difficult to carry that into effect.

1651. With regard to the proposal to water the animals in the trucks, do you think that that is possible?—There is no arrangement which I have yet seen which will effect that object satisfactorily.

1652. There have been plans for supplying the animals with water during the transit?—Yes; only that would involve complicated arrangements, or a totally new rolling stock, which is out of the question.

1653. Some persons have suggested that the animals should be untrucked and taken out

between Aberdeen and London, say at Carlisle, do you think that would be possible?—I think that with the present arrangements of the railway system it would be perfectly impracticable.

1654. And it would involve the difficulties of getting them back to the truck?—Quite so.

1655. What is the average time that a cattle train takes in coming from Aberdeen to London?—About 36 hours.

1656. Do you know how long it takes from Holyhead to Norwich?—I am not aware.

1657. We issued rather strict orders as to the disinfection of railway trucks; do you think they are carried out?—Only to a very imperfect extent.

1658. We have asked you, as far as you could do it consistently with the performance of your other duties, to see to the carrying out of those orders, but I suppose it has been impossible for you to see to the carrying out of them?—It would be quite impossible; where they have been able, the companies have always been quite ready to fall in with them; at some stations they have appointed men to disinfect the trucks, but I have not found the trucks any better disinfected in consequence.

1659. Have any obstructions been thrown in your way by the railway companies?—No.

1660. Dr. Williams thought that special inspectors would be required, or else a larger number of inspectors, so that they would be able to give some time to this duty; do you agree with that?—I do.

1661. Is it quite impossible for the present staff of inspectors to see that the transit orders are carried out?—It is quite impossible.

1662. That would apply especially to the import of Irish cattle, and to the railway traffic?—Yes.

1663. When I say it would apply especially to that, the reason why it would not apply so much to foreign cattle is, that the inspectors appointed to examine the animals can to some extent see to it?—Yes.

Monday, 24th March 1873.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mr. James Barclay.
Mr. Jacob Bright.
Mr. Clay.
Mr. Dent.
Mr. Dodson.
Mr. William Edward Forster.
Mr. Kavanagh.
Mr. Mossell.

Lord Robert Montagu.
Mr. O'Connor.
Mr. Pell.
Mr. Clare Read.
Mr. Ridley.
Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson.
Mr. Tipping.

THE RIGHT HONOURABLE WILLIAM EDWARD FORSTER, IN THE CHAIR.

Professor GEORGE THOMAS BROWN, called in; and further Examined.

Professor
G. T. Brown.
—
24 March
1873.

1664. *Chairman.*] AMONGST the questions put to you on the former day, I asked you whether you would not think it desirable to strike the foot and mouth disease out of the Act if it was found inexpedient to apply much more stringent measures than at present exist for its prevention; do you wish to qualify your answer at all to that question?—I should leave the disease in the Act in order that, in the event of a person exposing a diseased animal in a fair or market, or upon the public way, he might be dealt with.

1665. That is to say, you would leave the 57th and 58th sections in the Act as they stand affecting the foot and mouth disease, but you would take away any power given by that Act to make further orders?—That is what I should do.

1666. I asked you whether you had seen vessels arriving at Liverpool, especially in reference to whether you were aware that they were, or were not, properly disinfected; and you stated in reply that you had not seen any animal arriving, but had you any means of knowing whether the vessels are disinfected or not?—I am aware, from my own observations of the vessels which were on the point of departure from Liverpool, and also from the reports of our inspectors, that the orders relating to disinfection are not carried out there.

1667. Although you have not seen vessels arriving, you have seen them go out, I believe?—I have seen them about to go out.

1668. You mean that they were not disinfected when they return?—According to the inspector's account they were not disinfected when they return, and according to my own observations, they were not disinfected before they left.

1669. You know from your own observation that they were not disinfected at the time they left Liverpool upon the return voyage?—They were not.

1670. You merely speak from what you heard from your inspectors of their belief that they were not disinfected, either during the voyage back to Ireland or before they left Ireland?—In addition to that, we have the statement of the different

companies, that it is not possible for disinfection to be carried out.

1671. *Mr. Dent.*] Do I understand that vessels bringing Irish store stock to Liverpool are never disinfected?—Not unless some allegation has been recently made in consequence of the correspondence which has taken place.

1672. *Chairman.*] You think the disinfection is done at Bristol?—In the vessels I have mentioned it is done fairly, but not exactly in accordance with our orders.

1673. Was the same objection made by the owners of the Bristol vessels?—The captains of the vessels made that objection, but after having at my suggestion tried the system, they found that it could be carried out.

1674. Do you know whether that fact has been stated to the Liverpool captains and owners?—I believe an extract from my report has been sent to them, and I think one or two of the companies have agreed to carry out the system.

1675. I asked you, on the last occasion, whether there was cruelty in the landing of animals, especially in London, and you said that you thought that no more force was used than was necessary; am I to understand that you think there is no cruelty in that matter?—From my own observation I cannot refer to any instance of cruelty perpetrated, but from what I have been told by others I have no doubt that, in many cases, a great deal of unnecessary pain is inflicted upon the animals; but I may add it would naturally happen that the presence of any such authority would have a deterrent effect upon the men who were in charge of the animals.

1676. Do you think there is less cruelty than there was?—I think that, in reference to the accommodation for animals on board ships, there is less than there was, but I do not think there is much difference in the treatment which they meet with at the hands of the drovers.

1677. Do you think that anything short of some public official being present at the loading would check it?—I do not think anything short of that would check it.

1678. You stated that you thought that there

was no overcrowding of cattle upon the Bristol ships. Do you apply that answer to the Irish import generally?—I believe it is exceedingly difficult to decide what really is overcrowding. We have had a complaint recently of overcrowding on board one of the Bristol ships, in which case a large number of animals were lost during the passage. On the following day another ship came in and a number of animals were lost on board that ship, but the inspector specially remarked that the animals on that ship were not overcrowded; the company were written to, and in defence they urged that in the first case the animals were not inconveniently packed, but that they had died in consequence of the severe weather; and they further stated, that on board the second vessel which our inspector admitted was not overcrowded, the deaths were exactly twice the number of those which had occurred on board the first vessel. That answer, I believe, was considered so complete, that we took no further steps in the matter.

1679. I asked you with regard to the transit of cattle by railway, especially with regard to providing them with water, and whether you thought it advisable to make a change in the law by which the railway companies would be compelled not only to provide the water but to take care that the animal was watered, and you stated in reply that you thought it would be exceedingly difficult to carry that into effect. I do not suppose that you think it would be impossible?—I do not think it would be impossible, but I imagine that the companies would meet with considerable opposition very frequently from the persons in charge of the cattle.

1680. You mean to say that a company would be able to allege against such an order, not merely that it was the business of the person in charge to look after the animals rather than their business, but that the person in charge would oppose its being done?—I believe that would be the case.

1681. From your knowledge as a veterinary surgeon you surely do not suppose that cattle ought to travel 30 hours without water?—I do not think, so far as their feelings are concerned, that they should, but if I were to speak in reference to their sanitary condition I should say that they would be better without water than with it.

1682. For how long a time should you think that that might be carried on; there must be a point at which thirst would begin to tell?—I think in winter time they might comfortably go 24 hours without.

1683. When do you think an animal would die for want of water?—I think in something like six weeks; much would depend on the quality of the food.

1684. Do you mean to say that a beast could live for six weeks without drinking?—I am not aware that the experiment has ever been tried, except in the case of dogs.

1685. How long could they live without eating?—Something like a fortnight, if food and water are altogether withheld; much longer if water is given. I may say that those experiments have been tried upon dogs with the intent of producing rabies.

1686. I should be very sorry any experiments so cruel should be tried, but I imagine you are supposing that an animal gets green food in the

place of drink?—Yes; or turnips, which would contain a much larger quantity of water.

1687. Do sheep require water, more or less than cattle?—Very much less indeed; sheep on pasture or turnips, I suppose, scarcely ever drink at all.

1688. If you were a large cattle grazer in Scotland and you sent your animals up to the Islington Market, and you expected that their average journey would be, as I suppose it is now, about 36 hours, would you, or would you not, have them watered upon the journey?—If it could be so arranged that the animals could have a moderate quantity of water half way, I should prefer that they should have it, but I should prefer that they should be kept altogether without, than that they should be allowed free access to water after some hours' abstinence.

1689. I can well understand that there is great difficulty in untravelling the animals, inasmuch as they might get mixed with other animals, and that there would be great difficulty in getting them back again into the trucks, but where is the practical difficulty in water being taken to each side of the track?—I believe it could be done if there were a sufficient number of men engaged in the work at certain stations.

1690. Supposing they came up from Scotland, either upon the east or west side, there would be a large station on which they might be sided and watered, at Carlisle, for instance, upon the one side, and Newcastle upon the other side, would it be a very costly matter to have water provided in troughs, and put by the sides of the carriages?—I believe the cost has been calculated, it would not be very considerable.

1691. Do you think it is a cost which the grazer would much complain at having to pay?—I think that the graziers would very much complain if they had to pay any additional rate of transit, as they complain already that they are charged too much.

1692. But supposing that the graziers are now paying the market value for the mere carriage of the animal; I suppose that the railway company would naturally demand more if the carriage of the animals was made more expensive?—They would do so.

1693. The real difficulty in the matter would be that a grazer would not be inclined to pay the additional cost?—From what I have heard, I believe he would not.

1694. You think that that would apply quite as much if it was a positive distinct charge for watering, supposing he was obliged to pay the charge?—I believe there would be, in addition to the charge, a certain amount of loss from the delay, because animals coming from a journey would not go to a trough and drink immediately, if they were ever so thirsty, and they will not drink from a bucket at any time, unless they have been accustomed to it.

1695. Have you seen buckets and other means employed?—Yes; and the best I have seen is a moveable trough, which could be lifted up and down by long levers.

1696. Was that Mr. Read's plan?—I forget the name of the inventor.

1697. Was that the plan that was tried upon the Great Northern?—No; that system was not tried. The plan that you refer to was the plan of watering the animals in the trucks, and it was found not to succeed; in fact, the animals would

Professor
G.T. Brown.
24 March
1873.

Professor
G.T. Brown.
24 March
1873

not drink whilst they were in the act of moving, but this plan that I am speaking of was for the purpose of giving them water when they were drawn up at the siding. The troughs would stand at some distance from the siding, upon swing arms.

1698. Is there not a good deal of hardship to animals that are sided and left at the siding of stations?—I believe there is.

1699. That would not apply to any large quantity of animals, I suppose; but it would apply in several cases to small numbers, coming from comparatively small stations?—It occurs sometimes at large stations, where there is a great deal of traffic upon the line, when the animals may be kept for many hours in one place.

1700. Do you think that it will be advisable to have any enactment by which the railway company should be liable to a fine, or to some other penalty, if they left the animals sided beyond a certain length of time?—I think it will be desirable to do something which should cause the railway companies to facilitate the transit of animals on long journeys.

1701. Do you know that it has been frequently pressed by the grazing interest that the railway companies should be compelled to complete the journey within a certain time, or to pay a certain fine?—I think, if the scheme is practicable, it is certainly very desirable that it should be carried out.

1702. Do you think it is practicable?—Giving an opinion without any knowledge of railway management, I should say it is.

1703. But as a professor, you would say it is advisable?—I should say it is advisable.

1704. With regard to making cattle comfortable in transit by land, it is entirely a matter of cost, is it not?—Entirely a matter of cost.

1705. Would you say the same in reference to sea travelling?—Only to some extent; I believe much more comfort might be obtained by lessening the number of animals which a vessel is allowed to carry, but I believe it would be impossible to make animals comfortable at sea under any circumstances.

1706. And nothing which they can do could guard against the chance of a rough passage?—Nothing.

1707. Do you think the present hardship, or cruelty, or whatever we term it, has any influence in causing infectious disease?—I am convinced that it has no influence whatever.

1708. Do you not think that the foot and mouth disease is sometimes caused by it?—In my own mind I am satisfied it has no effect in producing the foot and mouth disease.

1709. Do not you think that the animal is put into a more feverish state, in which it is more liable to become diseased?—From personal observation I may assert that such hardships will not cause contagious disease.

1710. Mr. Dodson.] With regard to the importation of disease from Ireland, you told the Committee that animals might catch the infection on board, but that they generally started from Ireland with it; that being so, if there was an efficient inspection of animals in Ireland before they were put on board, and if also the vessels were kept strictly clean, the disease would be in the main prevented from being introduced into England; is that your opinion?—Yes. If it were clearly understood that in the event of disease being discovered upon the other side, all

the animals should be sent back again to the place they came from, and not allowed to cross the water.

1711. But should you contemplate sending them back to the places they came from or detaining them?—My answer should have been on the condition that they were not allowed to be imported into this country, speaking of the whole cargo.

1712. That would involve providing places of detention at the ports of embarkation in Ireland, would it not?—It would, most undoubtedly.

1713. At the ports of landing in England a great difficulty has been found in inducing the local authorities to provide places of detention?—They have always expressed their willingness to do so, but they have pleaded complete inability on account of want of space.

1714. Would not the same difficulty exist at the Irish ports as regards places of detention before embarkation?—Precisely the same.

1715. Is there any inspection now in Ireland before the animals are put on board?—I believe they are inspected at Cork by the constabulary and by the veterinary surgeon at Waterford, and also I believe at Wexford the constabulary are required to inspect the cattle, and they are allowed to call in the aid of a veterinary surgeon if necessary, but the instructions specially are that they are only to interfere with animals that are actually diseased.

1716. The inspection by the constabulary is not worth much, I suppose?—Unless the animal is in a very bad state.

1717. How many Irish ports are there from which embarkation to Bristol takes place?—It is chiefly from Cork, Waterford, and Wexford; pigs are also sent from Dublin.

1718. As regards the foot and mouth disease, you said that in England you would leave the 57th and 58th clauses in force, but that you would take away the power to make further orders respecting it?—Yes.

1719. Do you mean that you would take away that further power, both from the Privy Council and the local authorities, or only from one of them?—I should like it away from both, unless I had the alternative system of applying those severe measures of which I spoke in my former evidence.

1720. Would you not reserve to the Privy Council the power, in case of a very virulent outbreak of foot and mouth disease, of making some special order?—I believe there is a special clause which gives the Privy Council power to legislate in case of any infectious disease, I would leave that clause as it stands.

1721. Therefore there would be special power?—There would be.

1722. With regard to the cattle plague, you said that there should be an authority to slaughter not merely diseased animals, and animals herded with diseased animals, but a general power to slaughter all animals in the neighbourhood when it was deemed necessary to prevent the spread of the disease?—Yes.

1723. Has not the Privy Council that power now, under Clause 75?—I am under the impression that the clause only gives power to slaughter animals which have been herded with, or in contact with, diseased animals.

1724. Clause 75 is, that "The Privy Council may from time to time make such orders as they think expedient for all or any of the following purposes

purpose"; then follows an enumeration of the several purposes, and then comes this paragraph, "And generally any orders whatsoever which they think it expedient to make for the better execution of this Act, or for the purpose of in any manner preventing the introduction of, or spreading of, contagious or infectious disease among animals in Great Britain (whether any such orders are of the same kind as the kinds enumerated in this section or not)"; would not that clause cover it?—It appears to me that the clause only gives the Privy Council power to make an order for the slaughter of animals which had been herded with diseased ones.

1725. You went down into Yorkshire in the case of the recent outbreak of cattle disease, did you not?—I did.

1726. In order to procure the slaughter of the neighbouring animals in that case, you appealed to the good-will of the people concerned, did you not?—Yes; but that was not done until the cattle plague had broken out in one of the herds, and then it was too late.

1727. You have been asked some questions with reference to the feeding and watering of animals in transit; I suppose animals on the Continent have to make longer journeys than they have in the United Kingdom?—Yes, very much longer.

1728. Have they any rules abroad with regard to compulsorily furnishing the animals with water?—I believe not.

1729. What is the longest railway journey abroad which animals ever take without break, and without being watered?—I am not quite clear, but I believe on the Canada railways the animals are some four or five days on the journey.

1730. But I mean as regards cattle coming from the east of Europe?—They must necessarily be on the line several days coming from the extreme east.

1731. Are they generally rested at certain places, or not?—I believe they are rested occasionally, but I am not quite certain upon that point.

1732. But you believe that there is no law under which the animals are compulsorily supplied with water?—I believe not.

1733. Is there any such law in Canada?—I believe there is no such law, but I understand that after two days' journey the animals are rested for a day.

1734. They are untrucked?—They are untrucked and rested for a whole day.

1735. Do you know what is the practice in the United States?—I believe the same practice prevails there.

1736. Are the animals untrucked and rested every two days?—On a journey of five days I think they would be untrucked once and rested for the greater part of a day; but there is nothing said about their being watered, or fed, at any other time during the transit.

1737. Did I understand you to say, that that was the practice upon the Continent of Europe?—I am not aware that it is.

1738. You were not asked any questions with regard to sheep-pox; do you consider that the regulations which now exist with regard to sheep-pox are satisfactory?—They have proved sufficient to prevent the spread of disease, but they are not to my mind sufficiently stringent.

1739. What additional stringency would you
0.58.

suggest?—I would insist upon the slaughter of the diseased animals.

1740. Would you put sheep-pox in the same category as cattle plague?—No; because I should not, except under certain circumstances, slaughter the animals which had been herded with the diseased ones.

1741. If sheep-pox appeared in a flock, would you consider it sufficient to slaughter the diseased animals?—If the sheep-pox appeared in one flock in this country, I should without hesitation slaughter the whole flock; but if the disease were in the country to any extent, I should slaughter the diseased animals immediately on the discovery of the disease, and leave the other animals. The result of that system, I may say, has been very satisfactory.

1742. When you say you would leave the other animals, you would, I presume, require them to be isolated?—They would be placed under the regulations which now obtain, that is to say, their movement from the place where the disease existed would not be permitted.

1743. Mr. KENNEDY.] With regard to your answer as to taking the foot and mouth disease out of the Act, except so far as referred to Sections 57 and 58, do not you think that there are powers given by that Act which could be beneficially used other than those very strict rules which you mentioned with regard to slaughter?—I think they would be chiefly the powers expressed in those two sections, and the further one, which gives the Privy Council the power to make special orders in the event of their being necessary.

1744. Do you not think that a strict district inspection and entire isolation and prevention of movement of an animal from a diseased centre, would be a very great preventive of the spread of disease?—I do; but that would involve the system I previously referred to, the adoption of those strict measures which were in force during the time of the cattle plague, with the exception of the slaughter of diseased animals. It is only when that system is abandoned, that I propose to cease from all active legislation on the subject.

1745. In one of your answers on the last day, you said that you believed that the periodical variations in these diseases are due to the laws which regulate infectious diseases generally; do you allude to the laws of nature or to the laws that are to be applied by the Government?—I allude to the natural laws which govern those affections, and about which we know nothing whatever. We have no means of ascertaining why a disease like small-pox prevails, as it did recently in London, and why, under the same conditions apparently, it gradually resumed its normal state.

1746. You stated that those things are due to causes about which we know nothing, and can have no control over?—Certainly; I refer to those great outbreaks, and not to the prevalence of the disease during any particular portion of the year, which will be found to depend chiefly on the movements of the animals in various parts of the country.

1747. In your next answer you alluded to the fact of the movement of animals as having an effect upon disease?—That, I believe, accounts for the variations which are observed during a season.

1748. Are not some of those variations due to
I 2 the

Professor
G. T. Brown.
—
24 March
1873.

Professor
G. F. Brown.
24 March
1875.

the influence of climate; heat and cold, and matters of that sort?—It does not appear to be so; I have seen the disease in the midst of winter as badly as in the hottest months of summer.

1749. During what time of the year do you consider the foot and mouth disease is most prevalent, from your experience?—It seems to attain its maximum in the summer months, when animals are put out into pasture, where they naturally come into contact with each other.

1750. You attribute its increase to that?—Entirely.

1751. In one of your answers you say that you are not of opinion that the late outbreak of foot and mouth disease is due to any extent to foreign import?—I believe not.

1752. Is it not the case that while the stringent cattle plague restrictions were in force there was less of this disease than there has been since it was known in the country?—That is the case.

1753. Would not that appear to prove that foreign import had something to do with it?—It appears to me to prove that during that time animals were not moved about, and that consequently animals in which disease existed were not brought in contact with healthy ones, and the disease was generally confined to a few centres.

1754. Then it is to the absence of all home movement that you attribute the absence of the disease?—To the absence of movement altogether; in that remark I should include foreign with the home stock when they arrive here.

1755. There was no cattle plague in Ireland, was there?—Yes there was, for some months.

1756. Were the cattle plague restrictions applied to Irish imports; were all Irish imports stopped during this time?—From each province where the disease existed, they were.

1757. There was not any great amount of cattle plague in Ireland, was there; I thought there were only one or two cases in the North?—There were about 50 animals lost altogether, some of them were slaughtered under my direction; I remained in the district during the time that the disease was prevalent.

1758. Was it confined to one district?—It was confined for three months to the North of Ireland, near Drumagh, and it suddenly broke out then in the County Meath, near Enfield; but it was stamped out there by slaughtering the animals on the infected farm, and then upon the appearance of disease on the next farm the whole of the animals, including sheep and goats, were slaughtered and buried without delay, and no other case occurred.

1759. That outbreak only affected the ports near the district, and that would be the ports of Dundalk and Belfast?—Certainly, I believe that was so; the importation from Dublin was not interfered with, for I remember seeing animals shipped when I was there.

1760. The importation from Cork and Waterford was not interfered with?—It was not; I travelled all over the country to make a general inspection, and to inquire of the constabulary as to the diseases that were then prevalent.

1761. You alluded to a large amount of Irish import as taking place in the Bristol market of between 2,000 and 3,000 animals; I presume that went on during that time?—The market at Bristol was stopped during the prevalence of the cattle plague, but that was on account of its prevalence in this country; the importation of

Irish stock still continued into Bristol, but the market was not held in the ordinary market-place, it was held in the public streets.

1762. But still the importation continued?—Still the importation continued.

1763. Would not that prove, if the Irish import went on in the same degree, or almost in the same degree, except from the two ports which you stated, while the cattle plague restriction was in force, and that then the danger was known to have decreased very much indeed, that all that disease cannot come from Ireland?—Foot and mouth disease did not exist in Ireland at all at that time; at least I never met with a single instance of it.

1764. Not till after the cattle plague?—Not till the year 1868.

1765. When did you first hear of its appearance in Ireland?—I believe it appeared after my visit about the summer of 1868.

1766. Mr. Daden.] Was not it known in Ireland before?—There had been several outbreaks in Ireland before, but as in this country the disease sometimes decreases to such a considerable extent that it is difficult to find a case of it, and during the time I was there in 1867, I never met with a single instance of it.

1767. Mr. Kossavagh.] Was the disease unknown before the time you mentioned?—No; it was as well known in Ireland as it was in this country.

1768. But it did not exist during the time the cattle plague was going on?—Certainly not in that year.

1769. When did it again appear in Ireland?—I believe in the year 1868, and it was introduced again in May 1871, and by the end of 1871 it existed in every county in Ireland.

1770. In 1869, had you any means of tracing how it was introduced into Ireland?—Yes, we sent it there with some cattle from Bristol, I believe.

1771. And in 1871 again?—It was again caused by some calves which were sent from Bristol market; it was in consequence of the prevalence of disease in this country, that the importation of calves from England was prohibited in Ireland till August 1870, and then for some reason the prohibition was removed, and in the following year the disease was re-introduced by calves sent from the Bristol market.

1772. I think, as you say, there was a restriction imposed by the Irish Government upon the import of cattle from England into Ireland, on account of the cattle plague?—That was in August 1870. As far as I am informed the restriction related only to calves.

1773. As far as I am informed, there is not much home stock imported into Ireland from England?—No, a very small amount.

1774. In your examination with respect to the Bristol market, did you mean to imply that out of 2,000 or 3,000 animals imported into Bristol all were diseased?—Not all the animals imported, but it is very common indeed for two or three to be discovered by the inspector. I believe that nearly all the Irish dealers have at different times been prosecuted and fined for exporting diseased cattle in the market.

1775. Among what class of animals do you find it most prevalent; among pigs, or sheep, or horned cattle?—Chiefly in the market among the small store cattle; sheep are very rarely affected; there are very few cases in the market among

among Irish sheep, but pigs are very frequently affected; they, however, do not go into the market as a rule.

1776. They generally come over fat; they are not sent over as store pigs?—They generally come over fat, and are driven away to the butcher's to be slaughtered, or to the railway station to be sent to other parts of the country.

1777. Therefore when you speak of small store stock, you speak of horned cattle?—Yes.

1778. And it is amongst the store cattle that you find it most prevalent?—Chiefly so.

1779. I think you said that all the cases were diseased before they were shipped from Ireland?—I referred to the cases which I saw myself, on my visits to the market.

1780. Is it not possible that they could have caught the disease on the voyage?—Not in those instances to which I allude.

1781. Do you consider that it would have been hardly possible for it to have been caught upon the voyage?—I do, because the voyage would not be above 20 hours, I presume, in favourable weather.

1782. And from what port did these cases of disease come?—From Waterford and Cork chiefly.

1783. There is a system of inspection at Waterford and Cork, is there not, before the animals are shipped?—I believe at Waterford there is a veterinary surgeon, and at Cork the constabulary are requested to inspect, and to send for a veterinary surgeon if they have any doubt, but I believe there is also a particular instruction that they are not to concern themselves with anything but clear cases of disease; that an animal is not to be detained unless it is positively badly affected.

1784. Therefore the veterinary surgeon or the inspector may find an animal infected, but he has no power to stop it?—As a matter of fact, the inspector would not even discover that it was infected, because at those ports he has no means of making an individual examination of the cargo. I apprehend the person engaged in the inspection would merely look round him, and on seeing an animal presenting symptoms of the disease, he would have that one caught and examine it.

1785. And if he found that one had the disease, has he no power to stop it?—I believe he is instructed to stop the diseased one.

1786. Can infection in the case of foot and mouth disease be carried by the inspectors; supposing a man was inspecting a lot of cattle either at the port of embarkation or debarkation, and he inspected one cargo that was infected, and went to another lot, would not he carry the infection with him?—If he examined the second lot without disinfecting himself, he would almost certainly carry the infection.

1787. Is it not almost probable that in inspecting a lot of stock at the port, the inspector would hardly go and disinfect himself before going from one lot to another?—All inspectors at the ports in this country are instructed to do so, and it would be an exceedingly grave offence if they did not do so.

1788. Are you of opinion that foot and mouth disease is at all capable of spontaneous origin?—Except as an abstract proposition, I should deny the possibility of it.

1789. Have you read the Appendix to the

Report upon the Foot and Mouth Disease, of 1872?—The Report in the Appendix is written by me.

1790. Let me refer you to page 17 of the Appendix to the Report of the Veterinary Department, of 1872, headed, "Foot and Mouth Disease"?—That is the report on the disease which I wrote.

1791. What I gather from that is, that the disease called eczema may be produced in a sheep by simply travelling along the roads and other causes, and that eczema by inoculation would produce foot and mouth disease in the ox?—Eczema is really the foot and mouth complaint, and the ailment to which you refer was made by me in order to explain a difficulty which commonly occurs in consequence of sheep not being affected in the mouth, it is alleged by the owners of sheep that, as they only have the disease in the foot, it cannot be foot and mouth disease; but I endeavoured to explain that inoculation with the matter of the disease from the foot of the sheep will produce the same affection that we call foot and mouth disease in the ox, and that, therefore, the two diseases are identical.

1792. If it can be produced in a sheep by travelling along the road, or by many of the reasons you adduce here, surely that is a case of spontaneous origin?—It would be if it could be so produced, but it cannot be; it can only be produced by contact with the virus of the disease from an ox or some bovine animal, or another sheep. There are several diseases of the foot of the sheep which are not contagious.

1793. Mr. Clere-hugh. Foot-rot, for example?—In one form that is contagious.

1794. Mr. Keaney. In this Appendix you state, "The foot of sheep being subject to the disease of the foot, known as 'foot-rot,' and also to injuries during journeys on hard roads, gave a certain amount of force to the protests which were made; and although there was no reason to doubt the truth of the inspector's reports, it was thought desirable, in some cases, to make an investigation respecting the nature of the disease from which the sheep were suffering. In every instance it was found that the characteristic symptoms of eczema were developed in the feet of the animals which had been detained by the inspectors, although it was only in occasional instances that the vesicles were developed in the mouth;" therefore, what I wanted to know was, whether this travelling along this hard road, or these hardships, would not produce this eczema?—No, it would not. The term eczema there should be considered as synonymous with foot and mouth disease.

1795. You state, "in every instance it was found that the characteristic symptoms of eczema were developed in the feet of the animals which had been detained by the inspectors; although it was only in occasional instances that the vesicles were developed in the mouth"?—Yes, that might read "characteristic symptoms of foot and mouth disease," as we call it, were developed in the feet of the sheep.

1796. By its driving along this hard road?—I do not mean that.

1797. Chairman. I understand the Honourable Member to ask you whether, when you state in that paragraph that "in every instance it was found that the characteristic symptoms of eczema were developed in the feet of the animals," you do or do not mean to say that eczema was caused

Professor G.T. Evans.

25 March 1873.

Professor
G. F. Brown.

24 March
1873.

by what you mentioned in the preceding paragraph, namely, "injuries during journeys on hard roads"?—No, I mean to say that the sheep brought the foot and mouth disease with them from abroad. In this paragraph, I refer exclusively to those cases in which the inspector's opinions were disputed in regard to sheep landed in this country, chiefly at Hartlepool.

1788. Mr. Kewenagh.] Then none of those injuries alluded to, such as travelling along hard roads, and the feet coming into contact with nails and stones, and so on, would produce eczema?—No.

1799. In another part of this same Appendix you say that a number of the lesser animals are subject to this complaint: "Dogs, hares, rabbits, wood-pigeons, poultry, and crows, are all, according to statements which have been made by competent observers, occasionally subjects of this disease?" that is at the bottom of the left-hand column on page 167?—So far as my own knowledge extends I can only speak with regard to poultry, but there is very good authority for the statement that the other animals which I have mentioned are also subject to the disease.

1800. If they are subject to it, would it not be very difficult to isolate them? in fact, you could not isolate them?—Certainly not.

1801. Could not they infect the land upon which the flocks were?—I think it is exceedingly probable that they occasionally do.

1802. I am not using the argument with the view of throwing any impediment in the way of proper restrictions being laid down, but it seems to me that with all these possibilities of its being conveyed by other means, even this strict system of isolation and other precautions could not guarantee us from the possibility of the disease being spread?—That is quite the view I take of it.

1803. Are you aware in what way the steamers employed in the Irish cattle trade are managed?—From the reports which we receive, generally I should say they are very badly managed.

1804. In what way would you say that they were badly managed?—In the first place they are not properly fitted up, according to the terms of the Order, and in the next place they are not properly disinfected except in the cases to which I have alluded, of those vessels which trade to Bristol.

1805. From what ports to Bristol?—Dublin, Cork, Waterford, and Wexford.

1806. Are there steamers going from Wexford to Bristol?—I am under an impression that there are. I am not quite certain.

1807. Do you consider that the ventilation is bad on board the steamers?—Generally speaking it is very bad indeed.

1808. Is not that rather an important point?—It is very important for the comfort of the animals.

1809. And for their health?—For their general health, but not in reference to the production of an infectious disease.

1810. Do you not think that from being kept in the ill-ventilated hold of a ship, and tossed about in that way, they are predisposed to disease?—It is undoubtedly the case that they are, but unless they come in contact with the virus of a specific disease, no amount of hardship will produce it.

1811. But a less amount of infection might produce it than if they were in a healthy state?

—That is possible, but it is exceedingly difficult to give a definite opinion upon that subject.

1812. Do you mean to say that if cattle were placed on board a steamer, and that the steamer was slightly infected, or not properly disinfected, and the cattle were in an unhealthy state, they would not be more likely to catch the disease than if they are in a healthy state?—I think that if the germs of disease were in an active state on board a vessel, no sanitary precautions would give the animals any exemption.

1813. So that so far as that is concerned, an improved ventilation would be no object?—Very little indeed, as far as protection from infectious disease is concerned.

1814. Does the foot and mouth disease render the animals infected by it unfit for human food?—It is to be hoped that it does not, for we eat an immense quantity of it, no doubt; but there is no reason to believe that it does.

1815. Chairman.] It has been stated that the foot and mouth disease has been caught by children or by adults from contagion with animals; do you agree with that?—It has been stated that from drinking the milk of diseased animals, children have taken the disease, but the officer of the Medical Department of the Privy Council investigated the matter, and he could not find any positive evidence of the truth of the statement.

1816. Mr. Kewenagh.] You have been in Ireland, I believe?—Yes, I was there in 1866 for about two months.

1817. Have you had much acquaintance with the country?—I went over the principal part of the country.

1818. It was suggested, I think, by Dr. Williams in his evidence, that it would be an advisable thing, if possible, to impose a license upon cattle dealers. From your knowledge of Ireland, do you think that would be possible?—Not in Ireland, I believe.

1819. Is it not the fact that almost every person who has no land, but has money, is more or less a cattle dealer?—Decidedly.

1820. Every servant boy who has saved so many pounds of wages invests them in cattle and turns out a jobber?—I believe that is so, as they are a very numerous body in Ireland, I know.

1821. Mr. Peil.] You stated that the medical officer inquired into the statement that children get this disorder from bad milk; what sort of inquiries did he make?—A physician was sent down to the various parts of the country where it was stated that persons were suffering from the disease, and I believe on his return he stated to me that he had seen instances of eruptions on the lips in the case of children who had taken the milk of diseased animals, but he found a great many other cases in which the milk had been consumed without any such symptoms appearing, and he could not satisfy himself that there was any absolute identity between the cases which he saw and the foot and mouth disease of cattle.

1822. What is the earliest account which you have of the outbreak of the foot and mouth disease in Ireland?—The only outbreaks of which I have taken note are those which occurred in 1868-71.

1823. That would be about 30 years after it was known in England?—Yes, but it was known in that country during its prevalence in England on several occasions.

1824. It

1824. It was not known in Ireland before that time?—No, I believe not.

1825. Do you remember the outbreak in 1819?—No, I do not recollect the outbreak of 1819, but I remember hearing of the prevalence of it in Smithfield market in 1840.

1826. Do you recollect that it was especially prevalent in Middlesex amongst cattle which came up to eat the after-grass?—I do not remember that.

1827. You stated, as I understood, that it was hardly possible to make animals comfortable at sea?—I believe not.

1828. I suppose that applied very much to their rolling about, and being knocked about on board?—Yes.

1829. But with regard to ventilation, would it not be possible to make them more comfortable?—I believe a great deal might be done in that direction, but the chief difficulty with regard to the animals' comfort is the number carried. The vessels which trade from Spanish ports into London will probably carry from 60 to 120 animals, and they carry those animals as comfortably as they would be if they were placed in their own sheds, patting the movement of the vessel out of the question.

1830. Can you describe the difference between the way in which they are stowed; have you seen it yourself?—I have inspected those vessels.

1831. How are the Spanish cattle stowed?—They are chiefly carried on the 'tween deck, and they are placed in separate stalls, which hold five or six animals. Their heads are securely fastened to a rail which runs down the centre of the deck, and their hind-quarters are supported by rests at the bulwarks. Their heads are placed towards the centre of the vessel, near to the gangway which is used by the attendant for passing backward and forward, and giving them food and water.

1832. And there are barriers at the other end of the animals to prevent them from rolling as the vessel rolls?—Quite so; and there is also a proper foothold, which enables them to stand, and they have sufficient room to lie down in fair weather.

1833. All foreign animals are much more tractable, are they not, than English; with regard to tying them up by the head, there is much less trouble in tying up foreign animals?—The Spanish cattle are much quieter than ours.

1834. The German cattle also?—Some of the Germans are, but the Bremen cattle, and some of the Holstein beasts, are much wilder than those we have here.

1835. As you get north you find rebellion upon the part of the animals?—Yes.

1836. The Scotch cattle are especially troublesome, I believe?—They are.

1837. With regard to Irish cattle, do you find them more docile?—No, they are exceedingly wild, but that is simply the result of their bad treatment; they are rarely tied up.

1838. You have described how the Spanish cattle are brought over, are those cattle loaded in a better manner than any other foreign cattle are; do you say they are the best examples of stowing cattle on board ship?—Yes, because they stand almost alone in regard to the small number which is brought in each vessel; instead of 100, or something like that, a cattle-ship would carry 650.

something like 600; and they must be packed closely, in order that the ship may be filled.

1839. In this case there are divisional barriers between them, for the purpose of separating the animals?—I think six is the number of those animals in each pen; they are particularly docile, and agree together exceedingly well on the voyage.

1840. So that when the vessel pitches, the shock is not carried from one animal to the other, but falls upon the barriers at every sixth animal?—Yes.

1841. One word with regard to ventilation: is there any special arrangement for ventilation in the Spanish ships?—There are very large hatchways and windails, and also dead lights which are used in fair weather.

1842. Their hatchways are larger than are usually found on vessels; is not that so?—No, I do not know that they are.

1843. Are those vessels built specially for the cattle trade?—No, they are not built specially for the cattle trade, but they are fitted on the 'tween deck for that special purpose; the holds are exclusively employed for carrying cargo.

1844. With regard to Irish cattle, how are those vessels loaded?—In the ships which trade to Bristol from Dublin, Cork, Waterford, and Wexford, there are fittings on deck and in the holds, in accordance with the terms of the Order; but it happens very frequently that a considerable number of animals are brought over, and consequently the air of the hold is very much contaminated.

1845. Do you consider, as a rule, that they are overcrowded?—I do not think, as a rule, that they are overcrowded, because under those circumstances, unless they are packed tolerably tight, there would be considerable damage done, in consequence of some of the animals slipping down.

1846. The deck upon which cattle are placed gets exceedingly slippery when they have been on board a short time, does it not?—That is the case.

1847. With regard to ventilation, you have stated that you do not think that the health of animals coming from Ireland is so much affected by bad arrangements on board ship as their comfort is?—I mean their general health; their health is not affected with reference to infectious disease.

1848. But the ventilation, you admit, is bad on the Irish vessels?—It is bad on every vessel which I have examined where any large number of cattle are carried.

1849. I think you gave evidence on the last occasion when you were examined, to the effect that pleuro-pneumonia was transmitted from animal to animal through the breath?—I think in all probability that the virus is conveyed in the expired air.

1850. Do not you think it is probable that if you had an animal or two, as must frequently be the case, on board one of these vessels, exhaling this poisonous breath, if the ventilation is bad, the rest of the cargo is very likely to be affected thereby; in fact, much more likely to be affected than if the same thing occurred amongst the Spanish cattle?—Probably it would; but I believe the difference would not be very great. Undoubtedly where infectious disease exists, there are many causes which contribute to its spread, and bad ventilation among them.

I 4

1851. Would

Professor
G. F. Brown.
—
24 March
1873.

Professor
G. F. Brown.
—
24 March
1873.

1851. Would not poisonous breath and bad ventilation be the very thing to spread this infection?—To contribute to its spread decidedly.

1852. And that you say is found on board vessels conveying Irish cattle?—I should say on board all vessels engaged in the cattle trade.

1853. From Ireland?—From all parts of the world.

1854. Even from Spain?—Excepting in those vessels in which cattle are brought into the port of London, vessels carrying a very small number; and I should like to except also vessels trading to western ports, namely, small sailing ships trading to Plymouth and Falmouth. They carry their cattle in the hold, which is practically a long cowshed, where the animals stand very comfortably.

1855. Is it a losing concern to convey them from Spain in this more easy and comfortable way?—I apprehend it pays the importers very well indeed to bring them in that way.

1856. Then why should not more room be given to cattle coming from Ireland, affording them the same comfort that you find with the Spanish cattle?—In the first place, the Spanish vessels to which I allude are larger, and they carry very few passengers, whereas in the Irish vessels of the first class, the best part of the ship is taken up by passenger accommodation.

1857. I always understood that the greater part of the Irish import into England was carried on in vessels specially constructed for that object, and not for passenger traffic?—I only speak of those vessels which reach the port of Bristol, and I believe that nearly all of them are engaged in carrying passengers.

1858. Do you know the vessels that leave the North Wall, Dublin?—I have seen some vessels leave there.

1859. Are there many vessels come out from the port of Dublin that are specially confined to the conveyance of cattle?—I believe there are some small vessels engaged in that trade.

1860. Have they been built with regard to the comfort of the animals?—Not at all; certainly not.

1861. Do you wish to see an improvement in those vessels and in the internal arrangement for cattle?—I think the satisfactory system with those small vessels would be to compel them only to carry those animals which could be conveniently accommodated either on the main deck or in the one hold, which should be properly ventilated for that purpose.

1862. You have seen Irish cattle unloaded at Liverpool; do you know anything about the lairs at Liverpool?—I know Liverpool very well, but I have not seen cattle landed there.

1863. The London and North Western Company have got, I have been told, very good lairage for cattle?—That is at the railway station, but at the landing places there are no lairs at all.

1864. The cattle would have to be kept on the landing place first, and then driven up to the lairs?—That would be the case; but with the present arrangements it would be impossible to detain them long upon the landing place, they are unshipped upon the quay walls, and then driven away as quickly as possible.

1865. Where are they driven to?—To where there are lairs, and to the different cattle buyers in the district.

1866. They are some of them driven to the railway lairs, are they not?—Yes.

1867. Are those very good?—Yes.

1868. Do you know that there are some places by the river side, Salt Marshes, to which some of the cattle go?—I am not aware of that.

1869. Where neither fresh water nor food are provided them?—I am not aware of that. These lairs would not be under our inspection, as they would belong to private owners. I could give you a great many instances in other parts of the country.

1870. With regard to the railway lairs in Liverpool, those lairs are decently good, are they not?—They are very good.

1871. And there is water supplied, and hay also, I presume?—Yes, on demand.

1872. And there is a charge made for it, is there not?—Yes.

1873. Would you tell the Committee what you know with regard to private lairs at other landing places?—I do not inspect any lairs belonging to private individuals. I have no power to do so.

1874. Are there any private lairs at Bristol that you know anything of?—I know that there are places belonging to dealers.

1875. Have you been into them?—I never made an inspection of any private lairs since the order ceased which allowed us to make certain regulations.

1876. An honourable Member asked me to put this question to you with regard to the 57th clause of the Contagious Diseases Act, 1869; have you not power to inspect any public or private place adjacent to, or connected with, a market or fair; will you look at the clause, and see if that does not give you power to enter those places?—I believe not. This clause refers to the exposure in a fair or market of an animal affected with a contagious disease.

1877. Will you read the clause?—"If any person exposes in a market or fair, or other public place where horses or animals are commonly exposed for sale, or exposes for sale in any sale yard, whether public or private, or places in a fair or other place adjacent to or connected with a market or fair, or where horses or animals are commonly placed before exposure for sale, or sends or causes to be carried on a railway or on a canal," and so on.

1878. Does not that apply to inspection?—No, not at all.

1879. You know the district about Waterford, I believe?—I did not visit Waterford; my inspection terminated at Cork, and I then had to return to Dublin.

1880. Do you know at all what the price of calves was in Ireland in 1869?—I do not.

1881. You stated that there was an exportation of calves from England to Ireland?—Yes, there is for some reason a considerable exportation of calves from this country.

1882. Would not that be confined entirely to animals that were taken over to Ireland for breeding purposes?—I presume it would, but I cannot speak to that of my own knowledge.

1883. You state in your Report that you believe that the foot and mouth disease is conveyed from the lesser animals to cattle and sheep?—I think it is probable that it is so, but I have no evidence which would enable me to state positively that it is so.

1884. You have never made any experiment upon

Professor
G. T. Brown.
24 March
1873.

upon the subject, and taken a hare or a rabbit or a woodpigeon or a crow that was diseased, and tried to inoculate a sheep or a cow with the disease?—I have not; but in the cases which have been sent for examination, cases of hares and I think rabbits, I have not found any evidence of the disease at all.

1885. Did you ever see a diseased woodpigeon yourself?—Never.

1886. Nor a diseased crow?—No, I never saw any animal with the disease but cattle, sheep, and pigs, poultry are also attacked.

1887. With the oedema?—With the oedema, or foot and mouth disease.

1888. Mr. Dent.] Neither goats nor deer?—I never saw any deer with the complaint.

1889. Mr. Peil.] My question referred to this, how very seldom it was that these lesser animals were diseased at all?—It is exceedingly rare.

1890. There seems to be nothing between rudo health and death amongst these animals?—Precisely; we do not often see anything else.

1891. With regard to foot and mouth disease, you are of opinion that in its present form any attempt to check the disorder is useless or doing very little good, I believe?—As a matter of fact, very little has been done. The Act has never been tried.

1892. Not fairly, you mean?—Not at all in practice.

1893. You are of opinion that either we had better repeal a good deal of our legislation, or have something severer; would you say that?—I would say that.

1894. Which would you incline to, to relax or to attempt to impose more stringent measures?—Sparking from all I have heard and know upon the subject, I should be inclined to leave it as much alone as possible.

1895. With the exception of stopping the passage of diseased animals?—Precisely with the intention of preventing the exposure of diseased animals.

1896. As a member of the veterinary profession, do you see any likelihood of fading out a specific for it?—I do not think anything is to be gained by it, because ordinarily the disease, if not interfered with, terminates favourably, and our experience is generally with these things that if disturbed in their course more mischief is done than if they are left alone.

1897. It terminates favourably to the animal but unfavourably to the farmer to the extent of a loss about 40 s. a head upon the cattle affected?—But I mean to say that any treatment would scarcely mitigate the loss to any considerable extent.

1898. Do you agree with the statement that the average loss to horned cattle may be taken at 40 s. a head?—I doubt the correctness of it in many instances, and especially in reference to store stock.

1899. Does it apply to yearlings and two year olds?—The whole thing is based upon the assumption that the animals must have been perfectly healthy if they had not caught the foot and mouth disease, whereas they might have caught something very much worse.

1900. Do you think that the character of this disorder has altered very much in the last 12 or 15 months, and become much severer in its effects?—During that time it has assumed the virulent form which it has assumed on several previous occasions.

1901. Animals are liable to take oedema twice, are they not?—We have cases in which they have taken it three times, and it is the opinion of the authorities in Switzerland that the attack has no influence whatever in lessening the susceptibility.

1902. Mr. Dent.] That was not the opinion until last year, was it?—We had plenty of cases, shortly after the introduction of disease, of second and third attacks.

1903. Mr. Peil.] But the disease has been more frequent during the last two or three years that you have known it, has it not?—It has been more frequently recorded, but until this last outbreak we had heard little or nothing of the disease.

1904. Have you noticed that the last attack, especially in 1872, has seriously damaged the milking qualities of the milk cows?—I have not noticed that it has permanently damaged them to any great extent.

1905. Have you not observed that it has made the udder hard and callous, and that it has specially centred itself upon the udder?—Yes, it has in some cases, in the last two or three years.

1906. But has the same thing been previously observed?—Yes, in 1852, I recollect that was the case.

1907. Was that the special characteristic of the disease in 1852, and one which we have not had since that time?—I do not think it was a common characteristic in either case, but we have had many instances of it.

1908. Do you connect abortion amongst cows with attacks of foot and mouth disease?—Yes, to a considerable extent.

1909. Do you find the same consequences amongst sheep?—We have not found it to any considerable extent amongst sheep.

1910. Mr. Clay.] Your duties have taken you not unfrequently to Hull, I believe?—Yes, on several occasions.

1911. Do you know the town well?—I think I may say I know it very well indeed.

1912. Is it your opinion, that your department has any special grounds for complaint against the local authorities in that port?—Excepting that the regulations which were established here, in several instances, not been carried out.

1913. Can you give me any particular instances of that?—Yes; I had an instance of neglect to carry out the regulations which are intended to prevent the removal of animals from a defined part. Our attention was called to the circumstance by the inspector on the 8th May 1871. His statement was, that animals which were landed at the Albert Dock were driven across and through a portion of the defined part, in order to take the most convenient way to some other parts of the town. I was required to investigate that matter, and on the occasion of my visit to Hull in the following month, I made an inspection of the cattle market, which is outside the defined area, and I saw there some 50 German cattle with broad arrows marked upon their quarters in the usual way. I inquired as to the cause of this, and I was told by the officer of the local authorities that it was the custom, when there was no room for the animals in the defined part, to take them to the cattle market, in order that they might be kept until there was room, or until the butcher came to fetch them.

1914. What officer of the local authorities gave you that information?—It was the police sergeant.

K

Professor
G. T. Brown.

24 March
1873.

sergeant who was left in charge by the local authorities.

1915. Were those cattle from a scheduled or an unscheduled country?—From a scheduled country; they were German cattle.

1916. Mr. Dent.] I suppose the broad arrow mark indicated that they had come from a scheduled country?—Yes, it indicated that, but I did not require that indication to know where they came from; the character of the cattle was well marked, but that is positive evidence that the cattle were branded in the defined part.

1917. Mr. Clay.] That was your information received from Mr. Freeman, the inspector, for you, and also for the local authorities?—Yes.

1918. Was his letter forwarded to the local authorities?—I believe a copy of his letter was forwarded to the local authorities.

1919. The date is 9th May 1871, is it not?—I believe that is the correct date.

1920. Then, if I am not wrong, an explanation was given in a letter from the town clerk, as to what this complaint really meant, have you ever seen that, or heard the explanation?—I do not think I have.

1921. In Mr. Freeman's letter there was no complaint of cattle having gone out of the defined area, but he merely speaks of the general inconveniences experienced in cattle coming away from the Albert Dock, there being no covered sheds, and their being exposed during snow, rain, and wind, for 12 hours; are you aware, that the difficulties were with regard to a spot entirely unconnected with the local authorities, being in fact the private property of the dock company, and the great difficulty was that the cattle had to pass over (no doubt at considerable danger) the rails without a proper crossing, which was to be made thereafter, but that it was distinctly stated, that although there no doubt was inconvenience and danger, the cattle did not touch or come near the defined area; the cattle landed at the Albert Dock are cattle, I believe, coming from the Netherlands?—Chiefly.

1922. And no doubt they were exposed to considerable inconvenience in having to pass over the rails without a proper crossing, but they in no way touched upon or came near to the defined area; are you aware that it was so?—The statement was to the contrary effect, and it was shown that in order to get out of that part where they were, they were obliged to cross a portion of the defined part.

1923. With the exception of the complaint of Mr. Freeman, has there been any other complaint addressed in writing or otherwise, to the local authorities, with reference to any negligence or disregard of orders?—Excepting in the case to which I refer, and which I saw myself, of the animals being removed out of the defined part, that is to say, the case of the German cattle.

1924. Was that communicated to the local authorities?—Not by me; my duty was to communicate the fact to the Privy Council. I presume it was subsequently communicated to the local authorities by them.

1925. Would you be surprised to hear that it never was so communicated?—I recollect that it was communicated to the town clerk and to Alderman Bannister, by the Lord President

himself, in my presence, in the council room, but I do not know that my report was sent.

1926. I presume that that was at some deposition?—There was a deposition having a reference to the alteration of the defined part.

1927. In June 1871, I think it was, your department pressed upon the local authorities an alteration of the defined area?—I believe an application was made on three separate occasions for such alteration, but I do not recollect that any alteration was ever made at the request of the department.

1928. Are you aware that in consequence of that the local authorities prepared a plan for a very great reduction of the area, from I think 4,500 yards to about 2,000?—Yes, and I also remember that I entirely objected to the scheme, as it took away the only secure boundary which I had been able to make in the defined part.

1929. I dare say it was in consequence of that that the department then suggested the altogether new area, which they did?—I believe it was.

1930. Can you state where the new area was proposed to be?—I think it was suggested that a defined part might be arranged in the garden ground; but we were told that the ground was not attainable, and further that the local authorities having incurred great expense in fitting up the present area for the reception of animals, were not inclined to incur any further expense in fitting up a new one.

1931. Did they state that to begin with all the expenditure upon the existing area would be so much money thrown away?—I am not aware that they made that statement, but it could only apply to the customs depot which might have been used for animals from unscheduled countries.

1932. I think you were present, were you not, when the Lord President received a deputation of the town council and Mr. Alderman Bannister, and I think yourself and Dr. Williams were present?—I think we were.

1933. Was not it then urged that the expenditure already incurred would be so much loss of money?—I believe it was, but I should still object that that observation could only apply to that portion of the defined part which would be included within the customs depot, as the butcher's premises would have been left as they were.

1934. Were you aware that when the question was first raised, the Corporation of Hull laid out a considerable sum of money upon lairs?—I am not aware that there was any change from the time when I first defined the part in 1857.

1935. But you are aware that there were lairs at that time?—I am aware that there were.

1936. Do you know what they cost?—No.

1937. Would you be surprised to hear that they cost nearly 9,000?—I should not be surprised to hear that; they were very good lairs.

1938. You gave the opinion at the time that they were very good lairs?—I think so.

1939. And you stated, I think, that they were as good lairs as any that could be found in the provinces?—I said so, and I think so still.

1940. That expenditure would have been lost if you had gone from that defined area to another new area?—No, I am certain it would not, because the lairs would have been used for cattle from unscheduled countries, instead of building new ones on the promenade.

1941. Do you know how many slaughter-houses

Professor
G. T. Brown.
24 March
1873

houses were built on the defined area?—None were built for that purpose, but there were slaughter-houses which had been built previously, which were taken in. The primary reason was that the landing places were in that part of the port, and it consequently became necessary to get the slaughter-houses as near to that part as possible, and the cattle market was taken in order that sufficient lairage might be obtained for the purposes of the cattle, and also for a sale-yard.

1942. It was urged, was it not, that it would be necessary to build a pier?—Yes, it was.

1943. And that it would be necessary to have a private Act for that?—I do not recollect anything about the Act, but of course it is very likely that that would be so.

1944. It was held that the pier would be objected to as a hindrance to the navigation of the river?—I do not recollect that those were the precise objections, but I am aware that the scheme was altogether objected to by the local authorities.

1945. Was the result of that deputation that your department agreed to abandon the scheme?—The scheme was merely put forward by the department as a suggestion, but it was abandoned when local authorities stated that it was impossible. The chief argument, and the one that most impressed my mind was, that they could not get the ground.

1946. The suggestion having been abandoned, did your department agree without any exception, or at any rate, with very slight exception, to the redefinition of the defined area proposed by the local authorities upon their coming under certain conditions?—Yes, on consideration that promises were made that this new defined part, which was re-arranged entirely for the purpose of letting in cattle from Lincolnshire, upon the eastern side, should be watched by an extra number of police, because the new arrangement as I contended, gave greater facilities for the contact of English and foreign cattle than previously existed.

1947. Can you state to the Committee what the number of policemen was?—I am not certain, but I think eight was the number named.

1948. And beyond that there were to be six or seven others in the immediate vicinity outside the area?—I believe that there were to be some extra men employed in that way.

1949. And an inspector of police and a policeman in plain clothes were to be constantly on the watch?—Yes.

1950. At any rate the proposals for watching that area were considered by your department to be sufficient?—Under those circumstances we were satisfied, admitting that we were incurring increased risk by making the alteration, that the local authorities were about to do all that they could do under the circumstances.

1951. Have you any reason to suppose that those engagements have not been strictly and fairly carried out?—I have no reason to suppose so.

1952. Are you aware at all of the number of prosecutions which have been instituted for offences detected by these policemen set to watch for that special purpose; do you know how many convictions have been obtained?—I have not heard of any.

1953. I may inform you that there have been 14 convictions obtained, and fines imposed, varying from 20*l.* to 5*l.*, 3*l.*, and 1*l.*; are you satisfied?

1954. As to whether the engagement under which the local authorities came has been really strictly carried out?—I had not heard of anything which would lead me to believe that they had not, until you made the suggestion that persons had been prosecuted for not carrying them out.

1955. No, not for not carrying them out, but for infringing them?—That suggests to my mind that we have not been informed of certain infringements which really ought to have come under our notice.

1956. You yourself had been in Hull at the time?—Since this arrangement I have only visited Hull once, and then that visit had reference entirely to the outbreak of cattle plague.

1957. Then you hardly think this is any proof of vigilance on the part of the local authorities that they have obtained so many convictions for attempts (of course they were not always carried out successfully) to evade the Act, and evade the Orders of the Council?—The fact of persons being convicted for infringing the Act also suggests to me that the Act has not been carried out. I confess that I was apprehensive that it would occur, but I was not aware that it had occurred.

1958. There have been several alterations, I think, of the defined area?—There have been four, including the first definition.

1959. Were they all in the sense of a reduction of the area?—Yes, all of them, excepting the last, which was an extension for the sake of enclosing one more butcher's slaughter-house.

1960. That was a very slight alteration?—It was quite unimportant.

1961. That was sanctioned by your department, I believe?—Certainly. There was no objection at all to it.

1962. Are you aware, then, that the local authorities had previously refused to recommend it?—That I believe was the result of a statement which was made to the deputation when they had an interview with the Lord President, to the effect that as soon as this arrangement was made, we should have another petition from the tradesmen left outside the new area, that they might be included. The local authorities represented by the town clerk and Mr. Alderman Bannister, stated at once that they would not sanction any such application, and they did not.

1963. That which was the only addition to the defined area was not made upon application to the local authorities, but upon application to yourselves?—Yes.

1964. In Dr. Williams's evidence, he states that he objected to the defined area upon several grounds; first, that it was not sufficiently defined, and not sufficiently separated from the rest of the town?—That is an objection certainly.

1965. But is it one which applies especially to Hull, or is it not one which applies to several other ports?—It applies to several other ports.

1966. And must of necessity do so?—Unless separate buildings are arranged on vacant ground it must apply to a number of ports.

1967. That vacant ground cannot frequently be found?—It frequently cannot be found, as in the case of Hull.

1968. So that there is no special case of complaint against Hull in that respect?—Certainly not.

Professor
G.T. Brown.

24 March
1873.

1669. Is it not the case that the special area is as well defined as it can possibly be under the circumstances; what are the boundaries of it; it is bounded by the Humber on one side, is it not?—Yes, by the Humber, and on all other sides by streets.

1670. Upon the west side it runs almost to a point, does it not?—It does, taking in the western boundary of the Customs' depot.

1671. Have you any suggestions to make which would make it further defined than at present, and answer your purposes better?—My impression, when I first visited the port, was that it was not possible to make a complete defined part, and it was a question whether a part should be defined, or whether importation should be altogether prohibited in the time of cattle plague. The prohibition of importation was a serious question to consider, and the conclusion was that the best must be made of the conditions which existed, and I, of course, think that the defined part which I first drew out, was the best that could be made under the circumstances.

1672. Is that a correct representation of the defined area as it at present exists (*leaving a place to the witness*)?—That is the present one, but it is not the one which I consider the best.

1673. You could make suggestions for the improvement of that without altogether changing the place and going to the garrison ground?—I should certainly go back to the original boundaries, and include the cattle market, especially as I have before me the fact, that if the cattle market had not been outside the boundary, there would not, in all probability, have been an outbreak of cattle plague in Yorkshire recently.

1674. You would go back to the first defined area which was of considerable length?—I would.

1675. Did you make a recommendation to the local authorities?—I have not been called upon to make any recommendation to the local authorities yet.

1676. Now with regard to the "Joseph Soames," when was the fact of there being diseased cattle on board the "Joseph Soames" reported to your department?—I believe on the day of the arrival of the vessel.

1677. Do you recollect the date?—The 25th of July.

1678. And when did you go to Hull?—I believe I received a telegram on the same evening, when I was within a few miles of the port; somewhere in Lincolnshire, very close to the ferry from New Holland.

1679. You went over that day?—Upon the same day that I received the telegram; upon the 25th, I believe.

1680. Do you know what day of the week that was?—I believe it was on a Thursday.

1681. What did you do when you got there?—I arrived there late at night, so that I could not visit the vessel until the following morning, when I went on board with Professor Simonds, who had previously arrived, and the Customs' officer, and the inspector of the Privy Council.

1682. Did you make any communication to the local authorities at that time?—I did not; but the local inspector was aware of the animals being there, and he came on board with us, or shortly afterwards, I am not quite sure which.

1683. It was not in consequence of any information which he received from you or from Professor Simonds?—It was not in consequence of

any information he received from me, certainly.

1684. Did you at that time make up your mind what would be the best thing to be done under the circumstances?—Not until the following day; because I was required to find out what possibilities there existed of disposing of the animals.

1685. That would be upon the Friday?—Upon the Friday.

1686. And you did not consult upon the matter at all with the local authorities?—No, I did not consider that it was any part of my duties to consult the local authorities at the time.

1687. You considered the matter was one for which you were wholly responsible, and had to act in the best way you could under the circumstances?—Up to a certain time.

1688. Up to what time?—Up to the time when we had decided that there was no other course than to send the animals out to sea to be sunk; I made inquiries in order to ascertain how that could be carried out, and then I proceeded to consult the local authorities.

1689. When you proceeded to consult the local authorities, will you be kind enough to tell me what you did, did you write to them?—I had no time to write under those circumstances, as it was then Friday, and it was desirable to get rid of the carcasses as quickly as possible. I called at the Town Hall, but it was closed, it being too late; and I understood that the Town Clerk was expected at 9 o'clock on the following morning at his office, and I decided not to disturb him at night; I therefore waited until the following morning. On the Saturday morning I was waiting in my hotel for 9 o'clock to arrive, and I saw the town clerk coming into the railway station; I immediately went out at the back of the hotel, and met him on the platform, and told him the circumstances in which we were placed.

1690. Then it seems to have been more a matter of accident, than anything else, that my information was given to him upon the subject?—As it turned out it was an accident, but it was my intention to inform him and I did not intend to take any steps without seeing him.

1691. Chairman. If you had not seen him at the railway station, you would have gone to his office at nine o'clock?—Yes.

1692. Mr. Clay. You had previously decided as to the only course to be pursued?—The only possible course to be pursued.

1693. And you communicated that to the town clerk?—Yes.

1694. Not in the sense of asking his advice, but in the sense of giving him information which you supposed might have interested him?—I said, "I see no way of disposing of the carcasses, except sending them out to sea," and the answer I got was, "I am in a great hurry to catch this train; will you see Mr. Freeman and tell him to do what is necessary."

1695. Do you remember whether he said, "Do anything which may be legal"?—I have no objection to accept that interpretation, but I do not recollect the words. I will admit that very readily.

1696. Have you any recollection of saying, "In any case of this kind, you must not be too particular as to anything being exactly legal"?—I am quite ready to admit that I may have said it; it is just what I should say under those circumstances;

circumstances; but I have no recollection of it.

1997. Then you will admit that the local authorities are not responsible for the thing having been carried out in a bungling manner?—I think their officer was; he was sent with the carcasses.

1998. Was that Mr. Freeman?—No, it was one of the police sent by Mr. Freeman's direction; the whole thing was done by Mr. Freeman's direction, upon the statement made to him that he was authorised to act. I will make the remark, that it was only upon that assurance which he received from me, that he consented to act.

1999. Is it your opinion that in consequence of this bungling, that the infection was communicated to any place?—No, I do not believe that the slightest harm happened beyond what was involved in the expense of burying the carcasses subsequently.

2000. You agree with this, that it is impossible that any infection should have been propagated by the carcasses that were washed on shore?—I do not think that it is impossible that it should have been, but I agree that it was not.

2001. You say, that if cattle had been grazing upon the beach it might have been communicated?—Quite so; and if it had been we should have had the cattle plague in Lincolnshire to begin with, instead of in Yorkshire.

2002. I will ask you a question or two about the outbreak at Yapham; I believe you telegraphed to your department that there were three boats dismasted which had been bought at Hull?—At Yapham there were two originally.

2003. Was there a third afterwards?—There were several afterwards in the adjoining pastures.

2004. Which had been bought at Hull?—No, two of which were bought at Hull, and the remainder were in the adjoining pasture.

2005. Do you know when these were bought in Hull, and who they were bought of?—They were bought on July the 29th, by a hatcher at Farnington.

2006. Of whom?—I forget the name of the seller.

2007. Do you know whether they were imported cattle?—They were English cattle; they came from farms in the neighbourhood.

2008. In what way do you suppose that there could have been any disregard of your orders in this matter?—I do not believe there was any disregard of our orders in this matter at all.

2009. You consider that it was purely accidental?—Entirely so.

2010. Not being imported cattle it was nobody's duty to have given a certificate for them to pass, in order that they might so pass?—No, not at all.

2011. You have no cause of complaint upon that ground?—None whatever.

2012. I think I have gathered from you that the single cause of complaint against Hull, or at least the only one that has been officially communicated to the authorities was the complaint of the inspector, Freeman, as to the passage of these cattle over the North Eastern rails, and the general difficulties that attended the management of those affairs at the time?—That is the only official complaint that we received from our inspector. I should like to add that I have never

made any complaint myself upon the score of any intimation on the part of the local authorities; on the contrary, they have always professed themselves most anxious to do what could be done. The cases referred to are cases in which there has been some neglect to carry out the regulations, in which the officers of the local authorities is certainly responsible.

2013. You did not appear to be altogether satisfied with reference to the engagement under which the local authorities came when the last defined area was settled, that these undertakings were carried out with regard to the strict watching of the defined area?—I was perfectly satisfied from the absence of any evidence to the contrary, until I had received your statement that a number of persons had been prosecuted for infringing the regulations.

2014. Surely it may be taken for granted that that was anticipated as possible; otherwise you would not have required so many policemen to be employed?—Precisely so; it was the fact of its probability that constituted the objection to the new defined area.

2015. Still these men having carried out the purpose for which they were appointed, it can hardly be given as an instance that the local authority did not set up to their engagements?—I should hardly say that the local authorities did not set up to their engagements, but that they did not successfully carry them out.

2016. Mr. O'Connor. You stated, in answer to the Honourable Member for Carlisle, that you have found instances of cattle plague in Ireland?—I have.

2017. When was that?—In 1866.

2018. Did you go to Ireland specially for the purpose of looking into those cases?—I did.

2019. In what part of the country did you find them?—Within four miles of Lisburn.

2020. You found those cases?—I saw the cattle with the disease upon them.

2021. You have no doubt that it was real cattle plague?—There is no doubt about it.

2022. Was there any doubt expressed by the Irish authorities?—I believe my visit was the result of a doubt expressed by dealers and cattle owners in the country upon the point.

2023. You stated that the disease was also in the county Meath, near Enfield?—It was.

2024. You have no doubt that it was real cattle plague there as well as in Lisburn?—The evidence which I obtained in Meath led me to conclude that the disease was of such a nature that no hesitation would be permitted, and it was agreed with Professor Ferguson that it must be dealt with as cattle plague. We had no time to make further inquiry, as we were in the middle of a vast cattle district, and no doubt large numbers of cattle would have been sacrificed if we had not taken such measures as we did take.

2025. Did you find out how it came there?—No, it was quite inexplicable.

2026. Have you found any difficulty with the local authorities, or the farmers generally in stamping it out?—None. At the time of my visit they had become convinced that it was a serious matter, and that serious measures were necessary.

2027. And the result was that the disease was stamped out?—The disease was stamped out within two months after I arrived there.

2028. And you have heard of no other cases?—I have heard of none since.

Professor G. T. Brown.

24 March 1873.

Professor G. T. Brown. 2039. It was not sent back to England?—It was not.

24 March 1873. 2030. You stated that England gets animals from Ireland affected with pleuro-pneumonia to a considerable extent, but that you have no means of proving it?—We have reports from inspectors, and my own investigations in Cheshire, which convinced me that many of the outbreaks were traceable to cattle brought from Ireland.

2031. With regard to the foot and mouth disease, that is the disease, I believe, which you principally accuse Ireland of sending into this country?—Principally during the last two years.

2032. And you stated that you found it mostly in the port of Bristol?—Bristol is where I found it most, but it is equally bad in Liverpool, I believe.

2033. But I believe it was originally from the port of Bristol that it went to Ireland?—It was.

2034. In your report you state that the Bristol market is in a very unsatisfactory condition?—No, it is intended to in a better manner than any market that I know of all over the country.

2035. But you get more complaints of disease from the Bristol market?—It is a remarkable thing, that although more precautions have been taken to disinfect at Bristol, we have more complaints of that market than of all the other markets in England where they have taken no precautions whatever.

2036. You have no recommendation to make with regard to that, I believe?—No; I believe if anything is neglected it is the fault of the local inspector, the local authorities have given him full power.

2037. *Chairman.* But by that answer you do not mean to throw the blame upon the inspector?—No, I think he has done his best.

2038. Mr. O'Connor.] You stated that such regulations as you proposed, with regard to inspection on embarkation, would, in your opinion, tend to stop the trade of Ireland?—I believe it would tend to throw the store stock trade of Ireland into the hands of feeders. There is good reason to believe that it is desired that the store cattle in Ireland should not have a good sanitary reputation in this country, as the less the demand for them in this country, the cheaper the grazier can buy them in Ireland for the purpose of converting them into fat stock.

2039. You have a very considerable importation of store stock into England from Ireland, have you not?—There is a very large importation.

2040. It is a very valuable trade for this country, I believe?—It is.

2041. And also a very valuable trade for the people in Ireland?—It is.

2042. You have been in the grazing districts of Ireland a good deal, I believe?—I have.

2043. And you have observed that it is almost the only great trade of the country?—It is the great trade of the country.

2044. And anything which interfered with it would be a very serious matter to it indeed?—Yes.

2045. You stated that nothing less than the cattle plague restrictions, without the slaughtering of the animals, would stamp out the foot and mouth disease?—I think so.

2046. Such restrictions, I presume you think, would be intolerable to the farmer in England?—Unquestionably they would.

2047. And I presume they would be equally intolerable to farmers in Ireland?—I presume so; I would treat the whole stock of the United Kingdom in exactly the same way.

2048. You stated that cattle would live a very considerable time without water?—They will.

2049. And you qualified that by saying, "provided they were fed upon turnips"?—That was with regard to another question.

2050. If fed upon turnips, would not they live without any water at all?—Undoubtedly if they were fed upon turnips they would drink a very small quantity of water.

2051. So that that would be no test?—No.

2052. Mr. Kennaugh.] I think you said it was advisable that store stock cattle should not have a healthy reputation in this country?—I have reason to believe so.

2053. That it is advisable they should not have it?—Or that it is not advisable that they should; it is one and the same thing.

2054. In order that they might be bought more cheaply in Ireland for the purpose of fattening; is that your opinion?—I believe that that is the idea of the people in Ireland themselves.

2055. Is that your idea?—No, not at all.

2056. Mr. Deet.] You mean that the feeder in Ireland did not wish the store stock to have a good reputation in England?—That is so; he wishes to have them himself, in order to convert them into fat stock.

2057. Mr. Jacob Bright.] I understood you to state that there was an opinion that the foot and mouth disease had been brought to this country from Holland?—It is so stated.

2058. Is there any evidence upon that subject?—The chief evidence is that the disease had not been previously known in this country, and it certainly prevailed in Holland about the year 1838.

2059. Then supposing it to have come from Holland at that time, how could it have come over?—Only by animals being brought in for private purposes; milk cows probably. I presume they must have been smuggled in under those circumstances.

2060. Is there any evidence to show that animals did come in at that time?—I have not been able to discover such evidence, but it is stated that animals were brought over by a friend of the Dutch consul.

2061. Where is that stated?—I think it was stated in some evidence given by Professor Gamgee. I am not certain whether it refers to pleuro-pneumonia, or to the foot and mouth disease.

2062. You also stated it as your opinion that pleuro-pneumonia had been brought in from Holland in the same way?—In the same way. While I was in Ireland I endeavoured at Cork, and I had Professor Ferguson's assistance in the inquiry, and the aid of the constabulary, to gather some information as to the existence of these Dutch cattle in the town of Cork, to which they had been taken, but we could not find any evidence of it.

2063. There really is no evidence which would stand the test of examination, is there?—There appears not to be.

2064. If the disease did not come from Holland into England it probably did not come from any other country?—Pleuro-pneumonia was introduced

introduced into Ireland first undoubtedly, and from Ireland brought to this country.

2065. Still there is no evidence that you think of any value that it was introduced into Ireland from Holland?—There is no evidence that cattle were introduced into Ireland from Holland; the only evidence that disease was introduced is the fact that it existed in Holland first, and then appeared in Ireland.

2066. I think we understand that the evidence that it came from Holland into Cork is of small value; it is an inference only, is it not?—It is an inference.

2067. It is inferred, because the disease was in Holland at that time?—And it suddenly appeared in Cork.

2068. Do I understand you to say that it came from Cork or some other part of Ireland to England at that time?—Very shortly after that time it appeared in the London dairies.

2069. How soon afterwards?—I think that it appeared in Ireland in 1840, and it was present in the London dairies in 1841.

2070. At that time there were cattle in the London dairies brought from Ireland?—Yes, I think there were. I think its transmission from Ireland was traced with tolerable exactness.

2071. Was the disease nowhere else than in the London dairies?—Not at the time; it spread very rapidly, and very soon got to Scotland.

2072. The disease is supposed to have been transmitted from Cork to London, but not to any intermediate place?—There is no evidence of its having been seen at any intermediate place.

2073. How long would it take at that time for vessels to come from Cork to London?—In a sailing vessel it would take three or four days.

2074. Has there been as much disease (not speaking of the cattle plague, but of those milder diseases) in Ireland as in England of late years?—I think pleuro-pneumonia has prevailed in Ireland to probably about the same extent as it has in England.

2075. But I am speaking with reference to foot and mouth disease?—Foot and mouth disease has not been so prevalent there as in England.

2076. But foot and mouth disease has existed in Ireland?—It has existed in Ireland.

2077. And in many parts?—In many parts.

2078. Is it at all the case that during late years those diseases or any of them have been communicated to Ireland by any foreign countries?—No, I think not, because the foreign importation has been very limited.

2079. There is some foreign importation?—There is a small importation of Spanish cattle into Dublin, and those are taken for the purpose of slaughter, I believe.

2080. Has it ever been discovered that there has been disease amongst Spanish cattle?—We have found foot and mouth disease and pleuro-pneumonia, but very rarely.

2081. Chairman? Do you apply the words "very rarely," to foot and mouth disease as well as to pleuro-pneumonia?—I do.

2082. Mr. Jacob Bright? You stated that there had been cases of cattle plague in Ireland; in what part of Ireland was that?—Not very far from Belfast.

2083. Was that disease supposed to have been taken from this country?—It was supposed to have been taken from diseased animals in Scotland by persons who had been in contact with them.

0.53.

2084. Were the animals taken from Scotland into Ireland at that time?—I do not know that they were.

2085. The probability is that it was not communicated by any animal?—I think the probabilities are that it was communicated by individuals who were at the same time owners of cattle in Scotland and in Ireland.

2086. It is probable that the infection was not communicated from one animal to another?—Very probable indeed.

2087. The infliction of the most stringent prohibition upon animals would not have made any difference in that case?—The restrictions could not have been made more stringent than they were, for importation from Great Britain was entirely prohibited some time before.

2088. If we prohibited animals entirely from coming into this country, we should be liable to the cattle plague, should we not?—We should still incur the risk; the last outbreak occurred from animals which were never landed at all.

2089. With regard to the foot and mouth disease, you have given it very distinctly as your opinion that we should do either more or less?—I think so.

2090. I judge that you have a very strong opinion that we cannot do more?—I do not think that we can apply such regulations as I should consider effective.

2091. It is not remarkable that there should be disease and frequent disease, epidemic disease amongst cattle just as there is amongst human beings?—No, it is no more remarkable in the one case than in the other.

2092. With regard to human beings, I suppose it is the love of health and of life that is the chief motive for fighting against disease?—I presume so.

2093. Does not the law of property furnish a motive almost as strong on the part of the proprietor of property?—Judging from what I have seen, it furnishes a motive which is considerably stronger.

2094. Then if Government did nothing in regard to disease (I am not now speaking of cattle plague, because that stands out in a startling manner from the other diseases, but speaking of the milder diseases) should not that strong motive which the owner of cattle and people connected with agriculture feel generally, be expected in the long run to protect us almost as much as we can be protected from disease?—Practically it would very often fail to do so. I can say that from observations which I have made, particularly in the Bristol market, where animals upon each occasion on which I visited it, had been seized by the inspector, and placed upon one side of the market, where they could easily be seen, and it struck me to inquire whether in the face of this distinct advertisement of the presence of disease, any interference with the sale of stock was occasioned, and I found it was not so; and I inquired whether any individual had ever asked with reference to the particular lot of cattle from which the diseased cases were taken, and I was informed that such a question had never been asked.

2095. But if it had been very important to ask it, do not you think that it would have been asked?—I believe so, and the answers which I received were precisely those which I expected, because from my general observations over the country I have long come to the conclusion that

Mr.
G. F. Brown.

24 March
1873.

Professor
G. F. Bress.

14 March
1873.

the farmers really care nothing at all about the matter of foot and mouth disease.

2096. They do not think it of much importance to their interests?—I meant to say that they would not allow interference with the trade merely upon the ground that they incurred the risk of taking that disease to their farms.

2097. You stated that your interference had failed to a great extent; but surely the interference of the Government always fails to a large extent, does it not?—Yes.

2098. Does not it appear to you that if Government is to make itself responsible for the health of cattle with regard to those minor diseases, it is one way of undermining the independent action of farmers with regard to their own interests?—I do not think that it affects the interests of the farmers in the slightest degree; I mean by that, that the regulations which are insisted upon by the Act were never in the least degree respected.

2099. That is to say, the Government having done nothing, but having only appeared to do something, the farmers have necessarily to depend upon themselves, just the same as they ever had?—Precisely.

2100. Then if the Government did act energetically, and made its action felt, and the farmers felt that the Government was undertaking the care of their cattle with regard to all those minor diseases, is it not likely that they would take somewhat less independent care of themselves?—I believe they would meet the system by constant and systematic opposition, as I know they consider the disease of such minor importance as not to justify so much interference.

2101. I should judge that it is your opinion that if the Government would deal energetically with the cattle plague, and leave other diseases alone, the farmers upon the whole would not be dissatisfied?—I should include sheep-pox, certainly; and also pleuro-pneumonia, along with the cattle plague.

2102. You would include those diseases?—Yes; because they are both decidedly serious diseases.

2103. Sheep pox in foreign countries, I think, is treated differently from what I may call minor diseases?—Yes; it is always considered a serious matter, and districts are declared infected where it is known to exist.

2104. You think the conduct of the department with regard to the sheep pox up to this time has been right?—I think that the stringency of the measures ought to be increased.

2105. I think I understood the last witness to take a different view upon that question, and to think that it was a mistake to interfere, as the Government did now interfere, in regard to the sheep-pox; are you aware whether that is the fact?—I do not think that he holds that opinion.

2106. Lord R. Montagu.] You said that there was no evidence of the introduction of pleuro-pneumonia from Holland into Cork, but only an inference; is that because there are no records now existing to prove it; if so for what reason did you say that pleuro-pneumonia, in your opinion, was imported into Cork from Holland?—I conclude that, from the fact that pleuro-pneumonia existed previously upon the Continent, especially in Holland, immediately before

its sudden appearance in Cork, that it was in some way introduced from Holland.

2107. But there are no records existing now to prove that, and if any records were made at the time they have been lost?—We have not been able to discover them.

2108. But there are no records repugnant to that theory, I presume?—None. There is the fact that pleuro-pneumonia was known in Cork about that time. That fact was ascertained in 1866.

2109. Was the foot and mouth disease also imported into Cork?—That also was upon the Continent prevailing somewhat extensively before its appearance in England.

2110. Neither of those diseases were known to exist in the United Kingdom until after their existing abroad, and then they suddenly made their appearance in this country?—That is the case.

2111. It is known that some diseased cattle did come over from abroad?—It is asserted so, but we have never been able to obtain positive evidence of it.

2112. I believe, according to the present rules with regard to cattle from all scheduled countries, there are 21 ports where they now can arrive, and at which they must be killed?—That is the case.

2113. Chairman.] The Report of 1870 gives 32 ports altogether?—There are 21 ports where there are defined parts.

2114. Lord R. Montagu.] Wherever they are landed they must be killed if they come from scheduled countries, must they not?—Yes; at page 32 you will find the ports specified; those which have defined parts are marked with an asterisk.

2115. There are 32 ports in Great Britain where foreign animals may be landed, but there are 21 ports only at which foreign animals from scheduled countries may be landed, and there they must be killed?—That is so.

2116. I am aware that Belgium now is one of the scheduled countries; but before it was scheduled was there, and is there now, any considerable export of cattle from Belgium?—A very small number of live cattle are exported from Belgium.

2117. Belgium seldom exports more than she imports?—I believe not.

2118. So that, in fact, it comes to this, that the cattle merely pass through Belgium?—It is so.

2119. But the Belgian cattle are not exported?—They are not exported.

2120. Is there any great export of live cattle from Holland to England?—The export is considerable.

2121. Is there any export from Sweden and Norway to England?—There is.

2122. Is it to a considerable extent?—I think it is to a considerable extent; I do not know the number, but I believe it is mentioned in the Report.

2123. Then it comes to this, that the only cattle which do not come here for immediate death come either from Schleswig-Holstein, from Spain and Portugal, from Holland, or from Sweden and Norway?—Those coming from Schleswig-Holstein are only landed in ports where there are defined parts.

2124. That leaves only Spain, Portugal, Holland, Sweden, and Norway?—Yes, and Denmark.

2125. Would the total import from those countries

countries into this country be very considerable in the year?—I believe that it is very considerable.

2126. What happens to the beasts that come from those countries?—They are landed at certain ports not in the defined ports, and detained for 12 hours at least. On landing, or as soon after as convenient, they are seen by the veterinary inspectors, and on the termination of a 12 hours' detention they are examined again during daylight, after which, if they are certified to be healthy, they cease to be deemed foreign cattle.

2127. Then they may go inland?—They may be dealt with exactly as English stock.

2128. Are those store stock?—Some of them are; chiefly I should say those coming from Holland.

2129. Would you say that the majority are store stock?—I think not.

2130. Are the foreign store stock ever worth anything?—I believe the Netherlands stock are estimated as milk cows.

2131. They are only milk cows, and not for fattening?—Not for fattening.

2132. With the exception of milk cows there are very few cattle that come from abroad to England which are not killed at once?—A certain proportion of the sheep and horned stock that are nearly fat, are brought by feeders for the purpose of getting rid of surplus food, and they are kept until they can sell them in a good market; and in that sense a number of those animals coming from free countries may be looked upon as store stock, although they are fat enough for killing when they come.

2133. Do you consider that there is absolute or very great security in this system; I will put a case before you: supposing that cattle in some of those unscheduled countries become contaminated by contact either with diseased cattle or infected trucks, I suppose the farmers there would instantly send them over to the English market to be sold, as was the case in the Dutch outbreak in Friesland in 1857 or 1858, when they were all sent over for sale and distributed, and about a week afterwards the Dutch Government telegraphed to our Government to beware of those cattle?—That is so with regard to the farmers.

2134. Do you think that is likely to happen under the present system?—I think it is likely to be avoided now as we have guarantees from the countries under the schedule that they will not import or allow the transit of cattle through their dominions, or allow their entrance until they have passed quarantine.

2135. Do you think they will fulfil those guarantees?—I have no evidence which will enable me to speak to that.

2136. Do these guarantees which you are speaking of apply to Holland, Sweden, Norway, and Denmark?—I believe they apply to Holland and Denmark.

2137. Then there are no guarantees given by the Governments of Sweden and Norway, or by the Governments of Spain and Portugal?—No, I believe not.

2138. Chairman.] Neither of those countries, Spain, Portugal, Sweden or Norway, are importing countries, I suppose?—They are not.

2139. Lord R. Montagu.] I believe in the beginning of 1858, Spanish cattle were not allowed to be imported into the United Kingdom because of the epidemic of pleuro-pneumonia.

which existed at Santander in Spain; are you aware that that was the case?—I do not remember that any prohibition existed upon that occasion. I remember that the Spanish cattle had the disease.

2140. In the answer that you made to the Honourable Member for Manchester just now, you stated that you thought the love of property would be sufficient security; did you refer there to a security against importing disease, or against cattle which already are in this country taking diseases?—I understood the Honourable Member to refer to the influence those motives would have in inducing the owner or purchaser of cattle to take every precaution which he possibly could take without reference to any particular infectious disease.

2141. But in the case of the foreign importer, or foreign cattle trader, he would not care in the least what happened afterwards to the English cattle, so that the love of property would be no protection to the British farmer against the importation of foreign disease?—I think that if the farmer found out that the introduction of disease was due to a recent importation of foreign cattle, the trade would be likely to be interfered with.

2142. So that the suspension of the foreign cattle trade may be said to be held in *terreus* over the foreign importer?—I believe that foreign importers know that to be so, and with good reason.

2143. If a foreign Government, which either had or had not given the guarantee, were to be careless and to allow the disease to get into our country, or if foreign importers were by some means to bring in diseased cattle, I suppose those countries would be scheduled, and the import of any cattle from them, except for immediate slaughter, would be entirely prohibited?—I suppose that that would be the result.

2144. That would be a great shock to the trade, would it not?—It would, no doubt.

2145. A great trade would receive a sudden shock by that means?—It would.

2146. And it might be very difficult for us to obtain any supplies from other sources for a time, might it not?—It might be difficult to do so.

2147. If it was found that slaughtering at the port was not a great injury to the import trade of foreign cattle, would it not be better to make one rule, namely, for the slaughter of all foreign cattle at the ports of landing, rather than throw the trade out of gear in that manner?—If there is fair ground for concluding that the import trade would not suffer in consequence.

2148. Then you would say so?—Then I would say so.

2149. I suppose the prices of meat depend upon the amount of importation; if there is a large importation of meat, the price would be low in proportion, would it not?—Not to the consumer.

2150. I refer to the wholesale price in the market?—I should imagine that it would have some effect in reducing the wholesale prices.

2151. Are you aware that the prices of meat in the Manchester, Birmingham, and London markets actually fell after the slaughtering orders?—It was alleged that the price of meat in some of those markets was actually increased on account of those restrictions, and the Lords of the Council were asked to remove them on that account.

Professor
G.T. Brown.
24 March
1873.

2152. Will you look at those papers, and say who wrote them and signed them (*Handing over Papers to the Witness*)?—I signed them both.

2153. Will you look at the wholesale prices of meat in those papers; one refers to Manchester and the other to Birmingham; these are the prices in 1868, I believe?—Yes, they are.

2154. I believe you were sent down to those places before the Bill of 1868 was brought into the House, in order to ascertain the effect upon the price of meat of those slaughtering orders?—It was in consequence of an application for the removal of those restrictions.

2155. And I think you found that the prices of meat actually fell after the slaughtering orders?—I found that there had been very little variation for a considerable number of years in the wholesale prices.

2156. Will you read out the prices upon the first page?—In 1864 beef was from 5d. to 7½d. per lb. In 1865 it was from 5d. to 8½d.; in 1866, from 5½d. to 8½d.; in 1867, from 5½d. to 8d.; and in 1868, from 4½d. to 7½d.

2157. That is with regard to Manchester?—Yes, that is with regard to Manchester.

2158. With regard to Birmingham; that follows the same rule, does it not?—In Birmingham in 1864 the price of beef was from 5d. to 7½d.; in 1865 it was from 5½d. to 7½d.; in 1866, from 5d. to 8½d.; in 1867, from 5½d. to 7½d.; and in 1868, from 5d. to 7½d.

2159. Now with regard to London, we will take the Metropolitan Market; will you give the Committee the prices in that market?—In 1860 the average wholesale price of beef at the market was from 5½d. to 7½d.; in 1861 it was from 5½d. to 7½d.; in 1862, from 5½d. to 6½d.; in 1863 it was from 5½d. to 7½d.; in 1864 it was from 5½d. to 7½d.; in 1865 it was from 6½d. to 7½d.; in 1866, from 5½d. to 7½d.; in 1867 it was 4½d. to 7½d.; and in four months of 1868 it was 4½d. to 7½d.

2160. That Return does not go beyond that year, does it?—It does not.

2161. The blue Paper, I think, refers to various periods in 1865, 1866, and 1867 (*Handing the same to the Witness*)?—Yes.

2162. Will you tell me whether you observe that there is also a falling off in the Metropolitan Market at the time of the slaughtering orders?—In the wholesale prices there certainly was.

2163. Then we come to this result, that either the slaughtering orders did not affect the price of meat at all, or if they did, they made the price of meat fall?—Those Returns go to show that the slaughtering order rather reduced the wholesale price of meat.

2164. If it had any effect at all, it rather reduced the price of meat, but it certainly did not raise it?—Not according to those Returns.

2165. Is it true that the meat of foreign cattle is very inferior to the meat of English cattle?—I have certainly had as good meat in various parts of the Continent as I ever had in England.

2166. But I refer to meat that is brought to England?—No; I think the cattle from Tonning, the German beasts, and the Bremen beasts are all of a very excellent quality.

2167. Those are exceptions to the general rule, are they not?—They constitute the principal portion of the imports.

2168. Is it the rule that foreign cattle are equal to English cattle?—I should say that the

foreign cattle from those countries are equal to any but the very best English stock.

2169. How is it then that the foreign stock is always so much cheaper than English?—I do not believe that to the consumer it is any cheaper at all.

2170. But to the buyer?—The difference, I believe, is not very great.

2171. Is it true, as was proved before the Committee in 1868, that the foreign beast goes entirely to the carcass butcher and the contractor?—I believe foreign cattle are bought by every butcher in London, with very few, if any, exceptions.

2172. Would a butcher in the West-end refuse to do so?—I never found a butcher in my life who would confess to it; but we have found from our Returns that there are only three or four butchers in London who do not buy it; and foreign cattle even go into the neighbourhood of Broad-street.

2173. Then there is a reluctance to confess it?—Yes.

2174. Of the foreign cattle imported, the great majority come to the port of London, do they not?—Yes.

2175. In 1862 I find that the proportion which came to London was 78 per cent., and that in 1867 the proportion was 70 per cent.?—Yes.

2176. Or including Southampton and Harwich, the proportion was 74 per cent. in that year?—Yes.

2177. I wish to ask you some questions which I asked Dr. Williams, with regard to a comparison of the losses from imported diseases, and the amount of import; there is a Paper in the office which I believe you and Professor Simonds compiled, from which it appears that the number of cattle lost from contagious diseases other than cattle plague, between July 1842 and December 1867, was 1,275,000?—Yes, that is so.

2178. The losses from cattle plague during two years up to 1867 were 290,527?—I believe that is correct.

2179. So that the total number that died of imported disease between July 1842 and December 1867 were 1,565,527?—That is correct.

2180. The total import into the United Kingdom during the same period was 2,530,396?—That is correct.

2181. So that the losses were about three-fifths of the total importation?—Yes.

2182. Now let me ask you a few questions with regard to this report of Professor Gamgee to the Privy Council in 1862; do you find that a correct report?—I do not believe that the estimate which he gives of the losses is correct; he takes 5 per cent. upon the whole stock of the country, I believe, or something like that.

2183. If I give you some of the numbers will you tell me where they are incorrect, as far as you are able to do so; Professor Gamgee says that the average annual import of foreign cattle into the United Kingdom from 1853 to 1860 was 92,172, and that the loss to all cattle during the same period from imported diseases was 375,200?—No, I do not believe there are any means whatever of obtaining the numbers.

2184. Then he states that the actual number imported from 1853 to 1860 was 553,043, while the total loss from disease other than cattle plague was 2,265,100; do you believe that is also incorrect?—I believe that also is entirely incorrect with respect to the losses from disease, but perhaps

perhaps his figures for the imports would be obtained correctly from the Customs.

2185. Could you give the Committee any idea of the number?—We could only calculate it from our own observations, and the conclusion was that the losses would amount to about 1 per cent. of the whole stock in the country from diseases other than cattle plague.

2186. During what period?—From 1842 to 1857.

2187. Mr. Ridley.] Do I understand from your evidence, and from your report, that with regard to the Irish traffic you do not see your way to any regulation being made either at the ports of embarkation or debarkation?—Unless some arrangements could be made for detaining the animals, I do not think any security could be obtained.

2188. The same observation would apply to quarantine, would it not?—I believe it would.

2189. Does that remark apply to inspection at the port of departure from Ireland?—To both ports, certainly.

2190. You say that an inspection in Ireland would be of no use at the port of embarkation unless the cattle were sent back to where they were taken from, or detained in the event of disease?—Or detained in the event of disease near the landing place.

2191. You think that sending these cattle back again would be almost impossible?—Of course they would spread the disease.

2192. And that would be undesirable?—It would be undesirable.

2193. With regard to Irish traffic, do you think that regulations might be made for the better disinfecting of vessels, and that nothing could be done beyond that?—I think those regulations might easily be made, but at the same time I do not believe that that would have much effect in stopping disease here as long as diseased animals were sent over.

2194. I gather from your evidence with regard to Irish traffic, as well as to the home-moving of stock, that as respects the foot and mouth disease you have no suggestion to make?—I think that nothing short of a strong system of restriction would be effective, otherwise I suggest complete abandonment of active legislation on the subject.

2195. In the event of restriction being adopted, do you think it desirable that a power of entry should be given to the inspectors, upon the private lairs of salesmen?—I think, unless there were some serious reason, the proceeding would not be accepted with any favour.

2196. Do you think it would be practicable to have a system of registration as a safeguard?—I think so.

2197. Do you mean at the lairs before the cattle are taken into the market?—Yes.

2198. You think that might be possible?—Yes, I think it might be done.

2199. Do you think it would be desirable?—Yes, I think it would be desirable?—I think a proper inspection of the places where cattle are kept is very desirable, and I believe in London the sanitary inspectors have power of entry into places where the cattle are.

2200. Greater powers are given in London than in the provinces?—I am not aware whether this power exists in the provinces, or not.

2201. Do you think it would be possible to improve the means which the local authorities have

of following the animals, so as to know who buys them?—I think that would involve a very large number of officers.

2202. As regards the transit of animals, has it come under your observation that cattle and sheep are put in the same truck without partitions between them?—I never saw cattle and sheep put in the same truck.

2203. Do you think that that is not done?—I do not think it is ever done, except upon a very rare occasion, when a man might want to do it for his own private convenience.

2204. Do you know whether it is the practice of the local authorities in any place to send some inspector of their own to see that the railway companies carry out the Order of Council with regard to the disinfection of the trucks?—I am not aware of that.

2205. Are you aware that that is the case in Northumberland?—I am not aware that that is so.

2206. Do you think it would be worth while for the local authorities to spend money in seeing that the system was carried out?—If the system were well carried out, I think that the money would be very well spent.

2207. Sir H. Stables-Bolton.] Have you at all considered the system of entirely doing away with our system of scheduled countries for foreign imports?—I have not looked at the question in that light.

2208. Do you think it is necessary, for the protection of our cattle from disease, to continue treating those countries which are so treated, as scheduled countries?—Yes, I think so.

2209. But in consequence of the difficulty of ascertaining the districts from which the cattle are brought from abroad, and seeing that we are never protected by inspection at the ports of embarkation from the introduction of disease, in that case would it not be better to limit the number of those ports which at present exist as ports where scheduled cattle can be introduced into this country?—I believe it would be beneficial to do so.

2210. By doing so you would get a better inspection, and better areas at those ports which were left for the introduction of cattle?—The limit which I should set would depend on the accommodation which the port would afford. I should allow cattle to be landed in all those ports where they could show that they had prepared proper accommodation for the landing of the cattle, lairage, and the destruction of the carcasses.

2211. You think it would be important, in a port where cattle were to be landed from scheduled countries, that they should comply with the rules of the central authority, bringing themselves very much into the position that London occupies with regard to the Deptford market?—As far as possible that should be done.

2212. At present very few of the ports satisfy those conditions?—Very few indeed.

2213. Do you believe that the expense which would be incurred at those ports, to supply such requirements in proportion to the trade of the port, would be so heavy as to make it impossible to comply with it?—I believe it would in some cases, and I presume that Liverpool would be one, judging from statements which were made to me when I made suggestions to them upon the occasion of my visit there.

2214. Is there any large import from the scheduled countries into Liverpool?—Only of sheep; and the Order which placed the German

Professor
G. T. Brown.

24 March
1873.

Professor
G.T. Brown,
24 March
1873

sheep in the Schedule stopped the importation of them altogether into Liverpool; that Order, I may say, is now revoked.

2215. During the time the Order existed it stopped the importation altogether, did it not?—Altogether.

2216. You say that it would be impossible in such a place as Liverpool to comply with the regulations?—Yes, I think so.

2217. Is that from the difficulty of getting ground upon which to carry out their defined area?—There is no ground near the landing-places which is not already occupied; and from the annual value of those sheds which are prepared for the reception of ordinary merchandise, it appeared that it would not answer the purpose of the Dock Company to devote those sheds, even if they were suitable, for the purpose.

2218. Would it not be possible to make a part of the town, and an area outside the town, a defined area?—That would shut up a number of roads upon which there is a large and extensive traffic of animals of all sorts.

2219. Does that difficulty present itself in all the ports?—No; generally there is a possibility of making the necessary arrangements if money were no object.

2220. But when you say if money was no object, does not that objection increase immensely, owing to the fact of ground having to be taken close to the river or sea frontage, which is necessarily very valuable?—That is so.

2221. Could not such an area be set apart further inland?—The great objection would be the removing of the animals from the landing places into the defined area.

2222. Do you believe that it would be impossible at such a place as Hull, for example, to separate a certain portion of the town, leading up to a district outside the town, in which you could prevent the circulation of animals, and create a proper defined area?—I believe that at one end of the Promenade there is some vacant ground, which is close to the river bank, where a landing stage, and other appliances, could be erected.

2223. The only objection which seems to be made by the corporation, or the local authority there, is that they have an existing defined area where they have erected lairs, and other conveniences?—That is the objection.

2224. But you believe it possible that they might create an area which would meet the requirements of the Privy Council with regard to giving a separate market?—It is quite possible.

2225. At present there is no question that, dependent as you are upon instructions being carried out by the local authorities at the different ports, they are not carried out as well as they might be by a regular system of inspection extending to those ports?—I believe they are not.

2226. I should like to ask you a question with regard to the establishment of inspectors at the ports of embarkation from Ireland; do you think that there it would be impossible to arrive in that way at some security against the introduction of diseased animals?—I believe that all the inspector could do would be to keep the diseased animals in his charge, and let the others go. I do not think that that precaution would be worth anything at all.

2227. What I meant was, would it be possible

to arrive at such a defined area at the port of embarkation upon not such expensive ground as the centre of a town would be, where you would stop cattle and get your inspection and examination over, ground upon which you could really create a market; ground which would be less expensive than if you had to take buildings?—That would be possible, but it would also involve a quarantine station, and during the greater part of the year disease would be actually present.

2228. Do you not think it would be less dangerous than taking away all restrictions?—It would render the place useless during the time that any disease existed, as you could not bring healthy animals into it without great risk of giving the disease to them.

2229. You think that you would leave restrictions as to the foot and mouth disease more to the interest of the people concerned than to the Government?—That is my impression.

2230. You would not include pleuro-pneumonia in that?—Certainly not. I should try to get rid of pleuro-pneumonia.

2231. Would you put that in the same category as the cattle plague?—Not to the same extent, so far as the restrictions are concerned, but I should consider it of great importance to apply sufficient restrictions to get rid of the disease.

2232. You would recommend slaughter in the case of diseased animals?—Yes.

2233. Not to those which were brought into contact with them?—Not necessarily to those which were brought into contact with them.

2234. Can you tell me with regard to another question, which you answered early in the day, as to the journey and the increased accommodation to be given to animals, I understood you to say that there had been communication made by the railway companies with reference to the additional cost it would involve to provide water and other conveniences at certain stations for animals, did that calculation show what additional cost per head would be charged?—I think that the whole evidence was brought out by a Select Committee which sat about two years ago, and I believe all those points are referred to in their Reports.

2235. You cannot say whether it was an appreciable addition to the amount which must be charged for the transit of animals?—I am of opinion that it would not be a serious addition, but I am certain that it would be made the foundation of an increased charge.

2236. I suppose what was suggested, namely, that the animals could be watered at the stations upon one side of the truck, would not be sufficient from the manner in which the cattle are packed?—Not on one side of the truck; it must be on both sides.

2237. The ships that you have described as bringing the Spanish cattle, and as being so much superior, carry other cargo as well as cattle, I presume?—Yes; they carry general cargo as well.

2238. That would be a disadvantage in the import from scheduled countries, would it not?—The same thing occurs at nearly all the ports.

2239. But at the port of London the ships are chiefly fitted up for the cattle trade, I believe?—They are.

2240. Is there anything to prevent the ships trading to the port of London being fitted up

upon the same principle as the Spanish ships are fitted up?—They are fitted up upon the same principle to a certain extent, but the great difficulty is that they carry so many more cattle.

2241. I understood you to say that the great advantage on board the vessels carrying Spanish cattle was that the cattle were divided into small compartments?—That is one advantage and they also carry a very small number.

2242. You also stated that the ventilation was better on board vessels carrying Spanish cattle?

—Practically, because there are a smaller number of animals to contaminate the air, for example, 100 animals instead of 600.

2243. And you do not know of any means of improving the ventilation on board the Spanish ships?—I think ventilation could be very much

improved in all vessels by means of fans, or by some other means, which an engineer could devise.

2244. Do you not believe that it would be an advantage to importers to afford the same amount of comfort as is enjoyed on board the Spanish boats?—I should rest my recommendation mainly upon the ground of increased comfort to the animals.

2245. And you would hardly deny that disease is more likely to be taken by an animal jaded and worn out, and heated, than it is by a sound animal?—Decidedly; but I was about to add that I should not expect an animal to be exposed to contagious disease on arriving in this country.

2246. They would come over for the purpose of being slaughtered?—Yes, they would.

Professor
G.T. Evans.

24 March
1873.

Thursday, 27th March 1873.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mr. James Barclay.
Mr. Jacob Bright.
Mr. Curley.
Mr. Clay.
Mr. Dent.
Mr. Dodson.
Mr. William Edward Forster.
Mr. Kavanagh.

Mr. Leek.
Mr. Mousell.
Mr. O'Connor.
Mr. Pell.
Mr. Clark Read.
Mr. Ridley.
Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbelson.
Mr. Tipping.

THE RIGHT HONOURABLE WILLIAM EDWARD FORSTER, IN THE CHAIR.

Professor GEORGE THOMAS BROWN, called in; and further Examined.

Professor
G. T. Brown.
27 March
1873.

2247. Mr. Barclay. In speaking of the transit of animals, I gathered that it was your opinion that on a railway journey, not exceeding 36 hours, any advantage which was likely to arise from watering the cattle was likely to be more than balanced by the delay occasioned in consequence?—I think that any advantage which might arise from watering cattle during such a journey, would be chiefly upon the score of the animals' comfort. I do not think that the difficulty which would be incurred in providing the necessary arrangements, would be compensated for by the comparatively small advantage.

2248. And the delay in giving the water?—Quite so; I include that among the difficulties.

2249. The drovers are generally of this opinion also, I believe?—Not only drovers, but persons of considerable practical knowledge.

2250. The cattle could not be watered from the outside in the existing trucks with their present construction?—Certainly not.

2251. The cattle cannot get their heads outside the trucks to drink?—No.

2252. In your opinion, would it be a very considerable advantage to have all the cattle trucks covered over?—Certainly; all trucks used for carrying animals should be protected upon the top.

2253. It would be a very great advantage to protect them from the rain and snow in winter, and the sun in summer?—Yes, certainly it would.

2254. And to have the sides of the trucks open?—Yes, for ventilation.

2255. Speaking of diseased meat, do you know of any well authenticated case in which any serious consequences have happened from eating diseased meat?—I am not aware of any case in which ill consequences have arisen from eating meat which would be passed by a meat inspector.

2256. Do you know of any case?—Not of my own knowledge, but there are plenty of cases recorded in which injuries have arisen from eating animals which have died of certain blood diseases; but in such cases the protection would be the fact of the meat being, even in appearance, altogether unfit for use.

2257. Have you any doubt whether the disappearance of the foot and mouth disease in this country in 1866, was solely due to the Cattle Plague Restrictions then in force?—The only evidence is in the fact. Of course it is possible that the disease might have died out, as it has in all the previous outbreaks, after a certain time of prevalence.

2258. Then with reference to foot and mouth disease, I understand that it is your opinion that by sufficiently stringent restrictions, the disease might be exterminated in this country, but that really the enforcing of such restrictions as would be required is not practicable?—I am very doubtful if even the severe restrictions which I refer to would have the effect of exterminating the disease, but I am certain that nothing less stringent would have any chance of doing so.

2259. And that it is not practicable to carry the restrictions into effect?—I should say not.

2260. You would recommend, as regards the disease existing in this country, that it should be left alone so far as regards active dealing with it?—Precisely.

2261. The clauses in the Act referring to it, making it penal to move animals infected with this disease remaining in force?—Precisely.

2262. Is the disease likely to grow milder and gradually exhaust itself?—Judging from previous experience, it is likely to grow milder, and to assume what may be termed its normal state of prevalence.

2263. It is a common law of contagious diseases generally that they generally exhaust themselves?—Especially of those which assume an epidemic or epizootic form.

2264. Is this likely to result if we have continually fresh importations of the disease from abroad?—No; but it is not intended to allow the unrestricted movement of diseased animals from abroad.

2265. Assuming that we were going to abolish the restrictions upon the importation of foreign cattle, would foot and mouth disease be likely to die out in that case?—Certainly not; because it happens that while a disease is only existing in this country to a limited extent, it prevails extensively upon the continent, and under

under those circumstances, we should lose all the advantages which we had gained by the natural subsidence of the disease.

2266. Then, as regards the importation, you would maintain the present restrictions as regards foot and mouth disease?—Speaking generally, I should say yes; but there might be some slight modification in details necessary.

2267. You have seen in Dr. Williams's Report that 2*l.* a head is estimated as the fair average of loss on all animals attacked by the foot and mouth disease; do you think that that is a fair estimate of the loss?—It is a thing which it is very difficult to speak positively upon, because the loss must vary so very much under different circumstances.

2268. What is the duration of an attack?—Of an ordinary attack, about 10 days.

2269. Will the animal have recovered at the end of 10 days?—In the case where the disease assumes its ordinary mild form all the active symptoms would have subsided by the end of 10 days.

2270. Taking the case of milk cows, within what time, for instance, would a cow recover her milk in an average case?—It would vary from six weeks to three or four months.

2271. Then there would be a loss of milk in the case of milk cows for six weeks at least?—Of a certain portion for that time; I estimated that the course of the disease through a large dairy would involve a loss of about one-third of the whole quantity of milk which should have been produced if the animals had remained healthy for that time, but in all the cases the disease assumed a mild form.

2272. The loss is also very considerable in the case of fat cattle?—Decidedly it is.

2273. It would keep them back from the market from two to three months?—Assuming that they were at the time in a condition fit for the market.

2274. It would throw them back for two or three months?—It would certainly.

2275. In the case of milk cows and fat cattle, or cattle approaching to maturity, the loss by disease would be at least over 2*l.* per head?—If the cattle were sold immediately after the termination of the disease, the loss, I should say, would be considerably more than 2*l.* per head.

2276. Then according to the statistics for 1871, there were over 500,000 animals attacked in this country, which would bring the loss to over a million sterling, assuming 2*l.* per head as the estimated loss?—Assuming 2*l.* as the estimated loss per head.

2277. And according to the Tables published in the Report, the total importation of live cattle and sheep from abroad is valued at five and one-third million sterling?—No doubt that is correct.

2278. Now with regard to the importation of cattle from Ireland, you are in favour, I understand, of inspection at the port of shipment?—Only on condition that certain arrangements are made which will enable the cargo to be detained in the event of disease being discovered.

2279. But those cattle are brought up to the shipping port, or to the steamer in separate lots, are they not?—They are.

2280. Then assuming that pleuro-pneumonia was discovered in one of those lots, would you propose that the animal should be slaughtered?—Certainly, I should propose that an animal

affected with pleuro-pneumonia should always be slaughtered as quickly as possible.

2281. And supposing an animal was discovered in one of those lots affected by the foot and mouth disease, what would you suggest?—I do not see that any advantage would be gained by merely detaining or slaughtering that one animal, because the majority of the others must certainly have the disease some few days afterwards.

2282. Would you be disposed to stop the shipment of the lot in which the disease occurred?—If I took any steps at all, I should certainly detain the whole cargo.

2283. As soon as they are shipped, this lot of cattle, some of the animals of which we assume to be diseased, become mixed with the whole cargo?—They do.

2284. If you were an owner of cattle on board the steamer, would you consider that there was an injustice being done to you in the fact of these cattle being shipped along with yours?—Unless I was aware of the risk, and sent my cattle with a full knowledge of it, I should consider myself aggrieved, certainly.

2285. You would not like to send your cattle with a knowledge that foot and mouth disease was on board the steamer?—As a matter of personal preference I should not, but as a fact, the majority of cattle dealers do so, I believe, with the full knowledge of the risk.

2286. You imagine that they do?—I imagine so.

2287. A farmer, knowing that pleuro-pneumonia existed amongst his stock, would be willing to sell to the dealers?—The diseased animals he would.

2288. And probably the whole herd he might be willing to sell at a rather lower price?—I am not very certain that he would consider it desirable to make much sacrifice, as he would have before him the probability of the rest of the animals escaping.

2289. But supposing a farmer in Ireland has reason to suspect that there is pleuro-pneumonia in his herd, he would be inclined to dispose of his stock upon more advantageous terms to dealers than if he were quite satisfied of their soundness?—Probably he would.

2290. Then, in such a case, if there was an inspection at the port of shipment and there was a risk that they would be discovered, and, if found diseased, slaughtered, that would act as a deterrent upon the dealer, would it not?—Not to any extent, as he would only send those animals which were apparently healthy at the time.

2291. But, assuming that there were inspection at the port of shipment, would not there be some grounds for anticipating that, at various stages of the disease, the disease would be discovered by an inspector at the port of shipment?—There is always the probability of discovery.

2292. That would act, to a certain extent, as a deterrent upon a dealer engaging in that traffic?—To a certain extent it would, no doubt.

2293. You mean in this traffic of diseased cattle?—I understand your question to apply to animals which were not at the time suffering from disease.

2294. But which were at the time in a herd in which the disease existed?—Quite so.

2295. If the dealer suspected that there was disease in this herd, would it be any hardship to have the cattle slaughtered at the port of shipment,

Professor
G. T. Evans.
27 March
1873.

Professor
G. T. Brown.

27 March
1873.

ment, if detected?—Not if he bought them with the suspicion of disease being among them at the time.

2296. Would it not be a greater hardship to the other buyers to have their cattle shipped along with those that were suspected of being diseased?—Decidedly.

2297. If this restriction were imposed, would it not have the effect of raising the price of Irish cattle considerably?—It would have the effect of raising the price of Irish store stock in this country; but, as I have stated, that is exactly what the Irish graziers would wish.

2298. They would wish to buy the store stock cheap and convert them into fat stock?—Yes.

2299. That is not the interest of the Irish farmers, is it?—It is the interest of those who have large grazing grounds.

2300. But who are not breeders?—But who are not breeders.

2301. Do you know whether they breed more cattle than they can feed in Ireland?—I think they do, a great many more.

2302. But still, the smaller the price in this country, of course the smaller it would be in Ireland?—To the feeder, certainly.

2303. Therefore, although they do export a large quantity of store cattle, insecurity as to the health of the animals in this country affects the price in Ireland?—Undoubtedly it must do so.

2304. The Bedfordshire Quarter Sessions passed a resolution some short time ago, in which they called upon the Privy Council to make certain experiments; that resolution is to this effect: that the Privy Council should make experiments with a few cargoes of cattle from Ireland, by keeping such animals in quarantine both before shipment and subsequent to their landing, in order to test the belief widely entertained, that foot and mouth disease, and pleuro-pneumonia can be, and are, generated on board ship; do you think, without taking into account the trouble and expense, that such experiments could be carried out with any practical advantage or practical results?—Unless they were extended over a very long time, and carried out under an exceedingly strict supervision, the results would not be in any way reliable.

2305. A few cargoes would not serve for that purpose?—Certainly not.

2306. Even if they were in quarantine both before and after shipment, and if disease broke out in quarantine on this side, it would be impossible to determine where the animal caught the infection?—Under present circumstances it would be quite impossible.

2307. Would it be practicable, under any circumstances almost that you can conceive, to determine it with any accuracy?—It would be hardly practicable, because an outbreak under those circumstances would be no more mysterious than others which constantly occur in the United Kingdom, and which cannot be traced to any direct infection.

2308. Then I suppose that those who have a professional and practical acquaintance with the subject, have no doubt that pleuro-pneumonia and foot and mouth disease are not generated on board ship?—Certainly not, in the absence of the germs of disease.

2309. That is to say, disease does not originate under the circumstances which happen on board ship under any known conditions?—There is

positive evidence of that in the fact that in certain seasons we get a number of animals weak by weak perfectly healthy, although they are exposed to the same hardships, and suffer as much as those which are assumed to take the disease in consequence.

2310. Have you any doubt that pleuro-pneumonia, foot and mouth disease, and cattle plague have all been imported into this country?—I have only the fact that the disease existed previously on the Continent.

2311. Have you any doubt upon the subject yourself?—I have no more doubt than I have with regard to the other diseases which have come to us from the east.

2312. Cholera, for example?—Cholera, for example.

2313. And I suppose that there can be no doubt that these diseases have caused a very serious loss in this country?—No doubt, whatever.

2314. The figures given previous to the publication of statistics by your Department are not any very reliable guide with regard to the loss?—I have no idea how the information could possibly have been obtained; we have been entirely unable to obtain any information which could be depended on.

2315. Do you think it would be practicable for farmers, by any precautions that they could take to keep clear of these diseases, without any legislation?—Not entirely so, unless they followed the practice of supporting their own herds by breeding, and not bringing in any fresh stock without subjecting it to quarantine.

2316. You think that if all the farmers were to do that, and no cattle were imported into any county, that would be the result of what you propose?—What I propose would only apply to certain farms.

2317. Notwithstanding that, a farmer might have cattle plague upon his farm?—No doubt.

2318. Cases have been known in those counties where there was very little importation?—Yes; cases have been known in those counties which do not import to any extent. Of course, the importation of a single diseased animal would upset the whole scheme.

2319. If cattle plague and pleuro-pneumonia were imported into this country, we might count upon a serious loss being caused to the country?—Yes, if animals from all parts of the Continent were allowed to enter into the country without restriction, certainly.

2320. Cattle disease has raged much more in this country during the seven years since 1865, than it did during the seven years previously, has it not?—There have been during that time diseases of various kinds.

2321. That is to say, contagious diseases, pleuro-pneumonia, foot and mouth disease, and cattle plague?—I believe that is so.

2322. Do you believe these diseases have been imported more extensively from abroad since that time than previously?—The cattle plague certainly has been, but I have no evidence that pleuro-pneumonia and foot and mouth disease have.

2323. Are you not aware that these diseases have been prevailing more extensively upon the Continent since 1865 than they were previously?—Foot and mouth disease certainly has prevailed more extensively, but the regulations which have been made have intercepted the disease at the port

Professor
G. F. Brown.
27 March
1873.

port of landing, so that it has not been imported into this country, although we have landed more diseased animals upon our coast.

2324. Are the cattle brought from greater distances within the last seven years than they were previously?—Undoubtedly.

2325. Where are they brought from principally, southern Europe and south-eastern Europe?—From south-eastern Europe chiefly.

2326. Have you any idea where pleuro-pneumonia originated, or is there any idea in the profession with any certainty where it does originate?—The only assumption I have met with is to the effect that it originated in Hungary; but I believe there is no foundation whatever for that statement.

2327. That bringing of cattle from a greater distance during recent years may account for the greater amount of disease which has prevailed in this country during that time?—I do not think that it accounts for the great amount of disease in this country, excepting in the case of the cattle plague.

2328. But it accounts for the greater number of diseased cattle which are brought to Great Britain?—Decidedly.

2329. Besides the direct loss which arises to the farmers from death by cattle disease, has there not been a considerable loss also to the public in consequence of the insecurity to the farmer from imported cattle, and the great risk there is in keeping a large and valuable herd of cattle?—Probably that is the case to some extent, inasmuch as it would tend to raise the price of meat.

2330. It rather discourages a large breeding stock, and induces farmers to think more of fattening stock than of breeding stock?—I imagine that the system of breeding has regularly advanced for a great many years past.

2331. But there is a considerably greater risk from disease in a large breeding stock than there is in a large fattening stock?—If the stock is exclusively breeding stock, I should say exactly the contrary. If no animals are imported on to a farm for the purposes of breeding, I imagine the system of breeding stock would contribute to the safety of the herd.

2332. But mauling disease does get upon a farm?—In that case there is more loss occasioned among a breeding herd than among a fattening one.

2333. Have you any doubt that in dealing with a disease under the Cattle Diseases Act, Government superintendence, as exercised by your department, is in the interest of the consumer as well as of the producer?—It is decidedly so.

2334. In one of the Tables of the Report it is stated, upon the authority of the Board of Trade, that the import of cattle into this country is valued at 250,000*l.*; if we assume the value of the cattle stock in Great Britain to be from seventy-five millions to eighty millions sterling, a mortality of a little over three per cent. would equal the whole foreign import, would it not?—I must admit all these figures; no doubt they are correct.

2335. A large amount of live animals come at present from Tanning and Gesterunde, do they not?—Not at present; the Tanning season has not yet commenced; it has only lately ceased.

2336. But there are a large number of live

animals come from these in the course of a year?—Yes, certainly.

2337. What is the length of the voyage from Tanning?—About 40 hours.

2338. And from Gesterunde?—About the same time.

2339. Will dead meat keep during that time on the voyage?—It does not keep for that time, nor anything like that time, in bad weather, as it is continually pecked.

2340. But in the winter season, generally speaking, would it keep?—It naturally would keep much better in the winter season than in summer.

2341. Do you know the length of the voyage between Aberdeen and London?—I believe it to be about 36 hours.

2342. Considerable quantities of dead meat come by steamer from Aberdeen, do they not?—I believe so.

2343. Do you know any other obstacle to bringing dead meat from abroad, as compared with live animals, except the length of the voyage?—There is great objection to dead meat being brought instead of live animals, on the part of importers, naturally; but I see no difficulty in bringing dead meat from Tanning, if the same care was taken as is taken in packing it for its transit from Aberdeen.

2344. Do you know whether the dead meat trade is increasing between Aberdeen and London, and that in live animals decreasing?—I am not aware of that.

2345. Against what diseases would you propose to take active steps?—Against cattle plague, sheep-pox, pleuro-pneumonia, and glanders.

2346. In your Report, and I entirely concur with you, you state that the prompt discovery of the disease is one of the most important points for getting it exterminated economically and effectively?—Undoubtedly.

2347. What is your opinion regarding the proposal, that farmers and others should report all deaths or slaughter of meat cattle upon their premises, excepting slaughter-houses, of course?—If it could be carried out, it would be exceedingly important.

2348. It is at present imperative upon the farmers to report cases of pleuro-pneumonia and cattle plague existing upon their farms, is it not?—It is imperative on the owner of an animal to report any case of contagious or infectious disease, including foot and mouth disease.

2349. Would you recommend that to be continued in the case of foot and mouth disease?—I do not think that any advantage would arise in the case of foot and mouth disease if we cease to legislate actively in regard to it.

2350. It would complicate the statistics very materially?—Very much so.

2351. Would you propose that that should continue as regards pleuro-pneumonia and the cattle plague?—Yes, and sheep-pox also.

2352. And, I suppose, glanders also?—I should prefer that it should be so, but there would be a considerable difficulty, I apprehend, in carrying out the regulation. A regulation does already exist, but it is very seldom complied with.

2353. It is very difficult, I presume, to get a conviction against a stockowner in regard to not reporting cattle plague and pleuro-pneumonia, because he has always this excuse, that he did not know of the disease?—Practically that has been so.

M

2354. But

Professor
G. F. Brown.
17 March
1873.

2354. But he would not have the same excuse in the case of the death of an animal?—That is the case.

2355. That is a fact that there cannot be any mistake about?—No; but there would be a difficulty in many cases in which farmers are in the habit of slaughtering sheep for their own use; probably that might be arranged.

2356. I confined it, in the first place, to meat cattle; to horned cattle?—That would remove the difficulty, but it would leave out sheep-pox.

2357. Would you approve of veterinary surgeons being required to report cases of those diseases to which I will confine the rest of the examination?—Undoubtedly I should.

2358. Paying them an adequate fee for doing so?—In the sense of paying them an ordinary professional fee for the certificate which they may be called upon to write.

2359. Do you think that the profession would remonstrate very strongly against that regulation?—I think not.

2360. The great desideratum, however, is to have the stockowner report the disease himself?—To have the disease reported by some one.

2361. And to induce him, as the person likely to know soonest about it, to report it?—If possible.

2362. Can you suggest any other way of inducing him to report the disease than by making it his interest so to do?—I cannot suggest any other way.

2363. Is it his interest to do so under the present system of legislation, apart from the question of keeping the law?—Apparently the stockowner does not think so.

2364. If a farmer reports pleuro-pneumonia at present, what would be the effect and result in counties where the local authorities slaughter the animals which have been in contact with the affected animals; in the first place, they would slaughter the animal diseased?—And they might also slaughter the rest of the animals if they thought proper.

2365. Giving the farmer what compensation?—One-half the value for the diseased animal, I believe, and three-fourths for the healthy animals.

2366. Then a stockowner, if pleuro-pneumonia exists upon his farm, and he reports it to the local authority, runs the risk of losing half the value of the diseased animal, and certainly would lose the value, to the amount of one-fourth, of all the rest of his stock?—He does.

2367. Now would the stock, if slaughtered in certain cases, realise as much as three-fourths of their actual value; take the case of store cattle in pretty good condition?—There would be a prejudice against the purchase of them in the neighbourhood, undoubtedly, which would somewhat interfere with the actual market value of them.

2368. But, assuming the prejudice to be got rid of by slaughtering the animals which are not diseased, on the farm, and consigning them to market, what might be the loss?—There is no reason, under those circumstances, against the farmer realising their full value.

2369. But then there would be the loss that would arise from being slaughtered immaturity, would there not?—I understood you to refer to animals which are in tolerably good condition. If they were slaughtered immaturity, it would very likely happen that they would not realise half their value.

2370. Taking all kinds of cattle into account, would they realise, upon the average, about one-half their real value?—That would be a fair average.

2371. Now, supposing an intelligent stockowner found a case of pleuro-pneumonia in his herd of say twenty cattle, irrespective of legislation, what would you recommend him to do?—To kill in the first place the diseased animal, and to carefully examine the others by the aid of a thermometer, in the hands of course of a professional man, and to isolate those which indicated infection by a slight rise of temperature. Following that system, we have found that the loss has been very inconsiderable.

2372. What is the natural temperature of an ox?—It would vary from 100 to 102 degrees under ordinary circumstances.

2373. Then if it was only one degree over 102 you would suspect the animal to be labouring under disease?—It has been my practice to separate those in which the temperature approached 103 degrees.

2374. If a stockowner were to carry out this plan vigilantly and judiciously he might save a considerable portion of a herd?—He might undoubtedly.

2375. He might hope to escape with a loss of three or four out of the twenty, if the disease had been promptly discovered?—In many cases it would be so.

2376. And, apart from the question of legislation, he would not have done anything against the public interest or the interest of his neighbours by that process?—By exercising proper precautions he would have been acting in the interests of the neighbourhood.

2377. But in a good many cases after the slaughter of the diseased animals the rest of the stock is got rid of at somewhere about the market price?—Or otherwise kept until the others fall ill.

2378. But not unfrequently it is the case that the stock is sold off, and so spreads the disease?—The usual practice is to send off to market those animals which are in a fit condition in order to realise all that is available, and to keep the others that are not fit for the market in the hope that the disease will not extend.

2379. But is it not sometimes the case that even store animals which have been in contact with diseased animals, are sent to market?—It is, certainly.

2380. I have been reading a report of the Yorkshire outbreak of cattle plague, and I think they had some reason to suspect something of that sort there?—In that case the animals were sent to butchers in the neighbourhood.

2381. I suppose it is found very difficult to trace disease, or to bring conviction home to persons sending off cattle in that way?—It is very difficult, in consequence of its being necessary in all penal statutes to construe strictly, and to prove that the owner had guilty knowledge.

2382. From certain remarks in your evidence I infer that you do not think that fraud would be at all likely, even if full compensation were to be given?—Certainly, not so likely.

2383. Even if the full value of the animal were refunded to the owner, he would still have a loss?—He would, undoubtedly.

2384. Particularly if a considerable number of the herd were killed, as he would have the food unconsumed in those cases?—He would.

2385. And

2385. And if it were a dairy, there would be a prejudice raised against his establishment?—Yes, particularly if he were a dairyman.

2386. Do you think that the local authorities would have any difficulty in seeing that the valuation of the cattle were a fair and reasonable one?—There should not be any difficulty if an independent valuer were appointed for the district.

2387. I suppose there would be a very considerable difference between the valuation if the Imperial Exchequer had to pay it, as compared with the local authorities having to pay it?—That could be provided against by the Imperial Exchequer appointing its own valuer.

2388. But you do not contemplate the Imperial Exchequer paying any compensation, do you?—I understood that that point is not likely to be entertained; but it is a question which, I presume, the House would have to legislate upon.

2389. But in speaking of this full compensation, you contemplate that the local authority in each county is going to pay its own value?—I did not contemplate, in speaking of the amount of compensation, anything in reference to the source whence it should come.

2390. Would you approve of a system of compensation based, not as at present, upon a certain proportion of the value of the animal slaughtered, but upon the amount of loss sustained. I mean a system under which the diseased animals, and those in contact with them, should be dealt with as seemed best for the public interest, the carcasses sold and made the most of, and the loss arising divided in certain proportions between the local authority and the owner?—I should, if such a plan were sufficiently satisfactory to induce him to give notice of the disease.

2391. In the memorandum which I handed to you the other day I proposed that three-fourths of the loss should be borne by the public, and one-fourth by the owner; that would be a very considerable increase upon the present rate of compensation?—It would; and be so far an improvement upon the present system.

2392. Assuming a loss upon a certain herd, say 300*l.* value, and assuming that those cattle were all slaughtered, fetching 300*l.*, according to this plan, the 300*l.* of loss would be divided between the local authority and the owner of the cattle?—Yes.

2393. That is to say, that the local authority would have to pay 75*l.* and the owner 225*l.*?—Yes.

2394. If compulsory slaughter be adopted in the case of those diseases, pleuro-pneumonia, cattle plague, and sheep-pox, taking all the circumstances of the case into consideration, which system of compensation do you think would be most beneficial for the local authority. I would recommend, certainly, that system of compensation which would induce the co-operation of the owners.

2395. If the disease is early discovered, and the stock judiciously dealt with by experienced persons, such as the inspectors of the local authorities, do you think a good many more cattle might be saved than is at present the case?—Undoubtedly, a very much larger proportion.

2396. Then that would not only be more effective in putting down the disease, but also the more economical system?—Certainly.

0.68.

2397. With regard to dealing with the three diseases to which I have more particularly directed your attention, you propose that all animals affected should be slaughtered forthwith?—Yes.

2398. You have no doubt about the propriety or judiciousness of that course?—Not the slightest.

2399. Whether done by the local authority or by the individual?—In either case I would desire that it should be done.

2400. Would you also in certain cases slaughter animals in contact?—In cases of cattle plague, and in some cases of pleuro-pneumonia.

2401. Mr. *Clare Read*.] And sheep-pox?—In some cases sheep-pox, certainly.

2402. Mr. *Barnley*.] I suppose it would depend upon the value of the herd, and the circumstances of the stock, and so on?—Yes; and also with regard to the position of the herd in respect to the stock of the neighbourhood.

2403. And in cases of cattle plague you would also take the power to slaughter animals in adjacent fields?—In adjacent fields.

2404. But you would not make it compulsory under an Act of Parliament to slaughter animals in contact, or in adjacent fields; you would leave that to the discretion of the local authority?—I would leave no discretion to the local authorities in cases of cattle plague, in regard to those animals which were in contact with the diseased ones.

2405. How would you define "contact"?—I should say that animals in the same shed or field had been in contact.

2406. You would not understand animals to be in contact, supposing all the animals on a farm to be in different sheds?—No; because I apprehend sometimes that animals upon the same farm are a mile distant from each other.

2407. Assuming the usual farmstead, would you say that all the cattle upon that farmstead in different sheds were in contact?—I should not define it in that way in the Act or Order, but I should allow the Inspector or local authority to have a discretionary power.

2408. To define, at their own discretion, what "contact" meant?—Not to define what contact meant, but I should include under the term "contact" all animals which were in the same inclosure of any kind with the diseased ones.

2409. Then, I understand in the case of cattle plague, you would make it compulsory to slaughter diseased animals, and all those within the same inclosure, whether field or cow-shed?—I would.

2410. And give the local authorities power to slaughter all adjacent animals?—Certainly.

2411. You would stop all movement of live animals out of an affected place or farm for 30 days after the last case occurred?—Certainly, for at least that time.

2412. Would you approve in the case of pleuro-pneumonia of extending the period by two months, with a certificate, that is making it compulsory to have a certificate during a further period of two months for moving any animal out of an infected place?—It is very desirable that that should be done.

2413. Mr. *Clare Read*.] Do I understand you to mean two months beyond the 30 days?—Yes, and allowing movement by certificate.

2414. Mr. *Barnley*.] It might be left to the local authority to judge whether they would grant

Professor
G. T. Brown.

27 March
1873.

Professor
G. F. Brown,
27 March
1873.

grant a certificate or not, according to circumstances?—Yes, in order that they might judge whether it was right or not.

2415. In order that it might be critically examined by the inspectors before being removed from the farm?—Yes.

2416. In the case of cattle plague, you take an area beyond the infected farm; but it would be necessary to make the area some considerable distance around the disease?—The present arrangements, which give a radius of a mile, seem to have answered in practice.

2417. You would recommend that to be continued, that is to say, a radius of one mile around an infected spot where the animal was?—I should.

2418. You had some considerable experience in dealing with cattle plague in Yorkshire during the late outbreak?—And also during the former one.

2419. Do you think it necessary, if you are going to deal seriously with those diseases, that there should be some one employed upon an infected place, say for 30 days, to see that the rules and regulations of the chief authority were carried into effect?—I should prefer a person being sent from the Central Department, who should visit all the places within a reasonable distance.

2420. You think that there should be a chief officer appointed?—Or some one appointed to assist him.

2421. If he were not able to undertake it all himself?—Exactly.

2422. But with regard to farmers, do you think it desirable that there should be some one actually upon the premises during the presence of disease upon a farmstead or farm?—It depends very much upon the nature of the disease. In the case of pleuro-pneumonia it is desirable that some one should be appointed to watch an infected herd, and to give notice of every fresh instance of disease.

2423. Would you say for 30 days after the last case?—Certainly, for 30 days after the last case.

2424. That might not necessarily be a veterinary surgeon; a skilled cattle man would answer the purpose?—A skilled cattle man would answer the purpose, if he were instructed to report the slightest indication of departure from health.

2425. If the policy indicated and suggested by you were firmly, judiciously, and vigilantly carried out, do you think that pleuro-pneumonia could be eradicated from this country, provided we did not import more of it from abroad?—If the system were rigidly carried out, I have little doubt that the disease might be eradicated.

2426. Leaving out the metropolis, if the system were vigilantly carried out in the country, within what time would you say it might be done?—It would be difficult to separate the country from the large towns, as the supply of infected animals is quite likely to be kept up from those centres, but altogether I should say that in two years, with strict supervision, and the adoption of active measures, the disease might be nearly exterminated.

2427. Do you think the loss incurred in eradicating the disease would be equal to, or greater than, the loss which is likely to arise under the existing system?—The loss would, of course, be considerable in the first instance, because a very

large number of animals would have to be destroyed at once.

2428. It has got considerable force and extent already?—Undoubtedly it has.

2429. A considerable expense would have to be faced in the first instance?—Certainly.

2430. But spreading the whole cost and loss over two years, do you think that the slaughtering process would cost more money than the result which would happen under the existing system?—Probably it would not.

2431. Do you think it would be of much advantage to reduce the number of local authorities?—As far as relates to carrying out the regulations affecting diseases, it would.

2432. There are a great number of local authorities in some counties, I believe?—There are.

2433. How many local authorities are there in the county of Fife?—There are 13 local authorities besides the county local authorities.

2434. That is, 14 local authorities altogether in the county of Fife?—Yes.

2435. Pleuro-pneumonia is raging there to a considerable extent at present, is it not?—Yes.

2436. Leaving out of the question just now, the question of foreign importations, do you think that there is any clashing between the interests of the boroughs and counties in dealing with cattle diseases?—In some cases there is, particularly with reference to the management of the markets.

2437. In what respect?—The regulations which would be enforced without inconvenience in a county, might press very hardly upon a borough in preventing the movement of animals from a market, and within the borough.

2438. But supposing your regulations and restrictions were confined to those which have been alluded to in this examination, where nothing has been talked of regarding restrictions on fairs and markets; do you think there is any case in which the interests of boroughs and counties conflict?—Excluding fairs and markets, I do not think there are any.

2439. Do you think it is of any advantage to attempt restrictions on fairs and markets, beyond what has been already referred to in the Act, rendering it penal to expose such animals in fairs and markets?—It seems to be impracticable to prevent the movement of animals which have been herded with diseased animals.

2440. You would not give the local authority special authority over fairs and markets?—I would not give the local authority of the county authority over the fairs belonging to boroughs, but I would give the local authority of the boroughs power to make arrangements relative to their markets.

2441. Have they not this power independently of the Cattle Diseases Act?—They have local power; but I would make it compulsory upon them to apply certain restrictions to the markets, otherwise it would be impossible to insist upon the necessary cleansing and disinfection.

2442. It would be a general order to all local authorities, or all persons holding fairs and markets, that they should keep the market places clean and disinfected?—It would be so.

2443. It would not be either in the hands of the county authority or the borough authority?—It would not.

2444. There would not in this case be any conflict?—There would not.

2445. If your department had only one local authority to correspond and deal with in each county,

county, that would very much simplify, would it not, the duties and the work of your office?—It would, certainly.

2445. It increases the labour exceedingly, and the difficulty of getting reliable returns, that there are so many inspectors to correspond with?—It does.

2447. Speaking generally of what we would hope to be the normal state that we might expect to arrive at in respect to these diseases, do you think one chief inspector would be enough for each county, including boroughs; that is to say, to superintend the dealing with disease in that county?—Hardly in the first instance, unless the inspector had a considerable number of competent assistants.

2448. But I believe, speaking of the normal state which we might hope to arrive at within a year, for example?—Under such circumstances one inspector might probably be sufficient.

2449. He might keep such statistics of disease as were wanted for the county, and report them to the Privy Council, and he would have such clerks as might be necessary?—With assistance, he might do it.

2450. What statistics do you think it necessary to keep, with regard to disease?—Sufficient statistics have been kept to enable the department to judge of the rate of disease.

2451. Statistics should be kept, should they not, of pleuro-pneumonia, cattle plague, and sheep-pox?—Yes.

2452. And reported from time to time by these inspectors to the Privy Council Department?—Decidedly.

2453. Do you think there are any further statistics required?—If foot and mouth disease is not legislated for actively, I apprehend that those statistics would relate almost entirely to pleuro-pneumonia, as cattle plague and sheep-pox would be got rid of almost as soon as they were introduced.

2454. Sheep-pox is not existing in this country to any extent, is it?—It is not at all, that we know of.

2455. Then if there was one superintendent in each county to deal with disease, he would be likely to become more expert after a little experience as to the best course to be adopted in each case?—He should do so.

2456. And there would be this great advantage about it, that the better he did his work, the less he would have to do?—Decidedly.

2457. Do you think it would be desirable for the Privy Council Department to keep any power or supervision over those local authorities, in case they should fail in or neglect their duties?—Yes, I should say so. I consider that the officers of the Department should have absolute power to act in all cases.

2458. In the event of failure by the local authority?—Decidedly.

2459. You would ascertain by the statistical returns whether the local authority was doing its duty or not?—We should.

2460. And in cases where the local authority fails to be successful in dealing with the disease, you would recommend the Privy Council Department to send down an inspector to give the necessary instructions to carry out the Act?—Certainly, and also to stay as long as might be necessary, in order to see that the regulations were carried out.

2461. I dare say you would wish to charge the

expenses of such inspector against the local authority?—I have no particular feeling in the matter, but it would seem to be a just thing that the local authority should pay.

2462. It would be desirable in a good many cases in which the counties have not had much experience in dealing with the disease, that in the first instance the Privy Council should give the assistance of an inspector's advice?—It would be absolutely necessary to do so in several counties.

2463. Assuming that we had successfully dealt with the disease for twelve months, and reduced it within narrower limits than the present, I presume one or two supervising inspectors would be all that would be necessary to look after the local authorities, or what additional inspectors would be necessary to exercise such supervision over the counties I have indicated?—That is a matter of detail which I could hardly speak to without considerable reflection.

2464. The number would not be likely to exceed two or three additional inspectors, would it?—I should think two or three additional inspectors would be sufficient.

2465. Do you think that there would be considerable difficulty in dealing with the London dairies in respect to pleuro-pneumonia?—There would be considerable difficulty.

2466. Do they produce many calves in the London dairies now?—Very few indeed, comparatively.

2467. What becomes of all such calves as are produced in the dairies?—They are generally either killed, or sent into the country to be fed.

2468. Is the number sent into the country considerable?—I am not aware at this moment; but at one time it was considerable; that is to say, a considerable number of those which were born in London.

2469. The dairymen in London will not report the disease for several reasons?—I do not remember a single instance of a dairymen reporting disease.

2470. It does exist to a considerable extent in the London dairies at this moment, I daresay?—It does.

2471. Do they attempt to treat it?—Generally they do, in those cases where the animal is not in a fit condition to be sent to market.

2472. If the animal is in a fit condition to be sent to market, it is sold?—It is sold to a butcher.

2473. Does it invariably go to the butcher?—Not always; cows find their way to the markets.

2474. They find their way to the markets, and then they may go all over the country?—They may, if they are not so far diseased as to be incapable of travelling.

2475. Is the treatment of the disease attended with any success?—Not with sufficient success to warrant any reliance being placed upon any system of treatment.

2476. Such success as there is, is principally confined to the moderation of the symptoms?—Animals, when they recover, do sometimes recover perfectly; they occasionally get quite fat afterwards.

2477. But I suppose those are very rare cases?—They are comparatively rare.

2478. Do you think that any system of compulsory inspection of London dairies would prove successful?—It would certainly be met by considerable opposition.

2479. You

Professor G. T. Brown.

27 March 1873.

Professor
G. T. Brown,
27 March
1873.

2479. You would require a considerable number of inspectors?—We should.

2480. There is no cordon around the metropolis at present?—There is not.

2481. Would you recommend a cordon to be put round the metropolis with the special purpose of getting pleuro-pneumonia squelched in the country?—Taking a professional view of the subject, I should.

2482. Is it practicable?—It is practicable, but it would cause a great deal of opposition.

2483. Would it cause very considerable inconvenience?—Yes, undoubtedly.

2484. To whom principally?—To the butchers all round London, and 50 miles off.

2485. To those butchers who come up to the Metropolitan Market, and lay their cattle and take them down to the country?—Precisely.

2486. Is there any system whereby animals might be marked so as to insure their immediate slaughter?—That system has been carried out with considerable success, but it involves a very great deal of expense, and the employment of a great number of police.

2487. Was that by watching an animal, or branding it, or bow?—By marking it; cutting the hair from the end of the tail, and by the issue of licences, which the slaughterman was bound to deliver at the police station at the expiration of a certain time.

2488. The cutting the hair of the tail alone be effective?—It is an indelible mark for a very long time.

2489. For how long would it be so?—It is difficult to say, for there is no instance known of the hair having grown again to its normal length, I believe.

2490. It might be a pretty conclusive proof, at any reasonable time afterwards, that that animal ought to have been slaughtered?—Yes.

2491. And that its existence is a transgression of the law by some person?—Quite so; that would only be effective in case of a regulation being established that all animals so marked must be slaughtered within a certain number of days, and there must also be some means of ascertaining the date upon which the hair was cut from the tail, so that it practically involves a return to the system of issuing licences and largely employing the police.

2492. But you could tell within a week, could not you?—I should be very sorry to have to give an opinion within a month.

2493. It might have been a week, or it might have been a month, since the hair was cut off, from all you could judge by the appearance?—Certainly; the appearance would entirely depend upon the skill of the drover in clipping it more or less close to the skin.

2494. A few days ago I submitted a memorandum to you, and certain suggestions respecting alterations in the existing system?—You did.

2495. Have you considered that memorandum?—I have, as far as I have had opportunity.

2496. In conjunction with Dr. Williams?—Yes.

2497. Do you approve of a provision to this effect: "The occupant of any farm or building (excepting licensed slaughterhouses), where any horned animal dies or is slaughtered, to report such death or slaughter within three days to the police or local authority?"—Upon the understanding that some arrangement can be made

which will prevent a man from being compelled to report the slaughter of a sheep or other animal for domestic use.

2498. I confined the question to horned animals?—In the case of horned animals the difficulty would be removed, to a great extent.

2499. It is the case at present that the owner of an animal which is afflicted with pleuro-pneumonia, cattle plague, or sheep pox, is bound to report the disease?—He is bound to report any contagious or infectious disease.

2500. Would you make it incumbent upon every veterinary surgeon, or person professing to treat animals, to certificate the diseases above named, upon receiving a sufficient fee therefore?—I would make it incumbent upon every veterinary surgeon. I should not have any respect for a certificate which would be signed by an unqualified person.

2501. You understand, that under the present Act the local authority has power to seize animals labouring under any contagious disease going along any highway, or exposed in any fair or market, and deal with them as they shall deem expedient; is that provision in the present Act?—Not precisely; in some cases they have power to "seize and slaughter," and in other cases to "seize and detain for a convenient time."

2502. And to charge the owner with expenses which they may incur in dealing with the animals?—That provision is in the 51th section of the Act.

2503. Do you know of any doubts existing with reference to the power of the local authority in this respect?—I have not heard of any doubts upon that subject.

2504. If they existed, you think that they ought to be removed?—Yes, I think they should.

2505. Have you any suggestions to make to the Committee with reference to dealing with the disease, beyond what has come out in the course of this examination?—Speaking in general terms, I have nothing to add to what has been already stated; of course there would be a great many matters of detail which would require further consideration.

2506. But as regards general principles or leading provisions, you have nothing additional to suggest beyond what has come out in the course of your examination?—I have not.

2507. Mr. Cresswell. The foreign market at Deptford is very good, and very convenient, is it not?—Extensively so.

2508. Do you think there ought to be a rail from it, by which the meat might be sent direct to the manufacturing districts?—That would be a convenience, undoubtedly.

2509. Are you aware that when the foreign stock were slaughtered at Mr. Odum's wharf, a great quantity of meat was sent direct from that wharf?—I believe it was.

2510. But with that exception, you think there can be no improvement in the arrangements which now exist at Deptford?—I do not think that anything can be done to add to the convenience there.

2511. In the Report of last Monday's Deptford Market, I read this: "Foot and mouth disease prevails fearfully amongst the Hamburg herts"; is that the case?—The last Return which was published showed that very few animals indeed had been landed from Hamburg, or any other part of the Continent, with that disease.

2512. Then

Professor
G. T. Brown.
—
27 March
1873.

2512. Then this report is not true?—As far as my knowledge extends, it is not.

2513. Was not it true that last week 13 cattle were condemned at the Deptford Market for having foot and mouth disease?—I am not aware of that instance, I can quite believe that it is so; but I should not consider 13 diseased beasts sufficient evidence of the fearful prevalence of disease.

2514. Not in one cargo?—Certainly not; because more than once we have had a whole cargo diseased at the Deptford Market.

2515. Do you think this other extract is true: "Salesmen are making good returns to the continental cattle dealers from the Deptford Market"?—I have no means of forming an opinion upon that statement.

2516. I think you stated, in the evidence which you gave the other day, you considered that the prices of foreign beef and English beef were the same in the Metropolitan Market?—I believe I stated that, as far as my knowledge extended, there was no great difference.

2517. When the quotations were these: "The best foreign oxen, 5s. 4d., and the best English, 6s. per 8 lbs.," you do not consider that any material difference; a penny a pound?—No, I should not consider that any great difference.

2518. The person who had to buy it in all probability would. Now, I think you stated the virus of cattle plague could be communicated to cattle at a long distance away without contact with diseased animals?—There is every reason to believe that it can.

2519. By men, by animals, and by fresh hides?—And by all substances that have been in contact with diseased cattle.

2520. How long do you think the virus would keep?—It is asserted that it retains its activity for 11 months; but our experiments failed altogether up to six months; we had no virus which was fresher than that when we commenced them.

2521. With regard to pleuro-pneumonia, I think your evidence is entirely different; there must be direct contact between the diseased animal and the one that takes the disease?—We have not succeeded in producing pleuro-pneumonia in any other way; but there are numerous instances of outbreaks where no direct contact with diseased animals can be traced.

2522. Of what does the virus of pleuro-pneumonia consist; is it simply the exhalation from the lungs?—That is the conclusion which has been arrived at from experiments which have been made, such as saturating cotton wool with the breath of a diseased animal, and introducing it into the nostrils of a healthy one.

2523. With what result?—In the experiments which were performed in Ireland, we were told the result was the production of disease, and in the experiments which were performed here, it failed to produce the disease.

2524. But with regard to the foot and mouth disease, I believe that is very easily transmitted, without the contact of animals?—Undoubtedly; by the mere conveyance of a small quantity of the saliva.

2525. If you were to take a lock of hay out of the mouth of a diseased bullock, do you think it would be possible to go 200 miles and infect another bullock with it?—I should think very possibly indeed. I have done it at a shorter distance.

2526. Have you successfully done it?—Successfully.

2527. Then with regard to pleuro-pneumonia, there is a better chance of stamping it out than there is in the case of foot and mouth disease, because, if I understand you rightly, it is only when an animal is within a short radius of another that you think the disease is transmitted from a diseased animal to a healthy animal?—That is a conclusion which we deduce from the evidence which we had, and there is certainly a much greater chance of stamping out pleuro-pneumonia than there is of getting rid of the foot and mouth disease.

2528. And also, I suppose, of stamping out cattle plague, provided cattle plague should ever be as general as pleuro-pneumonia?—Decidedly.

2529. You have no reasonable doubt in your own mind, have you, that foot and mouth disease was introduced into this country from abroad?—I think it is a perfectly justifiable conclusion from the evidence.

2530. You stated just now that hides possibly convey disease. I see that in the year 1838 there were 346,000 cwt. of hides imported into this country from France. I believe that in 1838 the foot and mouth disease was very prevalent in France?—It was very prevalent in Holland, and many parts of the Continent. I am not certain about its prevalence in France.

2531. Do not hides come from Holland, as well as from France?—It is quite probable, but we have no evidence that foot and mouth disease is conveyed by hides; it is merely a probability.

2532. Why should there be any doubt about it, if it can be conveyed by men and animals, and by locks of hay; why should not the virus be in the fresh hides as well as in the hay?—There is no reason against that assumption, but we have no positive evidence of the fact.

2533. Are not the heads very often with the hides?—They are; at least, if they are not with the hides they are commonly sent over in the same vessel.

2534. I suppose the diseased foot of a bullock would very easily introduce the disease?—Decidedly it would.

2535. I always understood that the first outbreak of the foot and mouth disease in England, occurred in the county of Norfolk?—I was under that impression until Professor Simonds assured me that he had seen it himself in the Ludlow districts before it was in the county of Norfolk, but upon that point he will speak positively, as he remembers perfectly all the circumstances of the earliest outbreak.

2536. As this outbreak in Norfolk took place within a few miles of Yarmouth, and as there was daily a constant intercourse between Yarmouth and Holland, would you be very much surprised if, by some means or other the virus was imported to Norfolk?—It seems to be quite probable that it might have been so imported.

2537. Can you actually prove the introduction of the cattle plague in any one instance into this country; what actual proof is there, such proof as that upon which you would hang a man?—The clearest evidence which we have is included in the fact that diseased animals stood within a few yards of the shore in the Humber Dock at Hull, and that is something like eight days afterwards that affection broke out within 12 miles from that point.

2538. That is very good circumstantial evidence,

Professor
G. T. Brown.
27 March
1873.

dence, but it is no conclusive proof, is it?—It is not absolute proof, that is to say, it is not proof to demonstration, certainly.

2538. With regard to the two outbreaks in Ireland, at the period of these outbreaks there was no importation of cattle allowed into Ireland from England?—None.

2540. How do you suppose they occurred?—I suppose they occurred from persons who were in the habit of travelling from Scotland to Ireland having to deal with cattle in both countries.

2541. Have you any doubt that, by some means or other, the virus was taken from England to Ireland?—None whatever.

2542. But you have a doubt as to whether the foot and mouth disease was introduced into England in the same way?—No, I have no doubt about it. I accept it, as a fair conclusion from the evidence; in fact, the only conclusion that can be arrived at.

2543. We have two reports from the Veterinary Department; had you anything to do with the Report of the year 1871; it is signed by Dr. Williams; may I ask whether he consulted you in that report?—I do not remember any precise points upon which he consulted me.

2544. I believe that when Dr. Williams signs a report it goes forth as the Report of the Privy Council, with the sanction and approval of my Lords of the Privy Council?—I presume that is the case.

2545. When you sign your own report it is only on your own individual responsibility?—That is so.

2546. I will read you this passage from the Report of 1871, which is signed by Dr. Williams; he is speaking of the foot and mouth disease, and he says, "Whether it was or was not first imported into this country in 1839, or had a spontaneous origin about that time, or had existed here long before that date remains to be proved." Do you think that that is a proper statement to go to the country?—I am hardly in a position to give an opinion upon that point. I understand that, "the statement remains to be proved," refers to absolute demonstration, and in that sense it does remain to be proved.

2547. Like everything else we have had; like all your cases of cattle plague?—Decidedly; I put them in the same position.

2548. Then it results in this: that it is no use taking any record of facts, because you cannot prove them to demonstration?—I think it is of great use to take records of facts, whether they lead to demonstration or not.

2549. Have you any reason to suppose that the disease had a spontaneous origin at the time?—I am perfectly convinced, in my own mind, that it had not a spontaneous origin.

2550. Do you not know this that it did not exist in this country before that date?—I have been informed by some practical men, who are older than myself, that they knew it in this country ten years before that time.

2551. Can you give any record of it?—I do not think I was born at the time.

2552. But there were veterinaries born before your time, and there was a veterinary publication before your days?—Yes, long before my days.

2553. Do you think that in all probability this disease which spread with such wonderful rapidity when it was introduced in 1839, as to extend to Scotland and to every county in England, could have been introduced ten years before,

and no record made of it?—No, I do not think so, and I do not believe it, but in saying so I am contradicting men who were competent to judge before I was born.

2554. I think you stated that the importation of a single diseased bullock, if allowed to go unchecked, would be quite sufficient to re-introduce the disease, provided that we at any time got rid of it?—It would undoubtedly in the district into which the bullock was taken.

2555. And when it is stated in this Report that "increased import does not seem to be invariably followed by an increase of the disease," do you suppose that any body ever stated that it did; have you ever heard any one say it, or have you ever seen it written that increased import is invariably followed by an increase of the disease?—I have seen it stated frequently that the increased import of diseased animals has been followed by an increased appearance of disease into this country.

2556. But on the other hand, it is your opinion that the importation of a single diseased bullock would be quite sufficient, if it went unchecked, to spread the disease all over the country?—No, I said it would be sufficient to introduce the disease into the district into which the bullock was taken. Its spread over the country would depend entirely upon the measures which were taken in order to repress it.

2557. I am supposing a fresh outbreak. In the year 1869 you are aware that we had no restriction at all upon the foot and mouth disease?—There was none.

2558. And consequently any animal that happened to be infected with foot and mouth disease could be taken anywhere, and could propagate it without any legal hindrance?—Quite so.

2559. There is another passage in the Report which says, that the disease has not ceased to exist in this country since 1839: do you believe that?—As far as I am able to judge that is quite true.

2560. I think you stated in your evidence the other day that the disease had died out in Ireland upon more than one occasion?—I said that it had, as far as I could ascertain, ceased to exist in the country at the time I was there.

2561. It is extremely difficult to prove a negative, but you have not given us any evidence at all that the disease did exist in Ireland at the time of the cattle plague, or previous to the introduction of the cattle plague into Ireland?—There is very good evidence indeed of its existence in Ireland about the time that it existed in England, and there are records, I believe, from time to time of its existence there, more or less, ever since.

2562. Mr. Pell.] Does that answer refer to the year 1839?—About that time. It was spoken of by Professor Ferguson in a pamphlet published, I believe, in 1848.

2563. Mr. Clerk Read.] In which it was proved that it was introduced to Ireland from England?—Professor Ferguson speaks of it as a peculiar disease, accompanied with blisters upon the tongue and stiffness in the legs; but I am not aware that he reasons as to its mode of introduction.

2564. But have you not reason to know that in England, after the expiration of the restrictive Cattle Plague Orders, which commenced in 1845, we were for twelve months without any record of the disease at all?—We were for six months without

without any record of its prevalence to any extent, but I am not aware that there was any period during that time in which it was entirely absent.

2565. I think you stated that for six months there was no case in the Metropolitan Cattle Market or lairs?—There was no case detected in the Metropolitan Cattle Market or lair during that time.

2566. Were you collecting any statistics during that period, of any kind?—I was only making these inquiries, which I am constantly making, for my own information.

2567. Is there any record of them in the department?—Only my own report.

2568. I think you stated that there was an outbreak of foot and mouth disease somewhere in the year 1867 in the Metropolitan Market?—The first cases which were detected in the lairs occurred about the end of 1867, among some animals which I believe came somewhere from the north western counties brought up by the North Western Railway.

2569. Are not those the very cattle you told me of in 1868, which you stated came from Northampton?—I rather connect the word "Northampton" in my mind with those cattle, but I am not quite certain about it now.

2570. After having made an inquiry at that time at Northampton and all the region round about, whether there was a case of foot and mouth disease in that district, and having been assured that there was none, do you think that is a fair proof that there was none?—I do not.

2571. Do you not think that it was the duty of the Privy Council to have ascertained whether there was any?—I think it would have been impossible to ascertain it.

2572. If there was a case of foot and mouth disease in the country, do you not think it would have found its way very speedily either to the Metropolitan Cattle Market, which is the great fat market, or to Norwich Hill, which is one of the largest store markets in England?—It is probable that it would, if it had prevailed to any extent in any part of the country, but it is quite likely that isolated cases of the disease might have existed without any of the animals being sent to the markets.

2573. You do not believe that we got rid of the foot and mouth disease by those cattle plague restrictions?—I do not believe that the disease was entirely exterminated.

2574. And you think that it spread from those centres of which you know nothing, rather than believe that in the year when you let out the foreign sheep from the Metropolitan Market, it was spread by them?—I believe it was spread, to some extent, by the foreign sheep, but long before that it was spreading from the Metropolis in all directions.

2575. I think we have sent pleuro-pneumonia to Australia, have we not?—I believe we have.

2576. And to America?—Probably also to America; they have it there, certainly.

2577. Did it not come from us?—I think it is very likely we did send it there.

2578. Did we send the foot and mouth disease to Australia?—It is stated that we did.

2579. Do you think it is possible or probable?—I think it is very probable.

2580. The fact is, you are perfectly convinced in your own mind of the power of English cattle to transmit the diseases to places as far distant as 6,36.

as Australia and America, and yet you think it is very unlikely that foreign cattle should bring it to us?—On the contrary, I am certain that foreign cattle constantly bring it to us.

2581. Do not you think it is more likely that as we import so many foreign cattle from abroad, they should bring it to us rather than that we should send it to America and Australia?—If we imported them without any restriction, certainly.

2582. Take the case of restrictions as they at present exist; I suppose you will admit that sheep can not only take the disease, but that they can communicate the foot and mouth disease without being subject to it themselves?—If they carried the saliva of a diseased animal upon their wool or upon their hoofs, they could.

2583. You have the importation of foreign sheep, and you may also have an importation of foreign cattle, not in the same boat, but of foreign cattle coming from the same port as the sheep, although in different boats, the foreign cattle are detected with disease, they are stopped and slaughtered, what happens to the sheep?—The sheep, if they are landed in the same part of the port, will be slaughtered also.

2584. But they are frequently landed at the same wharf as that at which diseased cattle had been landed just previously?—Then they are slaughtered.

2585. But if they have mixed with the foreign cattle on the other side, and come over here, and are sent all over the country, is it not very probable that they should take the disease into the country?—There is decidedly a risk.

2586. I think you stated, in answer to Mr. Pell, upon the last occasion, that if cattle came over, either from Ireland or abroad, in an ill-ventilated ship, their health is not affected with regard to infectious diseases?—That is to say, with regard to the production of infectious disease.

2587. But are they not more likely to take disease in consequence of their having been in this confined and vitiated atmosphere?—It is very difficult to prove that they are much more liable to do so, because as the foot and mouth disease only requires two or three days for its development, it would be almost impossible to ascertain whether or not animals under those circumstances manifest the symptoms a few hours earlier.

2588. We will take pleuro-pneumonia, and go into the hold of a ship which is badly ventilated, and this is the statement: "A number of gases which are sensible to the nose, and which, though often intensely disagreeable, are harmless in small doses; yet if constantly breathed they vitiate the blood and impair the vigour of an animal, and thus predispose it to disease;" do you believe that statement?—Yes, I do.

2589. With regard to pleuro-pneumonia, if a bullock is in pasture and is taken ill, does not he, as an invariable rule, separate himself from the herd, and lie down in one corner of the field?—He does.

2590. And therefore if the disease is only spread by another bullock inhaling the virus which the diseased bullock has exhaled, there would not be so very much chance of the whole herd taking the disease?—The whole herd, certainly, is very much more favourably placed than it would be in a cowshed, or in the hold of a vessel.

N

2591. Take

Professor
G. T. Brown.
27 March
1873.

Professor
G. T. Brown.
27 March
1873.

2591. Take even the case of a market in which one diseased animal may be herded with 50 others, in a space no bigger than this room, would not he be much more likely to propagate that disease in the market than in the field?—Yes, the nearer the bullock is to other animals the greater the risk of propagating the disease.

2592. Therefore, not only is there a greater chance of propagating the disease in the hold of a ship, in consequence of the close contiguity of other animals, but having been during the last 48 hours re-breathing the same vitiated atmosphere; should you not think that that is a fruitful cause of breeding pleuro-pneumonia?—If a predisposition to pleuro-pneumonia exists among the animals.

2593. I am not assuming that pleuro-pneumonia is spontaneously produced in this country; but in the case of pleuro-pneumonia, I understand you to say, that it was only from the breath that infection could be produced, as far as you are aware?—That is my impression from what I have seen.

2594. How long are foreign cattle, as a rule, kept alive in this country, do you think?—The period will vary from one day to a fortnight.

2595. Should I be wrong in saying that, as a rule, the average duration of the life of a foreign animal in this country is, something like a week?—That is a fair average.

2596. Can you tell me upon what principle we have a comparison of the health of foreign animals, and the health of home animals, in this country?—That comparison would only be valuable in the case of foreign cattle, which are landed from unscheduled countries, and sent into this country as store stock.

2597. But that is not the case, is it; this Table which we have before us, is based upon the calculation of the number of cattle which arrived here in a diseased state?—I am not aware of the Table to which you refer.

2598. It really comes to this, that whereas the total time of observing disease in foreign stock would be about a week, the total time of observing disease in home stock would be 365 days?—Not in reference to the same animals; it is not usually the case that the total time of observation of any one herd of animals would occupy 365 days.

2599. But is it not got at in this way. Is not this Table, No. 37, on page 76, which I consider utterly worthless, a Table relating to the number of cattle that come diseased from abroad, and the percentage of disease of home stock. We will take the case of foot and mouth disease in cattle in 1871. It says in the Table that the percentage of home cattle that were diseased, was 9·7830 per cent., and of foreign cattle, 23·48 per cent. Now, I ask, does not that calculation mean this, that the whole number of the cattle reported in England in the year 1871, forms the percentage of the home stock, and the other is simply the number of cattle that have arrived in a diseased state in this country?—I think I had better say that I have not the slightest idea what it means. I never read any of those Tables; my time is too much occupied.

2600. Your business is not in any way to supervise those Tables, or to be consulted as to the expediency of issuing them?—Not at all.

2601. Do you consider that the town dairies are, as they have been termed, the hotbeds of pleuro-pneumonia?—I do.

2602. Especially of pleuro-pneumonia?—Decidedly.

2603. Why is that?—In consequence of the custom which prevails of milking the cows out, keeping them in good condition, and selling them as soon as they cease to give a certain quantity of milk, filling their places by stock, which is purchased at various fairs and markets.

2604. But why should that in any way generate pleuro-pneumonia?—It does not generate it, but it naturally happens where a number of animals are imported, that cases of disease are introduced, and disease being introduced into the cowsheds finds the most favourable conditions for its spread.

2605. Almost as bad as the hold of a ship?—Yes, rather worse, in consequence of the length of time during which the animals are kept together.

2606. I suppose, as far as regards the constant buying in of cattle into a town dairy, the same thing happens in all those counties to which a large proportion of store stock is sent?—It does.

2607. Do you think the present Act has had the slightest effect in checking the spread of pleuro-pneumonia?—I conceive it entirely impossible that it should have had, because I do not know a single instance in which its provisions have been carried out, speaking in reference to the dairies of towns.

2608. But I was not speaking in reference to dairies in towns; I was speaking of counties generally?—We are informed that, in those few instances where its provisions have been applied, some considerable success has been obtained.

2609. Is not the Act in force, as far as regards the Act itself, in every county in England. I am speaking of the Act, and not of any special Orders?—It certainly is not; at least its injunctions are not attended to.

2610. What injunctions?—The one, for example, which provides that animals shall not be exposed in markets and fairs, or taken along public roads, or allowed to pass by any other mode of transit.

2611. I am now speaking with regard to pleuro-pneumonia?—And in reference to pleuro-pneumonia I make that statement.

2612. Does your observation extend to the county of Norfolk?—I make no particular reference to the county of Norfolk, but I am aware that animals affected with pleuro-pneumonia are in the Metropolitan fairs occasionally, and I am aware that they are commonly introduced from the country into the London dairies.

2613. Are you aware that the Privy Council gave the county of Norfolk leave to remove healthy animals which had been herded with animals affected with pleuro-pneumonia for immediate slaughter to the London market?—I am not aware of that.

2614. If they did give that permission, do you think it was right or wrong?—I should certainly object to allow such animals to go from Norfolk to London.

2615. Which had been herded with animals affected with pleuro-pneumonia?—Yes, unless there was a cordon around London at the time.

2616. There was a cordon around London at that time?—Then I should not be so particular.

2617. But we will take the case of Norfolk, and I find this, that in the return of 1871 there were 189 farms affected with pleuro-pneumonia, and 389 animals diseased. In the year 1872 there were

were 511 farms affected, and no less than 1,550 cases of pleuro-pneumonia. In both those years the Act was administered as strictly as it possibly could be in the county of Norfolk, to the very great inconvenience of the stockowners, and I ask you whether that does not show that the Act is of very little use in retarding the spread of pleuro-pneumonia?—It only proves to me that the diseased animals were not prevented from moving about, otherwise the infection could not possibly have extended in the way it did.

2618. Are you not aware of this fact, that we import 19 cattle out of every 20 that we graze in Norfolk principally from Ireland, and might as the diseased animals have come in from Ireland or elsewhere?—I think it is very probable, and precisely according to the extent that they did come in were the provisions of the Act infringed.

2619. *Chairman* [The Honourable Member for Norfolk said that the Act having been very stringently enforced, did you not think that, the fact of pleuro pneumonia having increased went to prove that the regulations were of no avail; have you knowledge that it was so put in force?—I have not.

2620. *Mr. Chas. Reed.* Is the Act of much use, as far as regards pleuro-pneumonia, without compulsory slaughter?—It would be of considerable use if it were carried out, doubtless, because it would prevent the movement of diseased animals.

2621. But still, notwithstanding that, there is no decrease, but a considerable amount of increase all over the country in the year 1872, as compared with 1871?—That I trace to the circumstance of the Act not being carried out, and diseased animals being allowed to move freely over the country.

2622. Then I suppose we shall have to bring witnesses here from every county in England to prove that where you put the Act in force it has failed?—Unless they could prove that they have prevented the movement of diseased animals from other counties, and other parts of the country, they must at once admit that the provisions have not been carried out.

2623. But I thought you stated that 30 days was not sufficient for isolation from infection by pleuro-pneumonia?—I think not; cases commonly occur after the expiration of a month.

2624. And that therefore, although the Act might have been put very rigidly in force, the movement of animals which were afterwards diseased, might take place from a farm?—Not if proper supervision was kept up as the movement of the animals would be detected, and the Act again put in force upon the same premises.

2625. If at the end of 30 days there has been no case of pleuro-pneumonia, the animals may be removed?—Yes; but if at the end of the 32nd day there is a case of disease, the regulations can be re-established.

2626. But if they are sold upon the 31st day, with no appearance of disease upon them, is it not quite possible that might be divided, and become fresh centres of disease?—Yes, but that has been the case to a very small extent.

2627. How do you judge from that?—I know the fact, that animals which are probably suffering from disease, are moved, and I conclude it is infinitely more probable that they would be a source of spreading the disease than that it would arise in the way you refer to.

a.55.

2628. Where are cattle moved with the pleuro-pneumonia visibly upon them?—From various parts of the country into markets and into dairies.

2629. With the disease upon them?—They are.

2630. Can you give us any instance in the county of Norfolk in which a diseased animal has been found either upon the road or upon the market, in which the owner has not been prosecuted?—I am not aware of a case in Norfolk, but if an owner has been prosecuted for doing it, then I presume it has been done.

2631. The observation which you made the other day with reference to local authorities in no way putting the Act in force (I think that is what you said) means this, that when they endeavoured to stop the transgression of the law, that is not a putting of the Act in force?—To that extent it is putting the Act in force, but I did not, upon the occasion referred to, make a complaint against the local authority. I merely stated that the evidence which was then put before me was the first evidence I had had of the Act having been infringed during a certain period.

2632. The only way in which you can prove that the Act has been infringed, then, is from the fact of proceedings being taken before a court of justice?—And at the same time it affords proof that the provisions of the Act are not carried out. I merely speak of that as a fact, without laying any blame upon the local authority.

2633. You mean to say that it is simply possible for people to break laws?—It is absolute evidence of that fact.

2634. But surely that is no argument to prove that the local authorities have not fulfilled their duty in endeavouring to carry out the Act?—I do not think that I have even suggested that the local authorities have not fulfilled their duty in endeavouring to carry out the Act. I merely take a professional view of the matter, and state that the provisions of the Act have not been carried out.

2635. Do you think the local authorities here with reasonable and due diligence administered the Act?—Do you mean all over the country?

2636. Yes?—I do not.

2637. Not in counties?—Certainly not, speaking of all the counties in England and Scotland.

2638. You have no knowledge of how it is administered in any individual county?—I have no personal knowledge.

2639. Why do you make this sort of wholesale accusation against the local authorities?—From the observation of the fact that the provisions of the Act are not complied with. When I see animals suffering from disease herded with those that are perfectly healthy, and find them exposed in fairs and markets, I am justified in concluding that the provisions that are directed to the prevention of these things have not been carried out.

2640. Is it not quite possible for animals to leave Ireland perfectly healthy, and to be exposed in a state of disease upon Norwich Hill?—Very possible indeed.

2641. Is it not frequently the case?—I believe it is.

2642. Whose fault is that?—It seems to show that some one has not interferred to prevent the exposure of these diseased animals.

x 2

2643. But

Professor
G. T. Brown.
27 March
1873.

Professor
G.T. Brown.
27 March
1873.

2643. But the animal may be perfectly free from disease when he is put into the truck, and he may be delivered into the market in a state of disease?—But he would show the disease during some part of the transit, and if not, upon the morning of the day of sale.

2644. If he was seen in the market what could the inspector do?—The provisions should be carried out before the animal was taken into the market.

2645. Supposing he should get into the market when there are three or four thousand cattle in the market, would it be possible to inspect the whole of the cattle as they go into the market; may not one be there in a diseased state, without its being discovered?—It is not possible to inspect the whole of the cattle as they go into the market, but if the provisions of the Act were carried out, a diseased animal could not be moved along a public road, or carried in a railway van, or taken to market by any other method, and consequently it could not get to market at all.

2646. Would you be surprised to learn that we have had cases reported by the inspectors, of cattle going from Norwich Hill perfectly sound, and upon the second day of their transit to the farms, that they have fallen down upon the road with foot and mouth disease?—It would be quite likely.

2647. And that the unfortunate farmer has been heavily fined for this supposed offence?—Yes; I believe those cases have occurred frequently.

2648. I thought you said before, that in order to be convicted, he must have a guilty knowledge of the disease?—I have always heard counsel contend that it was absolutely necessary, in the case of a penal statute, to construe strictly.

2649. The 57th section says, "Unless he shows to the satisfaction of the justices before whom he is charged, that he did not know of the same being so affected, and that he could not, with reasonable diligence, have obtained such knowledge?"—That is the provision to which I refer.

2650. If some justices in the county of Norfolk have inflicted heavy fines upon farmers who take cattle which have been passed by inspectors as perfectly sound, and those animals have fallen ill upon their transit, do you think that that is a proof that they have endeavoured to administer the Act with a certain amount of severity?—I should say it is a proof that they have used considerable severity in administering that provision of the Act.

2651. And almost more than "due diligence"?—I would not inflict that slur upon the justices.

2652. This is the statement you have made, "I have long come to the conclusion that farmers really care nothing at all about foot and mouth disease?"—That is so.

2653. Upon what authority do you make that statement?—I only judge from what I have seen all over the country.

2654. Do you suppose that the agricultural societies and farmers' clubs and chambers of agriculture, which have been more or less asking for greater restrictions upon foot and mouth disease, do not represent in any way the farmers of England?—I think they represent one set of convictions, but I think that there are always two; one about which a man talks a great deal at public meetings, and another which guides his actions, and I only respect the latter one.

2655. Do not you think that the loss of 2 l. a

head would guide his convictions a good deal?—Still, judging from his actions, one is not justified in concluding that it would.

2656. Do you speak of the farmers as a class, or are you speaking of cattle dealers?—I speak of all the farmers that I have conversed with at various agricultural meetings, and at their own homesteads.

2657. They say they care nothing about the disease?—The general statement I have met with is to that effect.

2658. Do not they accept it as inevitable, and therefore do not care about it?—I believe they accept it as inevitable, and probably upon that account they do not care about it.

2659. Previously to the year 1865 (when the Cattle Plague Restrictions proved that the foot and mouth disease could be restricted, and in all probability got rid of) did we believe that there ever was a chance of getting rid of the foot and mouth disease?—Probably at the time the impression might have existed.

2660. And when Professor Gamgee told us, in 1862, that if we could get rid of it, and it was not re-imported, we should not have it again; the farmers who heard him did not believe a word he said?—I do not believe that any farmer who knew anything about the matter did.

2661. And when it was proved to demonstration that we did get rid of the foot and mouth disease, according to your own evidence, almost entirely, then we thought there was a chance of its not being so general again?—I believe the impression at that time did exist, but only for a short time.

2662. Then what has caused all the numerous agricultural meetings that we have held within the last two or three years, in which increased stringency has been advocated?—I presume they have arisen like other meetings, in consequence of certain persons thinking it desirable to call them for some purpose or other.

2663. Do not you think they have resulted from the enormous losses that have taken place?—I do not think it was in consequence of any special feeling upon the part of the farmers themselves, that much good would arise out of such meetings.

2664. Not such meetings, but such restrictions?—I am perfectly convinced that the whole agricultural community would resist the infliction of anything like the cattle plague restrictions, on account of the foot and mouth disease.

2665. Looking to the enormous losses (Mr. Howard valued them in Bedfordshire at 40,000 l. last year, and I put down the Norfolk losses at 100,000 l.), do not you think that people would naturally be desirous of trying to get rid of so damaging a disease?—Probably, when they take a public view of the matter; but taking the private view, each farmer would calculate whether it was better worth his while to put up with the annoyance of these severe restrictions, or to run the risk of taking the foot and mouth disease on to his farm, and he would act always at least under the presumption that he might escape altogether.

2666. Is glanders very common now in London?—Glanders is more prevalent now than it has been for some years.

2667. How is that?—Undoubtedly in consequence of glandered horses being used on public roads.

2668. And that, notwithstanding the passing of

of this Act?—It is another instance of the statement that I have previously made, that the provisions have not been carried out.

2669. What provisions are there for glanders?—The effect of them would be to compel an owner to give notice to the police-constable of the existence of that disease, and he would be compelled to keep the horse in his own stables.

2670. Which he does not do?—Which he does not do.

2671. Is not this disease imported from Belgium?—I never met with an instance of it in a Belgian horse.

2672. You think that giving notice to the police of the existence of the foot and mouth disease is of no use?—Not unless with the view to active legislation.

2673. Would not it have this effect, that if the police are empowered to stop cattle which are affected with the foot and mouth disease upon the road, and when they appear in the market, would it not give the man insight as to where the disease was supposed to exist?—It would do so.

2674. Would not it be better, in addition to giving notice to the police, that the owner of the stock should give notice to his immediate neighbours of the existence of the disease?—I think that should be done as a mere matter of friendly feeling.

2675. But when they know disease exists, would it not be better to have a law to make them do it?—I fancy it would be very difficult to legislate so far without going considerably further.

2676. The whole summer's grass is frequently given away by graziers when their stock is affected with foot and mouth disease, is it not?—Practically so, I believe.

2677. The cows frequently never return to their milk again until they have had another calf, I believe?—I should not say frequently, having regard to the number of animals attacked, but that is the case sometimes.

2678. You stated that highly-bred stock are more likely to contract disease than other animals?—Speaking generally, highly-bred animals are more susceptible to disease than those that are in their natural condition.

2679. Then do not all animals which are much exposed to fatigue, and have undergone a great amount of misery, become more susceptible to disease?—They are more susceptible to disease generally.

2680. And would not disease generally hurt them a good deal more?—Unless extra care were taken to protect them.

2681. Do you think that with regard to the compensation, that might be upon a more liberal scale than it is?—Solely with the idea of making it to the interest of the owner to state the existence of disease on his farm.

2682. In order to have it extirpated?—Decidedly.

2683. Then I think you stated that you would have the power vested in the Privy Council to send down their own inspectors in the case of an outbreak of cattle plague, and kill not only the cattle which were in contact with the diseased animals, but those which were close to them?—That is my opinion.

2684. I think I understand you to say that you do not consider that the National Exchequer should be burdened with the payment of that
0.63.

compensation?—That is a matter upon which I could give no opinion at all; it is certainly desirable that the animal should be paid for, but undoubtedly I should not without the least respect for the pockets of the persons who had to to pay.

2685. As a professional man, you would?—I should.

2686. Would you not think if these cattle, which brought the plague, were imported for the special benefit of the nation, and not of the unfortunate farmer, who catches the cattle plague, it should be the nation rather than the individual who should pay compensation?—If I were to grant the assumption, I should admit the conclusion.

2687. You cannot give a bullock pleuro-pneumonia by inoculation?—We have always failed to do so.

2688. You do not believe in inoculation as a preventative?—I have not a very precise opinion upon the subject; the evidence which I have met with has been so very contradictory.

2689. You have never conducted any very large experiments yourself, have you?—Not individually; but I have superintended experiments upon a considerable scale, and I have found the results which are obtained are exactly those which have been obtained already by the simple process of isolation.

2690. What does that mean?—I mean the separation of diseased animals immediately upon the occurrence of the first symptoms.

2691. You mean as a preventative?—As a means of arresting the progress of the disease.

2692. But I believe in inoculation it is not actually supposed that you give an animal pleuro-pneumonia, although you give it some kind of disorder which protects it from the disease?—It is presumed that you give a local form of disease; you produce exactly the conditions of pleuro-pneumonia in the part into which the matter is introduced.

2693. That is to say, you give it pleuro-pneumonia in the tail, which, as a rule, would not be fatal, except to the tail?—Except it extends to other parts of the body; then it is fatal.

2694. It has been adopted in Australia, I believe, to some extent?—It has largely, I believe.

2695. Do you know with what effect?—The inspector's report is quite in favour of it.

2696. I see that in the Report for 1871 there is a note to say that 734 cases of pleuro-pneumonia are reported to have been caused by inoculation; do you believe that?—I am perfectly certain that it is incorrect. I have made that statement frequently when my attention has been called to these reports.

2697. And therefore you believe that they were improperly reported as cases of pleuro-pneumonia arising from inoculation?—Yes.

2698. But you do recommend inoculation for sheep-pox?—Only under certain circumstances.

2699. That is to say, that when it became very extensive you would approve of inoculation?—When it is very extensively spread in the country, or when it manifests a tendency to spread through a particular flock.

2700. But, on the other hand, upon the first outbreak of sheep-pox you would compulsorily slaughter all the sheep in contact with the diseased ones?—I would not go so far as to say I would slaughter all the sheep in contact with the
the

Professor
G. T. Brown.
—
27 March
1873.

Professor
G. T. Brown.
27 March
1873.

the diseased ones, but I would have a compulsory slaughter of all the diseased ones; and I would advise that when only one flock was affected, the whole should be got rid of by slaughter, and buried, if necessary.

2701. That is to say, the slaughter of the whole of the diseased animals, and of those that were herded with them at the same time?—That is my belief, referring to the first introduction of the disease into the centre of a district.

2702. Therefore I suppose you do not object to the recommendation of the Central Chamber of Agriculture with regard to the treatment of sheep-pox?—Not if the treatment is restricted to the slaughter of the flock upon the first appearance of infection.

2703. There is another passage in your Report which I should like to ask a question upon, and that is with regard to this statement as to hares, rabbits, poultry, crows, and wood-pigeons being subject to the foot and mouth disease, upon what authority are those statements made?—They are made upon the authority of certain Continental writers, who state that the disease has extended to those animals.

2704. Do you believe it?—I have no right to contradict them, but as far as my own experience goes, I have not seen the disease either in dogs or birds.

2705. Would not it be a very easy matter to set that at rest by a few experiments in inoculation?—It would, certainly; but we have already in this country sufficient evidence that dogs are not susceptible, from the fact that an instance of the disease has never been detected in them.

2706. Nor yet in hares and rabbits?—In no instance that I have examined of hares which have been sent from the country have I found any trace of the disease.

2707. I think you stated that you had seen poultry affected?—I have not seen them, but they were undoubtedly affected in the early part of the outbreak.

2708. But you think you can communicate this disease by inoculation to all animals that would take it?—By the use of the saliva; and it is asserted by the Continental authorities that inoculation with the contents of vesicles will also produce it.

2709. I see that in another portion of the Report you say you have proved to demonstration, by inoculation, that the foot disease in sheep is the foot and mouth disease which affects cattle?—We have proved that.

2710. You have proved that to demonstration?—We have proved that to demonstration by producing the disease interchangeably.

2711. And it would be possible to produce it in other animals and birds if they were susceptible of it?—Certainly.

2712. That could be done at no very great expense, I suppose?—At no cost at all.

2713. May I ask why it is not done?—I am not aware why it is not done, except that there are so many other things to be done that ten times one's ordinary life would not suffice to enable one to do them.

2714. Is it not quite within the bounds of possibility to have, even at the Privy Council Office, a few rabbits and wood-pigeons to experimentally upon?—It is possible, but we could do it more conveniently at the Veterinary College.

2715. Do not you think that, instead of frightening the whole agricultural mind into the idea that all these animals and birds contract the disease and may spread it, it would be as well to have a few experiments made which would cost very little time and no money, in order to prove whether it is right or wrong?—I think it would be difficult to prove, in this country, whether the statements made by Continental authorities are absolutely right or wrong. They might allege fairly that certain differences of climate might operate, even if we came to opposite results.

2716. But we do not care what happens in other climates; we want to know what is the nature of the disease in this country; therefore, surely you might make these experiments here, which would have the effect of settling the question as far as England was concerned?—There would be no difficulty at all in doing it.

2717. You do not think that the foot and mouth disease in the recent outbreak has changed in any way from that of previous years?—Not compared with several of the previous outbreaks. I speak in reference to its fatality.

2718. I am not speaking with regard to its fatality, but with regard to the extraordinary way in which it has attacked sheep lately; was there ever so large an outbreak amongst sheep as there has been during the last year?—I am not aware of that having been so large, but there was a more fatal outbreak amongst sheep, I believe, in 1842.

2719. But is it not the fact, that in this recent outbreak there has been a development of a disease in the mouth of the sheep in a way which we have never had before?—No, I believe not; that development in the mouth of the sheep is comparatively rare, but so far as I am informed, it was as common in former years as it has been during the last outbreak.

2720. Then if I were to tell you that I have had the management of sheep for 30 years, and that I never knew a case in which it affected the mouth until this year, you would consider that my experience was exceptional?—I am afraid I should be obliged to conclude that you had not taken the trouble to examine their mouths until lately.

2721. I will put another case, and that is, that if sheep happened to die from the effects of this mouth disease, do not you think that it would have been brought to my observation very forcibly in my early days by the fact of their dying from it?—If they died from the effects of disease in the mouth, but that certainly is a very rare condition, and I should think would depend largely upon some local peculiarities.

2722. Have you any records of this disease in the mouth of sheep in the year 1842?—I am not aware that the mouths were affected then, but the disease assumed a very fatal character in the neighbourhood of Harrow in 1862, and I believe destroyed a very considerable number of sheep.

2723. It was, until this year, generally considered that a recurrence of foot and mouth disease in cattle never occurred under 12 months; do you think it is anything new that they should be attacked three times in the course of one year?—I believe there were cases in 1840 of second and third attacks; and I have been told frequently by farmers and cattle dealers of instances which have come under their knowledge in which animals have been affected twice and
three

three times during one year, but I believe recently those cases have been more frequent.

2734. Mr. PeM.] With regard to that attack at Harrow, you are too young a man to remember it?—I do not remember it.

2735. Where did you get your record of it; did Mr. King, of Stammers, leave any record of it?—I believe Professor Simonds is well acquainted with all the circumstances of it. I am only aware, generally, that it was a very fatal outbreak at that time.

2736. Mr. Clare Mead.] How often are you, as an inspector, called out from the Privy Council Office into the country?—It depends entirely upon the state and prevalence of disease.

2737. If, sometimes, there should be a very extensive outbreak of cattle plague, your staff of inspectors would be totally unable to go to all the outbreaks?—I should be only expected to visit those districts in which certain circumstances rendered it necessary that an inquiry should be made.

2738. Are there no veterinary inspectors having a retaining fee from the Privy Council, who are bound to go at any time to inspect cases of disease?—There is an arrangement, I believe, sanctioned by the Treasury, which allows the department to employ veterinary surgeons at a certain fee per day, for the purpose of making any inspections which may be necessary.

2739. Are you satisfied with the position of the veterinary profession in your office, with regard to the emolument it receives?—I do not think my own opinion upon that subject would be worth much. Of course, if it were a question whether my salary should be increased, I do not think that I should be called upon to object to it in any way.

2740. I see that in the Estimates we have a memorandum that the chief inspector is to receive 500*l.* a year, and you, as chief inspector, now have 600*l.* a year, the extra 100*l.* being put down as personal allowance: can you tell me what that means?—I have not the slightest idea. I believe it was an allowance given to Professor Simonds, in consideration of the circumstances under which he was first engaged, and that allowance has been continued to me. At the commencement of the department, our salaries were considerably more than they are now.

2741. What is the maximum for the chief inspector to be in future?—£850, I think.

2742. What is the maximum of the chief clerk?—I believe it is 600*l.*; but I may make great mistakes in speaking of the salaries of the officers of the department.

2743. May I ask which officer has the greatest amount of responsibility, the chief officer or the chief clerk?—I presume that, with due regard to modesty, I ought to state that the chief clerk has.

2744. Putting the modesty on one side, do you not think you have a heavier responsibility on you than the chief clerk has?—Yes, I may think so individually; but I have no right to think that; my opinion might not be that of other persons.

2745. But of course the duties of chief veterinary inspector would bring with them a greater amount of responsibility than those of the chief clerk?—Certainly, to the individual himself.

2746. And consequently to the office that he holds?—Probably so.

2747. I think you said that cattle coming from

the south of Ireland to Bristol, were about 12 hours on their voyage?—From Cork to Bristol, I think, is about from 18 to 20 hours.

2748. Is it not more than 24 hours?—I have in my notes from 18 to 20 hours.

2749. We used to take 10 hours from Bristol to Tenby?—The boats from Cork to Bristol are very excellent, and I believe they attain a high rate of speed.

2750. Would not it be a good thing for cattle if they were landed at Milford Haven, instead of being taken up to Bristol, provided there was sufficient accommodation to land them there?—It would be an advantage to the cattle to the extent that it would lessen the duration of the voyage.

2751. With regard to watering and feeding in transit, you state that the proposed plans would necessitate the reconstruction of all the rolling stock?—Those plans would which propose to water the animals during transit, or rather in transit, while they are actually moving.

2752. But it would not necessitate the reconstruction of the rolling stock to water them at the stations, in the trucks?—It would necessitate a considerable alteration in the trucks.

2753. Have you seen the plan of Mr. Alfred Welsh?—I have seen the plan, but I do not recognise it by his name.

2754. You stated, that in the separation of cattle in the Bristol market, the farmers made no difference in the prices that they gave for those cattle that were actually diseased and those that were not diseased?—Those which were actually diseased would not be allowed to leave the market.

2755. What do you mean by a separation of the cattle?—They are separated as they are detected, and placed in one corner of the market.

2756. They are in the market, although they are diseased?—They are kept there; there is no other place to put them in, they are kept perforce in the market.

2757. I understood you to say that there was no care taken in the separation of those that were diseased from those that were healthy?—I stated that the farmers take no care to inform themselves as to the lot of animals out of which a diseased animal has been taken, and we are aware that after having bought animals at the Bristol market, although they know of the presence of the disease, they have taken them on to their farms and mixed them with their own stock without taking any precaution whatever.

2758. Would it not be an absolute certainty that those cattle which had been herded with the diseased cattle would take the disease, and that nine out of every ten cattle in the market would have the foot and mouth disease?—It is undoubtedly the case that a very large proportion of them must have it.

2759. Mr. Dent.] How long have you been connected with the Veterinary Department of the Privy Council?—Since its formation.

2760. And I suppose one of your duties is to go to investigate into any outbreak or any particular complaint which is made to the department about disease?—Yes, it is.

2761. That does take you frequently from your office?—It does, frequently.

2762. And gives you some considerable information amongst farmers, cattle dealers, and importers?—Certainly.

2763. Therefore, when you say that the farmers

Professor
G. T. Brown.

27 March
1873.

Professor
G. T. Brown.
—
17 March
1873.

farmers do not take all the precautions that they might against the spread of the foot and mouth disease, you are not speaking without some personal knowledge of the matter?—I am not.

2754. You state that it is no infrequent thing for a farmer to buy a fresh lot of beasts, and take them home from the market, and mix them with his other stock without any isolation?—It is the common practice.

2755. Although there may have been other stock in the fair decidedly affected with disease?—Decidedly.

2756. With regard to the statement in the Report with reference to foot and mouth disease, I do not understand you to endorse all those statements upon your own authority?—Certainly not; I merely give the Lords of the Council my opinions which have been obtained from various sources.

2757. For instance, with regard to these smaller animals being affected, I do not understand you to endorse that statement, but merely to say that competent observers have said such things?—Yes, precisely; I intended to say so.

2758. I wish to ask you a few questions with regard to the port of Hull, and the outbreak of cattle disease. I believe there were altogether eight cargoes affected with cattle plague which came to England?—I believe there were nine.

2759. You succeeded in preventing the spread of the disease in every case except in the case of Hull and the East Riding?—We did; and in that particular case the animals never got upon land at all.

2760. The disease, therefore, must have been carried ashore, not by the animals themselves, but by those who had been in contact with them?—It must have been so carried.

2761. You are reasonably satisfied, in your own mind, that that disease was carried into the East Riding of Yorkshire by contagion, carried from the Hull Cattle Market?—That is the impression that I have formed from the evidence which came before me.

2762. It would be impossible to prove these things always affirmatively, but, deducing it from the facts within your knowledge, you have every reason to believe that that was the case?—I have every reason to believe so.

2763. The danger that arises at Hull, as I understand, is the contiguity of the present cattle market to the defined part of the port?—That is one source of danger.

2764. Is it not a very extensive source of danger?—It is a very extensive source of danger, undoubtedly.

2765. Has any suggestion ever been made to remove the present English cattle market to some other part, and to appropriate the present cattle market to the foreign trade entirely?—That was done originally, when I defined the port.

2766. That was carried out, do you mean, for a time?—That was carried out for some considerable time; that arrangement was made in October 1869, and it was in force until February 1870.

2767. At that time did no English cattle go into the present cattle market at Hull?—None at all.

2768. Where was the market?—In Corporation Field, and also in a field by the railway siding, a short distance from Hull.

2769. But it was, at your suggestion, or at the desire of the locality, that a fresh arrangement was come to?—It was at the request of the local

authority, arising out of a memorial which was sent to them by the dealers of the neighbourhood.

2770. Do you remember at all what the dealers' object was; was it the inconvenience of having two markets, or something of that kind?—They objected to being obliged to sell their sheep in Corporation Field and cattle in the cattle market; there not being space, I presume, for the two; and they requested either that the whole trade might be carried to Corporation Field, or that sheep might be allowed to come into the cattle market.

2771. The cattle market for English stock, as I understand, was then removed from the present spot?—The term "cattle market" in Hull applies to a certain piece of ground and buildings upon the north side of Edward's-place; it was formerly used on one side for foreign stock, and upon the other side for English stock, before the cattle plague led to any restrictions. That cattle market was included in the boundaries which were drawn for the defined part in 1867, and the cattle market was taken out of those boundaries at the request of the local authorities, instigated by the dealers in February 1870, it being alleged that it was for the convenience of the trade.

2772. Do you think it would be an improvement if the present cattle market were made a part of the defined port, and an entirely new cattle market were made for the English stock, and that from unscheduled countries?—Yes, I think so, certainly.

2773. It might lead to a still larger development of the trade from scheduled countries if there were more accommodation?—Probably all the animals that can be sent into the Port of Hull are sent under present arrangements; but there would be great convenience in having extra accommodation for those which do arrive.

2774. Are you satisfied with the present arrangements, by which the Customs officers have the first charge of animals which are believed to be affected with the disease?—I see no objection to their taking charge of them in the mere act of landing.

2775. Would it not have been possible to have hurried all those cases down in the Humber, upon the Corporation land outside the limits, instead of taking them out to sea and sinking them?—It would have been possible, but the ship was in the defined port.

2776. But could not they have been taken out in lighters and hurried, or could not the ship have been taken back again out of the defined port, and the carcasses slaughtered and buried there?—It was objected by the Customs authorities that the ship, being in the defined port, could not be legally taken out; and in any case it could not have been taken out until the cargo was removed, and the ship was properly cleared.

2777. With respect to one question which was put to you, as to the fear of disease having very much checked the breeding of cattle at home, I think I understand that upon a breeding farm there is much less chance of any form of disease, provided you do not introduce strange stock on to it?—Decidedly.

2778. Then it ought rather to be an encouragement to breed, owing to the freedom from disease in home-bred stock?—It appears so.

2779. You stated, I think, that you found in the Hull Market cattle marked with the broad arrow, when you went down there once?—I did.

2780. Those cattle ought, undoubtedly, not to have

have been taken into the market, ought they?—Certainly not.

2781. They were from a scheduled country, and they ought to have been kept in the defined part of the port?—They should have been so kept.

2782. Mr. Cloy.] The place where you saw these cattle, and which was outside the defined area, was previously inside the defined area, was it not?—Yes, it was.

2783. Was it shortly after the change?—It was about 18 months after the change.

2784. So that it could not have been urged in excuse for the policeman that he did not know of the change?—It was not so urged, but he admitted that they had been in the habit of removing cattle where there was no room in the defined part; but in his own defence, he stated that he always saw when taken back again.

2785. Mr. Mowell.] Do I rightly gather from your evidence that nothing short of the extreme measures taken at the time of the cattle plague would be effectual to prevent the disease from being imported into Great Britain from Ireland?—Referring to the foot and mouth disease, I think nothing short of those restrictions would be effective.

2786. And with regard to pleuro-pneumonia?—I think that something short of those restrictions might be effective in the case of pleuro-pneumonia.

2787. Will you state what you would suggest in the case of pleuro-pneumonia?—I would suggest that the same steps should be taken in Ireland as I have suggested already should be taken in England.

2788. I am not talking about what should be done in Ireland; I say those measures would only be effectual to prevent its being introduced from Ireland into Great Britain; we will come afterwards to what should be done in Ireland; have you any suggestion to make with regard to any measure short of these very extreme measures of slaughtering the whole herd, which could be adopted to prevent the importation of the disease from Ireland into Great Britain?—I do not think any measures that were adopted in this country would prevent the importation of pleuro-pneumonia from Ireland.

2789. And those measures, in your opinion, it would be impossible to take in the normal state of things?—I think so.

2790. Then the security of this country must depend upon the measures that are taken in Ireland?—To a very large extent.

2791. I want to ask you whether you approve of the Irish system?—As far as I had an opportunity of observing the outline of the system, I may say it is a very good one, but it failed entirely for the want of sufficient officers.

2792. The system is an excellent one, but there are not a sufficient number of persons to work it in a satisfactory way?—That is the case.

2793. There are, I believe, in Ireland now only two veterinary surgeons?—I believe there are more members of the profession in Ireland.

2794. I mean that there are only two veterinary inspectors employed by the Veterinary Department?—I believe only two.

2795. You would consider, I presume, that in order to work that system there is a highly centralised system, a very much larger force would be required?—Certainly.

2796. The most effectual protection which

could be given to this country would be that the Veterinary Department in Ireland should have a sufficient force to work it?—Undoubtedly so.

2797. With regard to your statements as to the foot and mouth disease having been imported from Holland to Cork; those statements after all rest upon very slight evidence, do they not?—Only on the fact of the disease having existed previously in Holland.

2798. But the exact statement, as I understand it, comes simply to this, that in the years 1839, 1840, or 1841, it is supposed that the disease was imported from Holland to Cork?—That refers more particularly to pleuro-pneumonia, there is nothing more definite than that.

2799. With regard to the foot and mouth disease do you know the case of an outbreak of foot and mouth disease at Lonsbay Island, an island three miles off the coast of Ireland, to which there had been no animal communication for many months before the disease broke out?—We had a report from Professor Ferguson upon that subject.

2800. And have you formed an opinion as to how that disease got to Lonsbay Island?—It must have been conveyed in some indirect manner.

2801. As I understand, for upwards of three weeks before the disease broke out, owing to stress of weather, there was no communication at all with the island?—I should rather doubt the truth of that statement.

2802. That is what Professor Ferguson has informed me. What I wanted to get at was, was there any possible way in which you would imagine the disease could have got there, assuming those facts to be correct, except by means of sea birds?—Except it came there by means of sea birds, which would be hardly likely to carry the virus under those circumstances.

2803. Mr. Clere Read.] Was not there a similar outbreak on an island near Tenby, near the mainland?—That was so.

2804. In that case I believe there was constant communication?—In that case there was constant communication.

2805. Mr. Lusk.] You were asked with regard to the Deptford Market, whether it was in good condition, and you said that it was?—I believe so.

2806. Do not you know that personally?—Upon the occasions when I have visited the market, the arrangements have been quite to my satisfaction.

2807. You were asked whether there should not be a railway to the market?—It appears to me to be a matter of convenience, for the removal of the meat from the market.

2808. That is a matter in which the public is concerned, and not those who made the market?—Unless those who made the market could see a clear source of revenue in adding a railway, I do not think they would be likely to undertake the speculation.

2809. They have undertaken as much as they are likely to get a proportionate payment for?—They have expended more than, I think, they are ever likely to get a return for.

2810. If the public want a railway, they should get it themselves?—I think that is reasonable.

2811. What do you think about the foot and mouth disease being prevalent there in the last two months?—I have no doubt the reports are correct;

Professor G. T. Brown.

27 March 1875.

Professor
G. T. Brown,
—
27 March
1873.

correct; but I do not interpret the statements in the same way. I do not consider the number of cases reported to be evidence of the fearful prevalence of the disease.

2812. There are a great many reports that we hear, which ought to be taken with a considerable amount of reservation?—I think all the reports that come to us from the Deptford Market are absolutely exact; but it is the popular interpretation that ought to be taken with caution.

2813. You mentioned with regard to pleuro-pneumonia, an experiment with cotton wool taken from the nose of a diseased animal, and put into the nose of a healthy animal, which met with no effect, I believe?—That has not succeeded in this country; but a similar experiment tried in Ireland was said to have succeeded.

2814. But you are not aware whether that is true or not?—No doubt the animal which was so treated became the subject of disease; but with all these cases the difficulty is to decide whether the disease arose from the virus which was placed in the animal's system during the experiment, or whether it was introduced at some previous period; and to be of any value, those experiments must be repeated over and over again.

2815. From long experience, and no doubt you tried it in a scientific way, you produced no effect whatever, so far as you are concerned?—We did not.

2816. Therefore that ought to be treated along with the reports we get from the market, with considerable reservation?—I do not think the reports we get from the market at all refer to these experiments.

2817. But I mean it should be treated in the same way?—Yes, unless those reports are official; but a statement of the number of cases is always published in the "Gazette," and there should be no question about its correctness.

2818. Do you believe in the infectiousness of pleuro-pneumonia?—Yes, it is highly infectious.

2819. How do you account for the experiments you have tried not succeeding?—That is a peculiarity which it is quite impossible to explain; it is almost the only contagious disease which cannot be directly communicated.

2820. How do you mean it cannot be communicated?—Not by inoculation.

2821. Now by breathing through cotton, as you have tried it?—In the two cases the result of one was positive, and the other was negative in its evidence; but the fact of its spreading amongst a herd when a diseased animal is introduced is sufficient evidence that it is contagious.

2822. In talking of the foot and mouth disease, I think you mentioned, in answer to one question, that you would not pay much attention to statistics in the case of that disease?—Excepting for the purpose of ascertaining where diseased animals are likely to be removed from, I do not know that any good would be likely to arise from obtaining statistics, unless you had at the same time active legislation.

2823. It is not fatal in many cases, as I understand?—The total mortality, I believe, would be something like one per cent. upon all the animals attacked, and in my judgment the fatality which has occurred is due to the unscientific treatment to which the animals are submitted.

2824. The losses that occur from that are

chiefly the fault of those who administer to the diseased animals?—Very largely so.

2825. Dr. Williams mentioned that he believed, if I am not mistaken, that foot and mouth disease was indigenous to this country; now do you believe that?—It is difficult to state under what circumstances a disease becomes indigenous but it certainly is so far fixed in this country that it is scarcely or never entirely absent.

2826. I do not mean to go practically into the question of when it was first imported, but do you believe that it is fixed in this country now?—I believe it is.

2827. Do you think that it is communicated as well by contact?—Undoubtedly it is.

2828. Do not you think that certain conditions in the atmosphere or in the animals themselves will produce both pleuro-pneumonia and foot and mouth disease?—I believe that certain conditions, both in the animal's system and in the atmosphere, may assist the spread of these diseases, but I do not believe that any conditions which exclude the germs of the disease can possibly result in its production.

2829. Certain conditions which occur in a house where persons are huddled together will produce fever; that is an admitted fact. Do you not think that certain conditions in which animals may be, will produce this disease without contact with any other diseased animal?—I do not think those conditions will produce infectious disease. If it is a fever, it is a fever of a non-infectious character.

2830. You mentioned that this disease was spread from the Metropolitan Market in all directions; how was it spread in all directions?—By animals which were exposed in the market suffering from disease communicating it to others, and those others being taken to various parts of the country.

2831. But the animals sold there are mostly for slaughter, are they not?—Yes they are, but the animals sold for slaughter are constantly taken to be fed upon pasture for some time before they are slaughtered. Some graziers prefer buying animals which are nearly fat, what we should call fat animals; they buy and treat them as store cattle. Some pastures fatten so rapidly, that it is more economical to get the animal on and off quickly.

2832. You were speaking about the hold of a ship; do you think that their being confined there tends to produce the disease itself?—I do not think it tends to produce it.

2833. Are you aware that emigrants on board a ship where the smell is very often exceedingly bad, generally find in very good health in Australia and New Zealand?—I am not aware as to that.

2834. Is it not the fact, that farmers, instead of making known the existence of foot and mouth disease, as a rule, would keep it to themselves upon their farms?—I find that owners of stock are generally disinclined to make statements as to the existence of disease upon their premises.

2835. I suppose they are afraid of the restrictions and other troubles, and they think the least said is the better for themselves?—I think there is a general dislike to have it known that animals upon their premises are affected with disease.

2836. Mr. Tipping.] I think you admitted that the effect of the disease has been rather to discourage the production of breeding stock?—I did not intend to admit that. I think I stated that

that it should have had the contrary effect, inasmuch as the stocks which are sustained by breeding would be less likely to take disease than those herds and flocks which are kept up by the introduction of new stock.

2837. For instance, does the meat which is the result of a live animal killed in London, brought alive from Aberdeen, fetch a higher price than the dead meat which is brought from Aberdeen; which would obtain the highest price in the market?—I have no information upon that point, but I know that Aberdeen beef is very highly estimated, whether in the carcass or in the live animal.

2838. Upon the question of transit, do cattle often go by railway without being in charge of any driver, or anyone employed to represent the owner?—Yes; I believe they do very often.

2839. Do you believe that in those instances the railway company is liable as regards watering, supposing there is no person in charge?—The railway company is not liable, I believe, under the present arrangements.

2840. Do you consider that it is the province of the railway company to do more than supply the conveniences in such a case as that?—In my own mind, I should say not.

2841. I may gather from you that you consider the water custody has been considerably exaggerated?—Yes.

2842. That is to say, everyone feels for himself; one rather judges of the feelings of cattle by his own in such a position, and does not understand the practical difficulties which attend the transit; you may take a horse to the water, but you cannot make him drink; is it not the case that that credulity has been greatly exaggerated?—I believe it is considerably exaggerated; but, at the same time, I have no doubt cattle suffer very much in very hot weather from want of water.

2843. The constant and careful disinfection of steamers, to which you alluded as being very desirable, is an item which must be costly, and must naturally affect the cost of transit, and increase the delay and all those precautions, however necessary, must tend naturally in their final result to enhance the cost of meat to the consumer?—All the cost falls upon the consumer in the end, doubtless.

2844. All those precautions must increase the cost?—They must.

2845. Do you at all complain of the want of disinfection of railway trucks now-a-days?—Generally speaking, they are not properly disinfected; but of all, the trucks are not properly cleaned; the great difficulty seems to be to get a sufficient application of water.

2846. What do you mean by a proper disinfection of the trucks; do you mean the frequency of it, or the necessary washing of it?—Always after one animal has been conveyed, the truck should be thoroughly cleaned and disinfected before another one is put into it.

2847. You are decidedly in favour of close packing in steamers, does that apply to railway trucks also?—Certainly it does.

2848. No less so?—No less so within reasonable limits, which must be left to the owner or person in charge.

2849. You were asked whether the hirs of the North Western Railway at Liverpool were decently good; are they not very good?—The hirs at Liverpool are very good.

2850. You used the word "decently good;" I wish to know whether that was quite the qualification to apply?—They are very good.

2851. With regard to the Gallician and Holstein cattle, and the Normandy cattle, do you consider them as good as our own beasts?—Yes, as some of our own beasts.

2852. Do you attribute the difference in the price to a sort of insular prejudice in favour of our own produce, rather than to its superior quality?—Yes.

2853. The result of the prejudice is in favour of insular meat?—Yes, I believe every body is prejudiced against eating foreign meat.

2854. Supposing that the restrictions which you have explained to me, and the system of vigilance was carried out to its ideal, would not that raise the price of meat to an amount equal to the effect upon the price by slaughtering at the port of landing, that is to say, it is admitted that slaughter at the ports of landing would enhance the price of meat; if there was anything like a vigorous carrying out of your ideal system, would it have an equal effect in enhancing the price?—It is disputed, in the first place, that slaughter at the ports of landing will enhance the price of meat.

2855. Do you dispute that?—The evidence which I obtained when I was directed to make inquiry in the Midland counties led me to infer that little or no effect had been produced by the slaughter of the animals at the ports, but that if any effect had been produced, it was to the effect of lowering the price.

2856. That was during the great panic, was it not?—During the time of the cattle plague. I think the conclusion is hypothetical. The presumption is, that if all the foreign stock were slaughtered at the port of landing the price would rise.

2857. If the railway companies were compelled to carry the cattle through without stopping, that would have a serious effect, would it not, in raising the price of such transit?—Doubtless it would.

2858. Mr. Barclay.] You stated that it was safer to keep a breeding stock than a fattening one; that is simply due to the fact, that there would not be so much cattle brought upon the farm?—Yes, precisely.

2859. You spoke with reference to its being safer in that respect only?—That is all.

2860. Is it possible to get foot and mouth disease and cattle plague on a farm, although you bring no new cattle upon it?—It is certainly possible.

2861. Has it happened frequently?—It has happened, and one might say that it has happened frequently.

2862. In case of cattle plague and foot and mouth disease?—Certainly.

2863. So it is no immunity to a farmer not to bring cattle upon his farm?—Nothing would give immunity, but in those counties where few cattle have been introduced those diseases have been generally absent.

2864. What is the consequence of any of those three contagious diseases coming into a breeding stock?—It would lead to the serious injury, and probably the destruction of the herd or flock amongst which it appeared.

2865. If it was to be slaughtered the value of the carcasses would bear a very different proportion

Professor
G. T. Brown,
27 March
1873.

Professor
G. T. Brown.
27 March
1873.

partion to the value of the live animals upon a breeding farm or a fattening farm?—Yes.

2866. The risk of loss by disease is very much greater upon a breeding farm than upon a fattening one?—Quite so, assuming that the disease is once there.

2867. And to that extent it would be likely to involve a much heavier effect upon the farmer as involving a greater loss?—I doubt whether there would be a much greater effect.

2868. The killing of a breeding stock as compared with a fattening one, would involve a much greater loss?—Certainly.

2869. The farmers are anxious to import store cattle from abroad, if they can do it safely, are they not?—Chiefly dairymen. They are anxious to import milk cows from the Netherlands.

2870. Therefore, cattle would be imported still from abroad, if it could be done with equal safety as from Ireland?—I do not think they care much about store stock from abroad, except with regard to dairy purposes.

2871. *Chairman.* The Honourable Member for Norfolk asked you about your salary; what is your present salary?—£200, with an annual increment of 20*l.* up to 850*l.*

2872. You know your profession very well; what is the professional income of a veterinary surgeon in good practice?—I should think a veterinary surgeon in good practice in London might multiply that by four without any difficulty at all.

2873. You know that the veterinary surgeons do make more than 2,000 *l.* a year?—I do.

2874. Do you know the chief clerk's salary?—I am not quite certain, but from what I remember of the Estimates, it is 600 *l.*

2875. When the secretary of the Veterinary Department is obliged to be absent, the chief clerk is obliged to take his place?—Yes.

2876. In that case you are aware that he would have to advise the Lord President or the Vice President, as to the steps to be taken, in case of any interference with the trade?—Yes, he has to do so.

2877. An Honourable Member wishes me to ask you why the secretary should be absent; perhaps you will answer that question, and also answer whether he is often absent or not?—He is very seldom absent for any length of time; but on one occasion he was absent from illness, and on several occasions he has made an attempt to take the vacation which is allowed to him, and which I believe he has a right to.

2878. And has not succeeded?—And has not succeeded.

2879. And he was sent also to Vienna, was he not?—He was.

2880. *Mr. Cleve Seed.* In answer to a question from Mr. Alderman Lusk, you said that

you thought that the Corporation of London had expended more money upon Deptford Market than they could expect a return for?—That is my impression.

2881. Are you not aware that they got the considerable indirect advantage of doubling the tolls upon the Metropolitan Market in consequence of the opening of the Deptford Market?—Yes, I am aware of that; but I believe that does not compensate them to anything like the extent that would be necessary to justify the expenditure which they have incurred.

2882. Do not you think that the doubling of the tolls would eventually repay the expense they have incurred?—No, I do not know; but I am told by those who know better than I do, that it will not.

2883. I read in your Report, that the affection of foot and mouth disease amongst sheep really affects the mouth of the sheep in this country; and when I said that, I had never seen it before. You were good enough to imply that it was my carelessness in not looking into the mouths of the sheep?—You suggested that to me.

2884. Is it not very probable, from your statement, that I never could have seen it?—I have not the slightest hesitation in saying that you did not see it as you stated.

2885. And that it did not exist, and that I could not have seen it in the stock that I had the care of?—I think it is very likely that it did not exist in your stock.

2886. *Chairman.* You stated that, with regard to foot and mouth disease, you would be prepared to leave the enactments in Sections Nos. 57 and 58 of the Act as they stand?—I would.

2887. There has been a complaint made that it is difficult to take an animal with the disease across a road, from one part of the farm to another, without infringing those sections?—That is a very undesirable thing to allow, if it can possibly be avoided, because the droppings of the saliva upon the road might affect passing herds.

2888. You do not think those who object to that have proved their case?—I do not.

2889. *Mr. Dodson.* What proportion of the fairs and markets throughout the country are inspected by the veterinary inspectors under the order of the local authorities?—Until recently, very few indeed; but within the last few months several market authorities have appointed inspectors, and carried out the orders.

2890. Do you think that is a valuable precaution?—It is very necessary.

2891. Do you think that the knowledge that disease is present, and that the inspector will be present, has a tendency to discourage sending the diseased animals to market?—I am certain that it has that effect.

Monday, 31st March 1873.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mr. James Barclay.
Mr. Callan.
Mr. Clay.
Mr. Dent.
Mr. William Edward Forster.
Mr. Kavanagh.

Mr. O'Connor.
Mr. Pell.
Mr. Chas. Road.
Mr. Ridley.
Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson.

THE RIGHT HONOURABLE WILLIAM EDWARD FORSTER, IN THE CHAIR.

PROFESSOR JAMES BEART SIMONDS, Examined.

2892. *Chairman.* You are Principal of the Royal Veterinary College, are you not?—I am.

2893. When did you cease to be an officer of the Veterinary Department?—In March last year, 1872.

2894. At the time when you were appointed principal of the college?—At the time when I was appointed principal of the college.

2895. For how many years before that had you been employed, more or less, on behalf of the Government, as regards diseases of animals?—I have been employed at different times since the year 1847.

2896. Your employment in 1847 was in consequence of an outbreak of sheep pox, was it not?—It was.

2897. From the first constitution of the Veterinary Department you were the chief inspector in matters connected with disease, were you not?—I was; I made the original communication to the Government, reporting to the Clerk of the Council, the present Sir Arthur Helps, the existence of the cattle plague in this country upon the 10th of July 1865, and from that time I received instructions to turn my attention to the disease, and to keep the Government informed as to its extent; that was the origin of the office.

2898. During the whole time of the prevalence of the outbreak which began in 1865 you were actively engaged?—I was actively engaged as chief inspector as soon as any organization of the department could be made.

2899. You made more than one journey abroad for the purpose of obtaining information with regard to the diseases of animals, did you not?—Beside being engaged from time to time on the part of the Government, I have been also engaged, on the part of the Royal Agricultural Society, to institute an independent inquiry with regard to the existence of cattle disease on the Continent.

2900. Will you briefly give the Committee the number of visits that you have made to the Continent, and the object of each visit?—I have made several visits to the Continent; I could scarcely say how many; but there were three special ones; I made a special investigation of the process of inoculation as a preventive of

pleuro-pneumonia upon the application of the Royal Agricultural Society in 1852.

2901. Where did you go for that purpose?—For that purpose I went to Belgium, locating myself at Hasselt, that being the chief seat of the disease, and the residence of the gentleman who introduced the system of inoculation; I remained there some time, and went through the whole of Belgium to investigate the result of the experiments which were being carried on. The matter was subsequently reported to the Royal Agricultural Society, and published in its Society's Journal. Then, in 1857, at the request of the Royal Agricultural Society, and also of the National Agricultural Society of Scotland and of Ireland, I went to the Continent for the purpose of investigating the cattle plague.

2902. Upon that occasion you went to Galicia?—Upon that occasion I had to go far into Galicia before I met with the disease. Upon my return the matter was reported at length, and the report was published in the Royal Agricultural Society's Journal. Then, in the year 1868, I went to the Zurich Congress, on the part of the Government, and took part in the discussion with regard to contagious diseases generally.

2903. That is the last visit that you have made, I believe?—That is the last official visit to the Continent that I have made.

2904. When did you first come across the foot and mouth disease?—In the month of August 1859.

2905. You were then in practice, I believe, as a veterinary surgeon?—I was in practice at the time at Trichenham, near Richmond, and had plenty of opportunity of studying the disease; I also instituted experiments with regard to the disease, and satisfied myself that the affection was easily conveyed by contagion, and that cattle were not the only animals which were the subjects of it.

2906. You discovered the disease in sheep and pigs, as well as in cattle, at the time, I believe?—I experimented with pigs especially; one experiment consisted in supplying some pigs with the milk of a cow which was the subject of the disease; the experiment succeeded.

2907. Was the disease very prevalent in 1859?

O 3

—Not

Professor
J. B.
Simonds.

31 March
1873.

Professor
J. B.
Simonds.
31 March
1872.

—Not so very prevalent in 1839, but in 1840 it was remarkably prevalent, and throughout the whole of 1840 and 1841.

2908. Where did you first meet with the disease; at Twickenham?—No, at Laleham, a village within four or five miles of Twickenham, upon a farm there, and it was carried to that farm by the purchase of some suckling calves, as they are commonly called, in the metropolitan markets; these calves were the subjects of the disease, and the first cow which became affected upon the farm was a cow which suckled a calf which was suffering from the malady.

2909. Had you ever heard of the disease before you saw it there?—Never.

2910. Was that after the fair that we have heard of at St. Faith's?—No, that fair was suppressed in 1845.

2911. Did the disease excite much alarm in 1840?—It excited a great deal of public attention upon that occasion, and the matter was taken up by the Royal Agricultural Society.

2912. Was it also fatal?—It was more fatal than it has been since, but I ascribe the fatality, in part, to the circumstance that veterinary surgeons did a very great deal in attending to the animals medically for the purpose of arresting the progress of the disease.

2913. You think the veterinary surgeons killed more than they cured?—I think we must admit that more harm than good was done by medicine upon that occasion.

2914. At present you agree with Professor Brown, that the best thing to do with the disease is not to attempt to physic the animal much?—I believe the same thing applies to all those special diseases, that what we have to do with them as medical men is to support the system, to assist nature in throwing off the poison, and not in any way to frustrate her efforts.

2915. I think you heard Professor Brown's evidence?—Yes, I did.

2916. Do you agree with him that from 1839 the disease has been more or less existent in the country, and has never been completely extirpated?—Quite so; there have been periodic outbreaks of the disease, some of which have been very remarkable for their extent, and also for affecting other animals besides cattle.

2917. Which do you think was the worst outbreak which we have had?—I think the worst outbreak was in 1840-41, but the outbreak in 1845 was a very serious one. It was in that year that St. Faith's Fair, in Norfolk, was suspended in consequence of Scotch cattle being so much affected by it, Scotch cattle being sold at that fair in large numbers. Then we had an outbreak in 1863, which was continued into 1865; the outbreak in 1862 was connected with the bringing together of animals at the International Show at Battersea; the disease spread from there as a centre, and we had a great number of cases. In 1869, again, the disease was very rife upon the Continent; we have had the disease continuing from 1839, when it was first introduced, down to the present hour.

2918. Mr. Dent.] With regard to the Battersea Show, do you remember what animals were supposed to have brought it there?—The first animal which showed the disease at the Battersea Show was a Breton bull.

2919. Chairman.] Has the character of the outbreaks varied in this way, that at one time cattle are more affected than sheep and pigs, and at other

times sheep and pigs more than cattle?—The disease has varied in this respect, that whenever it has assumed a wide-spread existence, then sheep and pigs have also been affected, and likewise domestic poultry on the different farms; after a certain length of time the disease has subsided, apparently naturally, but probably depending upon the circumstance that it had no real material that it could well arise upon, thus it assumed its normal proportions, until a state of things existed which again led to a more serious outbreak.

2920. Do you consider this outbreak of last year more serious than any other outbreaks?—It was decidedly not worse than the outbreak of 1840-41.

2921. You think it might have been worse, had there not been the Act to check it?—That is my opinion.

2922. Do you know anything about the introduction of the disease into Ireland?—Yes; it appeared in Ireland very shortly after it appeared in England.

2923. After the year 1839?—In 1839. I have an extract here which I made from the census of Ireland, which bears date 1851. In the year 1841, it states "that the epidemic among cattle, characterized by a stiffness of the legs and blisters on the tongue, spread among sheep in the county of Clara, and prevailed among horned cattle, goats, pigs, and sheep in all parts of Ireland, and it also extended to many parts of Europe." In 1842 (quoting from the same statement) the distemper in cattle again set in; and then there is another statement that it has prevailed more or less in Ireland down to the time of the publication of the Census in 1851. I have also an extract from a pamphlet published by Professor Ferguson, which bears date 1842; he writes thus: "A period of nearly three years has elapsed since the first appearance in this country of a peculiar epizootic among horned cattle, the chief characteristic of which was a peculiar affection of the mouth, nose, and feet."

2924. Soon after I first came to the Department I was informed that we had sent foot and mouth disease to Ireland; does that mean that it had been completely extirpated in Ireland?—I can scarcely think that it was completely extirpated in Ireland, any more than it has been completely extirpated in England; there have been periodical outbreaks of it in Ireland, just as there have been in England; but I believe that in 1859 Ireland received the disease from some Channel Island cows which went from Southampton; subsequently some calves were sent there from Bristol.

2925. Do you think that the disease was imported into England from the Continent in 1839?—In 1839 no animals were imported into England, nor until 1842.

2926. That is to say, the import of animals was illegal at that time?—The import of animals was illegal, it was prohibited; it is difficult to say how the disease first reached England; I have thought it was just possible, reflecting on the matter from time to time, that it might have been brought in by some old ship stores, as they are called; that is, animals which are unconsumed which had been taken on board to feed the crew with. The disease first appeared in the neighbourhood of London, at Stratford, near the docks; it spread from there to Islington, and from Islington it spread throughout the country, and I believe

believe the first country outbreak was the one which took place in Norfolk.

2927. I suppose it is a disease, the existence of which had been long known upon the Continent?—There is a pretty good history of the disease from the year 1682; it was at the latter part of the 17th century that we began to know more about contagious diseases, and were enabled to classify them to some extent. Up to that time all these diseases, such as cattle plague, pleuro-pneumonia, foot and mouth disease, and so on, were spoken of as murrains affecting cattle.

2928. I merely ask this question as a matter of curiosity, but like the cattle plague, do you believe that the foot and mouth disease came from the east?—I can hardly say that I have sufficient information upon the point to say where it comes from; allow me to add that there is scarcely any part of the habitable globe which is not more or less affected with foot and mouth disease; it exists in Africa, at Port Natal, in Australia, and in South America, and it is well known in India, and also in the northern parts of Russia.

2929. I suppose naturally from our communication with Natal, and with Australia, we have sent the disease to those colonies?—I do not know whether we sent it to Port Natal, but I think that we sent it undoubtedly to New South Wales; it is also a singular circumstance that when the disease showed itself in Victoria, it broke out in animals which had been exported from England, but those animals had been in Victoria for, I think, a couple of months, and were presumed to be healthy at the time they were landed. The history of the importation of the disease into New South Wales is a very interesting and very instructive one, and I think should guide the Committee a great deal in its decisions.

2930. Will you state why you think so?—There were not more than about six or eight animals which were landed there from England, and there are good reasons for believing that one of those animals was the subject of the disease when put on board the ship "Paramatta." The disease was kept up during the three months' voyage, and they were suffering from the consequences of the disease at the time they landed, and thus communicated the disease to other animals in New South Wales.

2931. Mr. *Clare Reed*.] After the animals were perfectly healthy?—No, they were suffering from the consequences of foot and mouth disease; the consequences of foot and mouth disease are most serious; far more serious than the attack itself.

2932. *Chairman*.] The animals were infectious the whole time?—Yes; they kept up the infection.

2933. I gather, from your answer, that the probability is we received the disease from the Continent in 1839, but that since that time it has been a native of this island?—That is so; it existed in Holland and elsewhere; in fact, we have a distinct history of it from 1834 as making its way from Hungary towards the west coast before it showed itself in England in 1839; but it was not brought in by animals imported direct from Holland, as no importations were allowed; and if it did come in by animals, I think it must have come in by ship stores.

2934. If it was imported from abroad, it was imported at the time when there was a prohibition against the import of cattle?—Yes.

2935. The same fact applies to the cattle

plague when it was so virulent in England a hundred years ago, does it not?—I doubt that; I think there was no prohibition against the import of animals in 1745, when we were visited by the cattle plague, because I find that in 1710 and 1711 sheep-pox existed in Sussex, and that cattle plague in 1745. I think, also, that it is highly probable that pleuro-pneumonia existed at the same time in England, but that it was stamped out by the same means which were effectual for eradication of cattle plague. As late as 1803, also, sheep were imported from Spain in large numbers to improve our breed of sheep.

2936. When was the first prohibition?—I have looked, but I cannot find any record of it; but there is no doubt that we imported animals down to 1805, and probably later.

2937. As regards the import from the Continent; it is a matter of historic interest; but I suppose it makes very little difference as regards what we should do now, whether the disease was originally imported or not?—Not at all.

2938. What are the animals which you think are most susceptible of the disease?—Bovine animals, sheep, pigs, and ordinary domestic poultry. It has also been stated, but I have no proof of it, that partridges and pheasants have sometimes suffered from the malady; and some persons have gone as far as to say that rooks and crows also have suffered from it; deer have likewise been stated to have been the subjects of the disease; and this last year his Grace the Duke of Buckingham sent the feet of some deer to the college for examination, but I was not satisfied, from the condition of the feet, that those animals were affected with the disease.

2939. With regard to the story about pheasants, partridges, and crows, is it not possible that the suspicion may arise, not from their having been found to be affected, but from some veterinary surgeon saying that he thought they were likely to be affected?—I think that is so; I have no proof of it myself; but I have plenty of proof that ordinary domestic poultry, that is, the gallinaceous tribe, are subject to the disease. It is a remarkable fact, that when poultry on a farm are affected with the disease, ducks and geese are not, although mingling freely with the poultry.

2940. Hares and rabbits are said to be affected by it?—I have no proof of such being the fact.

2941. Nor dogs?—Nor dogs. All experiments, I believe, in this country, have failed to produce the disease in dogs, just as they have failed so far as horses are concerned.

2942. Some people have said that human beings have caught the disease?—In 1840, when the disease was remarkably rife, Mr. Erasmus Wilson had the medical charge of the Infirmary at St. Pancras, and I well remember my predecessor, Mr. Sewell, being interested in the children taking milk of diseased cows, which was brought from Islington. These children took the milk in abundance, to my knowledge, for weeks together, and their health in no way suffered.

2943. I trust I am right in supposing that no such experiment has been tried since to your knowledge?—I believe not; but I know that individuals have tried the experiment upon themselves again and again, because whenever the disease has broken out upon a farm, many of the farmers' families have partaken freely of the milk. Such experiments are continually going on.

2944. We have had your statement with regard to the prevalence of the disease, and so far as you

Professor
J. B.
Stewart.
31 March
1873.

Professor
J. B.
Simonds.
31 March
1873.

know of its origin; now, with regard to the mode of shipping it; in the first place, how far was it, or was not it, the fact that the measures taken during the cattle plague for the stoppage of the movement of cattle had an effect upon the foot and mouth disease?—The disease was rife at the time of the introduction of the cattle plague, and the measures which were ultimately effective in clearing the country of cattle plague materially decreased the number of cases both of foot and mouth disease and also of pleuro-pneumonia, and we almost congratulated ourselves that we had got rid of both those diseases in getting rid of the cattle plague.

2943. How long did those restrictions last?—I think until the end of 1867.

2944. Then the restrictions were in full force for more than a year?—For more than a year; that is from the passing of the Act.

2947. You were so good as at once to accede to my request, and to go down to the East Riding last year, in consequence of an outbreak of cattle plague; you are aware that the foot and mouth disease was very prevalent in the East Riding at the time of the outbreak?—Yes, it was.

2948. Do you think that the restrictions on the movement of cattle for the short time they lasted, had any effect upon it?—I think not; in fact, legislation for the disease has failed completely in arresting its progress. We have seen that when we had no legislation at all with regard to it, namely, in 1840–41, and onwards up to the time of the cattle plague restrictions, the disease periodically assumed a serious aspect, and then declined, just as we have seen since the Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act came into operation.

2949. To what extent, if any, do you think that we owed the prevalence of the disease last autumn to our foreign trade?—I do not think that we owed the prevalence of the disease very much to our foreign trade during last autumn; it is unquestionably true that animals were brought into the country that were the subjects of the malady, but they were dealt with in such a way as to prevent any injury arising therefrom; that is, they were killed at the port of landing.

2950. I suppose every animal which comes from abroad and having the disease upon it, is a centre of disease in the same manner as every animal which is of native production?—Certainly, that is the case.

2951. And that when we wish to stop the disease, the only way in which we can possibly hope to do it, is by isolating those centres of disease so much as possible?—I question whether simple isolation, with such a disease as foot and mouth disease, would be sufficient to get rid of it out of the country.

2952. You think we should require to kill the animals?—Those diseases belong very much to the same class, with regard to their inspecting properties. I should consider foot and mouth disease as being equally infectious with cattle plague. Pleuro-pneumonia is by no means so infectious as either of those diseases, nor is the small-pox of sheep.

2953. You think that the process of isolation would not answer with foot and mouth disease; you would have to slaughter?—I think if it were our object to free the country entirely from foot and mouth disease, and also to keep the country free from it, we must slaughter every animal which is the subject of the disease as quickly as possible, and lock those up upon the premises which had

been herded with them; in short, we must put in full operation the cattle plague measures.

2954. You mean that we should apply to the whole of the animals the same measures as we apply to foreign cattle; are you aware that the rule is that upon an animal being found affected with the foot and mouth disease in a cargo of foreign animals, the whole cargo is slaughtered?—Yes.

2955. Do you think that in order to stamp out the disease, the same measures ought to be taken with home animals?—I think little short of that would clear the country of disease, and if the country were cleared of the disease, I think we should have it introduced again very soon.

2956. From where?—So long as we are importing; there is no doubt in the world that in these infectious many substances are charged with the morbid matter, and thus become fæces, in medical language, and with substances so charged we should have the germs of the disease introduced.

2957. Do you at all imagine that the farmers would tolerate the slaughter of the animals for such a disease as foot and mouth disease?—I cannot for a moment imagine they would tolerate anything of the kind.

2958. Would you recommend it?—Certainly not.

2959. I suppose I am right in thinking that what you mean is this, that comparing cattle plague with foot and mouth disease they are almost equally infectious, but that foot and mouth disease is more or less existing in every country from which we import animals?—Animals and merchandise also.

2960. It is impossible for us to have any reason to expect that even if we were to take the most stringent measures with regard to the foot and mouth disease, the countries on the Continent would take anything like the same measures as they do with cattle plague?—Certainly not.

2961. Consequently, our hope of stamping it out would be disappointed in two ways; first, we should not get the home owners to submit to the loss and the trouble, and secondly, we could not expect that the dealers on the Continent would take measures which would preserve us from the disease, unless we were absolutely to prohibit foreign import?—I quite agree with you.

2962. You have read Dr. Williams's last report, have you not?—I have.

2963. At the end of that report, he states that he would hope to check foot and mouth disease by measures somewhat less stringent than those you suggest; namely, by imposing restrictions on the movement of the animals, and by making those restrictions uniform and compulsory by providing, by Government supervision and licenses for removal, for those restrictions being more efficiently carried out; I gather that you do not suppose that that will have the effect of extirpating the disease?—I do not think it would have the effect; it would keep the disease somewhat in check, but the disease certainly would not be extirpated by those means.

2964. I think I told you last autumn that I had had a good deal of pressure from certain parts of the country to put in force the same restrictions upon the movement of cattle as were in existence during the cattle plague, in order to check the foot and mouth disease?—You did.

2965. And you are still of opinion, as you were then, that a six weeks' restriction, which was what

what was asked for, would have had but little effect?—I think it would have had hardly any beneficial effect.

2966. Even supposing we had checked it, we should have been liable to its recurrence almost immediately afterwards, should we not?—Quite so; when we look at the fact that we have so many centres of infection in cattle, sheep, and pigs, we can see that our measures must be very stringent indeed if we hope to check this disease.

2967. But you admit that although those measures suggested by Mr. Williams might not stamp it out, they might check the disease; but do you think that the farmers and cattle dealers throughout the country would willingly submit to such restrictions as those suggested upon the movement of animals for foot and mouth disease?—I do not think they would; I think it would be prudent to restrict movement as much as we possibly can, and also exposure in fairs and markets; I would have the disease in the Act, but I would not deal with it by Orders in Council.

2968. You had a great deal to do during the cattle plague in watching and trying to secure the carrying out of the stringent orders that were then in force, had you not?—Yes.

2969. Did you not find that notwithstanding the immense loss from cattle plague, and the great fear that there was of it in the country, it was very difficult to get the farmers thoroughly to carry out those orders, even at the height of the outbreak?—The wish of the farmers was rather to have the animals treated with a view to their being cured rather than to have any preventive measures taken, or to have any measures taken that would remove the disease out of the country.

2970. I suppose the reluctance fully to carry out those measures would be very much more strongly felt with the foot and mouth disease, because there would not be the same fear, and there would not be the same loss as with the cattle plague?—I think so, because the foot and mouth disease, although it injures the animal for the time being, seldom lessens the ultimate value of the animal; whereas, on the contrary, cattle plague destroys by far the larger proportion of the animals attacked by it.

2971. Are not the local authorities, and even the central authorities, almost powerless in carrying out those measures unless they are supported to some extent by the public opinion of the owners of the cattle?—Quite so; I consider it depends entirely upon them.

2972. You have had occasion to visit Germany, where the restrictions with regard to cattle plague are very severe, have you not?—Yes.

2973. Do they at all attempt to carry out the same restrictions with regard to the foot and mouth disease?—They make no attempt with regard to anything of the kind; I have been told recently that Switzerland has been desirous of getting rid of the foot and mouth disease, and very strong measures have been had recourse to in some of the cantons, but with what success I am not informed.

2974. When you were at Zurich, was foot and mouth disease much the subject of your deliberations?—It came before us as one of the subjects, but it was generally thought that we could do very little with it, and at that time the disease was not very rife in Switzerland.

2975. You are aware that I was consulting you

at the time that we tried what might be considered an experiment on a large scale at the Council Office; in 1859, at the request of a few counties, we made imperative orders relative to the foot and mouth disease somewhat similar to the pleuropneumonia Orders?—I am aware of that.

2976. And you are also aware that we found we were so little supported by public opinion, and that there were so many of the local authorities who protested against those Orders, that we found it expedient, and I may say necessary, to change the general compulsory Order into a permissive power to the local authorities to issue Orders for their districts?—It was so.

2977. I think I gather from this, that you would not think it worth while to try to do anything by Order in Council beyond the provisions in the Act itself?—I think not.

2978. Let me turn your attention to the provisions in the Act in Sections 57 & 58; this makes it an offence to expose an animal affected with the foot and mouth disease in any market or fair, or in any saleyard or any fair connected therewith; would you keep up that provision?—I would.

2979. Then it goes on to state that it makes it an offence to send or cause to be carried on a railway, canal, or river, or any other inland navigation, or on a coasting vessel, or cause to be carried, led, or driven on a highway or thoroughfare, any animal affected with a contagious or infectious disease; would you keep that up?—I should keep that up only in part. I think that animals which are the subjects of foot and mouth disease should be allowed to be removed from off a farmer's premises to a slaughterhouse. I can readily believe that a number of them might be fat cattle at the time, and it might be desirable and advantageous upon the part of the proprietors to get those animals slaughtered, and to turn them to the best account. I would allow removal from those places to the slaughterhouse, and I would also allow the removal of cattle from one part of a farm to another, so as to allow a change of pasturage for store stock.

2980. Is that the only relaxation which you would make in that part of the section?—That is the only relaxation I would make.

2981. Mr. Deas.] Would you allow them to be removed across a highway from one part of a farm to another?—Yes, across the same farm; I think when we come to look at the practical working of legislative measures with regard to foot and mouth disease, that it is a serious thing to lock up a number of animals upon a piece of pasture ground and half starve them; I think they should be allowed to move freely about from one part of the farm to another.

2982. Chairman.] We have had several of those cases sent up to the Office, not only that they want to remove them to another pasture, and store them better, but to remove them from an outlying part of the farm to one where they could be more easily tended; do you think the farmers ought to be allowed to move them along a road for such purposes?—I do.

2983. I asked the same question of Professor Brown, and he thought there was much danger of the infection that they would leave behind them in their passage along a road?—There would be some danger, no doubt; but I think, looking to all the circumstances, it is a danger that we should incur.

2984. We have had the same difficulty with regard to animals that have been loaded from
P Ireland,

Professor
J. B.
Simonds.
—
31 March
1872

Professor
J. B.
Simonds.
—
31 March
1873.

Ireland, in reference to taking them to a place that was in other respects most convenient for slaughter, because it happened to be along a road for a short distance; would you relax the rule for that purpose?—I would deal with foreign stock, and with Irish stock, in this manner: that the exporter should declare whether the animals were store animals or fat animals, and the fat animals found to be the subjects of disease, upon their arrival in England, I would have slaughtered; foreign animals upon the spot, and Irish animals at the port of landing; store animals I would send back either to Ireland, or the Continent, if they were found to be affected with the disease; I would not add to the amount of disease existing in England, if I could avoid it.

2985. The suggestion you have just made with respect to sending back store animals applies to Ireland only, does not it?—No; I would make it apply to Denmark, and such other countries as send us store stock from time to time.

2986. You would relax the restriction upon Holland and Denmark that exists at present, that whether they be store or fat cattle, they all have to be slaughtered, to this extent: that if there were one case of foot and mouth disease you would allow the store stock to be sent back?—I would. Take the case of cattle coming, we will say, from Holland; Holland, when she is short of grass, sends us large numbers of cattle which are worth only about 4*l.* each; if they are affected with the disease she ought to take them back, and I would make her take them back; I think a lesson or two of that kind would have a great effect upon the exporters of foreign cattle.

2987. That would not be so severe a lesson as compelling them to kill them, would it?—They would not care much about killing them, because they would get a small amount for them; and in the other case, they would have them sent back again, and would thus get nothing for them.

2988. You would not give them the option of having them killed?—No, I would kill the fat cattle; we want the fat cattle as food, and I would make the countries which send us store cattle, if they were affected with foot and mouth disease, take them back again.

2989. You do not imagine that there would be any legal difficulty with regard to determining whether they were store or fat cattle?—No; I would have a declaration upon the part of the exporter, whether they were store or fat cattle.

2990. Do you, or do you not, think that there has been much importation of foot and mouth disease lately?—Not being now connected with the office, I have had but very few opportunities of ascertaining lately what amount of diseased cattle have been sent over from the Continent.

2991. It is a very considerable punishment, is it not, to the importers of animals from non-scheduled countries to cause their cattle to be slaughtered at the port of landing?—It is.

2992. With regard to the Irish export, have you any suggestion to make to the Committee for the prevention of the foot and mouth disease?—I think the Irish cattle should all be detained at the port of landing for a certain time, perhaps six or eight hours, and the cattle declared to be fat cattle by the exporter from Ireland, if found to be affected, should be slaughtered at the port of landing, and the store cattle affected should be taken back to Ireland.

2993. What is the length of the incubation of the foot and mouth disease?—Direct experiment

has shown that the disease will declare itself in forty hours. I made an experiment of that kind in 1840, and practical observations since would seem to show that the disease is incubated as much as three days.

2994. Are you aware that a good many persons whose opinions are deserving of attention think that the Irish animals catch the disease on board ship?—It is quite possible that if a vessel brought a number of animals which were the subjects of disease, and that vessel was not thoroughly cleansed and disinfected, the other animals put on board would contract the disease; but I believe the fact that so many Irish stock cattle have arrived in the country affected with the foot and mouth disease has arisen from the circumstance that the animals have been gathered out of herds in which the disease existed.

2995. We have to deal, have we not, with the fact in general applying to all cattle owners and cattle exporters, that, unless there are measures making it inconvenient to them to do so, they have a strong temptation to send to a distant market any animals affected with any contagious disease?—That is the case.

2996. You are aware, I suppose, that the importing interest from the Continent, and also the consuming interest as represented by the butchers, especially from the northern towns, not merely butchers but other persons representing the consumers, have protested against so much more stringent regulations existing with regard to the foreign animals affected with foot and mouth disease than exist with regard to the home animals?—That has been so; because butchers supplying the people in large centres of consumption of meat are desirous, of course, of purchasing animals at as cheap a rate as they possibly can; and, as a general rule, perhaps, they can purchase foreign animals a little cheaper than they can English animals.

2997. You have had great experience, not merely in watching disease, but in watching the effect of measures to stop disease; how far do you think it would be possible to maintain the present regulation of slaughtering all the fat animals in a cargo if one of them had the foot and mouth disease, or of sending back the store animals, if at the same time, with regard to home animals which had the disease, all that we did was to make it punishable to send an actually infected animal along a highway or into a fair or market?—I do not think it would be prudent for us to listen to any representations which might be made by foreign importers; I think that we should not be justified in allowing any relaxation which would add to the amount of disease existing in this country; we might deal in one way with our own cattle, but we should deal more sanely with animals which are sent into the country, which are the subjects of infectious disease.

2998. You do not fear a reply being made somewhat similar to what you have already stated, that the disease, however it came to England, is now an English disease, and this interference with the foreign trade would not stamp it out, and would very much more seriously affect the foreign trade than we felt it could affect the home trade?—I believe a pressure would be put upon the Government of the day for that purpose, but at the same time I do not think it would be prudent to yield to that pressure.

2999. Will you turn to Section 58, which makes it an offence "to place any animal affected with

with contagious disease" (and therefore any animal infected with foot and mouth disease) "on any common or uninclosed land, or in any field or any other place insufficiently fenced, or on the side of a highway;" would you keep up that restriction?—I think I should; I think placing animals upon uninclosed land would offer facilities for these animals to stray along roads and come in contact with healthy animals.

3000. The suggestions then that you have made with regard to foot and mouth disease are; first: that we should give up attempting to stop it by Orders in Council, beyond the provisions in the Act?—Yes.

3001. And secondly, that we should so far modify Section 37 as to allow in certain cases an animal to be taken across a highway?—Yes.

3002. Thirdly, with regard to foreign animals, you would order store cattle to be sent back if the cargo has any infected animals in it?—I would.

3003. Fourthly, with regard to the Irish import, you would have a quarantine of six hours, and in the case of any animals in the cargo having foot and mouth disease, you would slaughter all the fat animals and you would send back the store animals?—Just so.

3004. Now we will turn to pleuro-pneumonia: when did we first hear of pleuro-pneumonia in England?—We first heard of pleuro-pneumonia in 1841.

3005. Did you see it yourself then?—I saw it myself in 1841.

3006. This is a matter, I suppose, only of historical interest, but the disease did come from abroad, did it not?—There is no proof that it came direct from abroad. The disease existed early in Ireland, and it has been said that it existed in Ireland in consequence of some friend of one of the British consuls in Holland having some animals sent to him either in "1839, 1840, or 1841."

3007. That may be an interesting question for the historians of the disease, but I suppose it is not one which affects our deliberations one way or the other?—I do not think it does at all; we have proof upon proof that the disease existed in Ireland as early as it did in England, namely, in 1841, and in both countries prior to the removal of the restrictions upon the import of foreign cattle.

3008. With regard to foot and mouth disease, are you one of those who believe that it is not spontaneous?—Certainly so. I believe that all diseases of an infectious kind depend upon special germs of infecting material, and that the spread of the infecting material is governed by fixed laws, and I believe also that no common causes or combination of common causes will produce those special animal poisons.

3009. I suppose there must have been a time when they first began, without infection?—Doubtless so, but not in this country.

3010. And to trace that is about as difficult as to trace the origin of evil, I suppose?—I think so; both probably are depending entirely upon the same cause.

3011. With regard to pleuro-pneumonia, do you think that that is not spontaneous?—Certainly not. Encouragement has been given to the idea that pleuro-pneumonia may not be contagious, arising out of the circumstance that so long a period of time often elapses between one case and a second; we know now that the disease

is incubated for a very considerable length of time. Pleuro-pneumonia is a remarkable exception to those diseases in this respect.

3012. How long does it incubate?—Cases have occurred from 10 to 12 weeks after exposure to the infection.

3013. You stated, in answer to a previous question, that pleuro-pneumonia was less contagious than foot and mouth disease or cattle plague?—I believe that pleuro-pneumonia is more easily dealt with than either of those diseases, in consequence of its being less infectious.

3014. But does not it make up for that, and make it almost as difficult to be dealt with, by the disease remaining undetected for so long a period?—I think that if all animals affected with pleuro-pneumonia were killed, and strict isolation were observed, we should soon get rid of pleuro-pneumonia. We know as a fact that in a herd of 20 or 30 animals, if pleuro-pneumonia is allowed to go on even for some weeks, that a large proportion of the animals escape the attack; that is not so with the foot and mouth disease nor with sheep pox.

3015. Mr. Pell.] Do you extend that remark to young animals?—To young and old alike; it is one of the conditions which govern the disease.

3016. Chairman.] Is an animal infectious during the process of the incubation of the disease?—There is no sufficient proof of that with regard to any of these diseases, although as the period of incubation passes away, and the disease is about to manifest itself in a visible form, we may then say that infection begins.

3017. What do you consider to be the average fatality in cases of foot and mouth disease?—It depends very much indeed upon how the animals are managed, and so on; but looking to the disease as a whole as affecting both store stock and fat stock, I should think 1 per cent. would fully cover the loss.

3018. Have you seen that estimate bringing up the loss from foot and mouth disease to a tremendous figure, averaging it at 2 l. a head for every animal affected?—I have seen that estimate.

3019. Do you concur with it?—I can concur with it in certain individual cases; but when I come to look at the disease as a whole throughout the country, I cannot, and do not, concur with it. I do not think the loss is anything like equal to that calculation.

3020. Now, with regard to pleuro-pneumonia; what is the rate of fatality in cases of that disease?—The fatality of pleuro-pneumonia may be said to be equal to the fatality of cattle plague; it is very rarely that an animal recovers, and it is fortunate indeed that it does not recover.

3021. That being the case, you would consider that an animal is worth but very little to its owner which really has pleuro-pneumonia?—Very little indeed.

3022. Mr. Clive Read.] Not to kill?—A fat animal killed directly, and sent into the markets, as hundreds are every year, no doubt would realise a sum which would be remunerative to the owner.

3023. Chairman.] Which sum, if the owner sends it into the markets, he would obtain?—Yes.

3024. Mr. Dent.] A fat animal affected with pleuro-pneumonia before medical treatment, is perfectly good for human food, is it not?—I believe so; we have eaten thousands of them

Professor
J. B.
Simonds.
31 March
1873.

Professor
J. B.
Simonds.

31 March
1873.

in this country since 1841; and I believe there is no evidence of the flesh of animals affected with pleuro-pneumonia ever having done any harm.

3025. *Chairman.* Will you turn to the 54th section of the Act, which relates to pleuro-pneumonia, and the 7th Schedule; would you make any alteration with regard to those provisions?—I should make an alteration, perhaps, with regard to the inspection of animals, and also with reference to the persons to whom the notices should be sent.

3026. You mean with regard to Sections 54 and 55?—Yes; I would make alterations with regard to the arrangement of giving notice. I have no confidence in the present system of inspecting animals as to whether they are affected with pleuro-pneumonia or foot and mouth disease, or any other contagious disease.

3027. What changes would you make?—I think that each county should be divided into sections, and professional inspectors should be appointed for each, and that the divisions or sections should be in proportion to the extent of the cattle population. I think that these inspectors should be appointed by the Government, and that all veterinary surgeons who are engaged in ordinary practice throughout the country, should furnish them with certificates of the existence of any contagious diseases upon a farm which they might have visited as medical attendants upon the animals.

3028. At present, the local authority is bound by the Act to appoint inspectors, but only so many as appear to them necessary for the execution of this Act?—That is so.

3029. It is within your knowledge that a good many of those inspectors have no professional knowledge, I believe?—It is so. Policemen have been appointed in order, no doubt, to lessen the county's expenses; that is, immediately to lessen them, but at the same time to make them greater in the long run, by their not knowing anything about what should be done under such circumstances.

3030. Take Section 54, which says, "Where an inspector finds pleuro-pneumonia to exist within his district, he shall forthwith make a declaration thereof, under his hand;" do you think it is at all reasonable to expect that anybody but a veterinary surgeon would be able to define pleuro-pneumonia?—Certainly not.

3031. I suppose an experienced stock keeper would?—An experienced stock keeper might detect the disease when it was far advanced, but then considerable mischief would have been done. We want to have the disease detected at its earliest stage, and it is often a most difficult thing even for a professional man to determine whether an animal is or is not affected with pleuro-pneumonia in its earliest stages at a first examination.

3032. A policeman would have to be an uncommonly sharp fellow to detect that?—An uncommonly sharp fellow.

3033. I understand you to say that those inspectors not only ought to be veterinary surgeons, but that they ought not to be appointed by the local authority; why would you not have them appointed by the local authority?—I think the inspectors should be under the immediate direction of the central department, and should communicate at once with the central department, and should receive instructions with reference to how

they were to proceed with regard to any infectious disease which might show itself.

3034. Would that not be open to the inconvenience of the central department in London being responsible for the action taken with regard to every attack of disease throughout the country?—No, I do not think it would; if veterinary surgeons had to send to the individual who was appointed by the central authority a certificate of the existence of disease, and those men would detect the disease, whatever it might be, upon the premises where it occurred, they would only report such cases to him.

3035. Would it not answer that purpose if the appointment of the head inspector was limited to the appointment of a veterinary surgeon, and that it should continue to be made by the local authority with the assent to the appointment of the central department?—Yes, that might answer the purpose.

3036. When you say the inspector, you would think that a policeman might not under the orders of the veterinary surgeon?—Policemen might be used for the purpose of transmitting information, but I think that the certificates should come direct from the veterinary surgeon to the head inspector.

3037. What extent of area, generally speaking, would an active veterinary surgeon inspector, whose time was fully occupied and who did nothing else, be able to undertake?—With the present facilities of getting about the counties by railways he would take a great extent in many counties, but in some counties a very limited one, because the cattle population would be large in some counties and very small in others; in some counties there are very few cattle kept, and in others a large quantity.

3038. Take a medium county, such as Dorsetshire; do you think one inspector could manage Dorsetshire?—No, I do not think one inspector could manage Dorsetshire, looking at the number of cattle and sheep in Dorsetshire. You must bear in mind that you must deal with sheep and pigs also with regard to foot and mouth disease.

3039. But we have got rid of foot and mouth disease, with the exception of putting Sections 54 and 55 in force?—If the foot and mouth disease is put aside altogether, I think, in all probability, about three inspectors might be needed in a county like Dorset.

3040. Take Norfolk, for example?—Norfolk is a very difficult county to deal with in many respects; Norfolk is a county which raises as much cattle of its own, or very few; it is a very large importing county, and it is a county which boasts of standing at the head of agriculture; I do not know whether it does so or not; I think we might require several inspectors to satisfy the Norfolk people, as a whole.

3041. *Mr. Clare Read.* We have nine inspectors at the present moment; do you think that is a fair amount?—I should think nine or ten would do the work.

3042. *Chairman.* Then we have got to the inspection, and what you think would be a better security for a good inspection; now do you want any further alteration?—Animals affected with pleuro-pneumonia, I think, should be killed as early as possible; I think that should be made imperative.

3043. Then you would make this alteration in the seventh schedule, that instead of merely requiring that animals affected should not be moved,

moved, except for slaughter, and that animals infected should not be moved without a license; you would kill all that were attacked at once?—I would.

3044. What would you do with those which were infected; by infected I mean those that had been herded with animals affected?—I would only allow them to be moved off the premises by license to a place for slaughter.

3045. There was a great deal of discussion in Parliament at the time the Act was passed as to whether 80 days was a long enough time before the expiration of which a place which had been declared infected could not be declared to be uninfected; do you think the time long enough?—I think, for practical purposes, we may consider it long enough, but certainly there are cases where the disease has been incubated for a much longer time; but great inconvenience would arise from regulations of the kind alluded to being in force for three months.

3046. Now, turning to the foreign imports, with regard to pleuro-pneumonia, have you any suggestions to make with regard to the foreign trade, except that which you have already made with regard to foot and mouth disease, that all stock animals which have been in cargoes where there has been disease should be sent back?—I should deal precisely in the same manner with pleuro-pneumonia; I should slaughter all the fat cattle, and presuming that any spare cattle were sent in the vessel with the fat cattle, or by themselves, I should send them back.

3047. With regard to the Irish import, how would you deal with that?—I should deal with it in precisely the same way.

3048. Do you think that a six hours' quarantine would be of any use in pleuro-pneumonia?—I do not.

3049. Except that it would give you rather more time for careful inspection?—It would give more time for careful inspection.

3050. Now, we will come to sheep pox; that distemper was very prevalent in 1848, was it not?—It was very prevalent indeed in 1848; it was introduced into this country in the year 1847.

3051. Was it stamped out or did it grow out?—There were no legislative measures until the latter part of 1848, I think, to deal with sheep pox, and in consequence of that the disease was spread far and wide; infected animals were sent all over the country. But when the Act was brought into operation, which simply in point of fact effected the isolation of the animals, the disease began to decline, and by isolation, we may be said, with inoculation and other means that were used, to have got rid of the disease in 1850.

3052. We had an outbreak just before the passing of this Act, had we not?—Yes, there was an outbreak in Cheshire, and there was also another in Northamptonshire. Besides these there have been various other outbreaks; there was one immediately before the introduction of the cattle plague in the county of Sussex.

3053. The Privy Council making use of the power which they had then to issue orders, stamped it out very quickly?—Yes, they stamped it out very quickly in Cheshire, and in the other counties, as they had power to do so by Act of Parliament.

3054. Did you order slaughter before this Act was passed, or did you rely upon strict isolation?—We relied upon strict isolation.

058.

3055. You are aware that there are some persons in authority who recommend that we should order slaughter for sheep pox, as we do for cattle plague; would you recommend that?—Certainly not; my experience shows this, that when the disease exists in a flock at the commencement, if we slaughter the affected animals and isolate the others, and look them over carefully day by day, we prevent any further extension of the disease.

3056. I gather from that answer that you would leave the Act very much as it stands with reference to sheep pox, that is, that we should have rules of the same stringency with reference to isolation and movement as in cattle plague, but that we should not order slaughter?—Yes, I would leave the Act very much as it is.

3057. Now we come to cattle plague; you have read Professor Brown's history of the late outbreak in the East Riding, have you not?—I have.

3058. Do you concur with that generally, speaking from your own personal knowledge?—Quite so.

3059. You agree with him that it is a very strong probability, almost amounting to a certainty, that it was imported by the "Joseph Seames"?—I think there can be no doubt about it.

3060. And you have no belief whatever in its having been introduced into the country by the animals which were washed ashore?—Certainly not; those animals were washed ashore in Lincolnshire, and the disease showed itself in Yorkshire; the animals which were first attacked were known to have come from the Hull market.

3061. Notwithstanding the exceeding virulence of this disease, am I not right in supposing that it requires a good deal of veterinary knowledge to be quite sure that an animal which is affected with it has it?—The symptoms of cattle plague vary considerably, and very often it is difficult for a man, unless he has had experience, to determine as to whether an animal is, or is not, affected with the cattle plague.

3062. You will recollect last autumn I had an anxious time of it for a week or two, owing to many false rumours of cattle plague reaching the Office?—I recollect it.

3063. And nothing but a man of your authority going down and examining would probably have satisfied the persons in the neighbourhood that it was not cattle plague?—There were many false reports, as they turned out to be. I was enabled to satisfy myself that these cases were not cases of cattle plague, and, consequently, that the disease did not extend beyond where it was first introduced from the East Riding of Yorkshire.

3064. Supposing that we had not been able to isolate the disease in the East Riding, and that, either from our not putting in force the Order with regard to movement, or from any other cause, it had got up to London, you would have expected that it would have got all over England?—There is no doubt if it had reached the Metropolitan Market that it would have very quickly spread through the country.

3065. And you would then have been in great alarm, in consequence of the great want throughout the country of inspectors of real knowledge?—Indeed, I should; I think that if that had been the case it would have required more inspectors to be attached to the central department, and to have sent almost everywhere, under existing circumstances,

P 3

Professor
J. B.
Stewart.
—
31 March
1873.

Professor
J. B.
Siveland.

31 March
1873.

circumstances, to know whether cattle plague existed or not.

3066. It has been suggested that the cattle plague rules should be altered to this extent, in two ways, first, that the discretion should be taken away from the local authorities with reference to the slaughter of animals herded with those which are diseased, but that it should be their duty at once to order such slaughter; will you inform the Committee what is your opinion upon that point?—I think it would be the right thing to do, to slaughter every animal which had been exposed to the infection of cattle plague, and I also think that a power of slaughter should be extended to animals that are in dangerous proximity to the disease.

3067. Am I to understand by that that you would make it necessary that animals in the same herd should be slaughtered, but that you would leave it within the discretion of the local authority to order the slaughter of animals in the neighbouring field?—Quite so.

3068. There has been a great deal of difference of opinion with reference to compensation; have you any remark to make upon that subject?—I think, under certain circumstances, perhaps full compensation might be allowed for the animals that were slaughtered as being in dangerous proximity; three-fourths of the value would be quite sufficient, I think, for animals slaughtered on account of having been in contact with the animals affected.

3069. Is not that a most liberal allowance?—Very liberal indeed.

3070. Have we not reason to suppose that any animal which has been in contact with the disease is in the greatest possible danger of catching it?—Yes.

3071. That which is true with regard to pleuro-pneumonia is not true with regard to cattle plague; you would think that no animal ought to be eaten that has had the cattle plague?—I think no animal ought to be sold for food that has had cattle plague certainly, because the flesh would undoubtedly communicate the disease wherever it might be taken, coming in contact with another animal; but that the flesh can be eaten with impunity I fully believe.

3072. Did you go to Hull during that outbreak?—I did.

3073. Have you any suggestion to make with regard to the landing of animals at Hull?—The arrangements at Hull are certainly not satisfactory, and never have been quite so to my mind. I think that an alteration should be made, by which either the present cattle market should be taken into the defined part of the port, or that the defined part should be made upon the Albert Dock, and that the arrivals from unscheduled countries should go into what is now called the defined part of the port.

3074. You have inspected the arrangements at Deptford market, have you not?—I have.

3075. Are you satisfied with them?—Perfectly so; I think they are very complete.

3076. Do you think we ought, or ought not, to insist upon fresh arrangements being made at the ports where animals are landed from scheduled countries?—I think that at all the ports where animals are landed from scheduled countries provision should be made for the slaughter of diseased animals, and for disposing of the carcasses, and for disinfection of hides, &c.

3077. Would not that entail considerable ex-

pense?—It would entail considerable expense upon the town, doubtless.

3078. Do you think that the risk is so great as to warrant our imposing this expense upon them?—I do, especially now that such facilities are given for bringing animals from distant parts of Europe, and out of cattle plague countries.

3079. You have studied the communication with the countries in which cattle plague is indigenous, have you not?—I have.

3080. Have we not this danger now that we had not in former times, that there is railway communication between those countries and the western parts of Europe?—Yes; there are four distinct lines of railway running into Russia; one which runs through Galicia into Bukowina, goes directly into the bone of the cattle plague. There is another one which runs through Austria and Hungary, and into the valley of the Danube, where the disease frequently exists. Coming to the north, we have two railways, one running from East Prussia into Russia, and another by way of Warsaw through Poland.

3081. Quite independent of the cattle plague, supposing we had no restrictions, and left the trade perfectly free, would it pay to import animals, direct for the London market, from Russia by railway?—I should think it would; the animals could be brought there at a very small cost indeed, and it is well known that all central Europe is getting pretty well exhausted of cattle, which by-the-by adds to the danger of cattle plague being introduced; not a very long time is occupied in bringing animals from Russia to England.

3082. Practically, do you think they would fatten animals in Russia, or would they fatten them somewhere on the road?—Animals not unfrequently are taken from Russia into Bohemia, Moravia, and Silesia, to be fattened, and sent on here after they are fattened.

3083. A good many animals are fattened at the distilleries, are they not?—At the sugar factories.

3084. Is that a limited number only?—No, it is a very considerable number; some thousands are gathered together out of Hungary, Russia, and Styria, and sent to the sugar factories for fattening.

3085. Does that result in those sugar factory districts being generally affected with cattle plague?—No, it does not; because they take care to derive their supply from uncontaminated places, so far as they can, and I do not think that we run any risk in that way.

3086. Dr. Williams gave the Committee the result of his inquiries on the Continent from information which he had obtained, that with regard to many countries in Europe, that is to say, France, Germany, and Belgium, those countries are not upon the whole producing more cattle than they can consume?—I believe that is so; France I believe does not raise sufficient cattle to feed her people; she imports rather largely from Italy.

3087. I suppose, if we are to obtain more food for our increasing population, so far as Europe is concerned, we must rely upon Russia and the countries similarly situated to Russia, such as Transylvania and Bukowina?—I fear so.

3088. The Wallachian Provinces are in the same position, are they not?—Precisely in the same position.

3089. They all have cattle plague?—They all have cattle plague; cattle plague is introduced into those countries very frequently in consequence

quence of the traffic which exists between Odessa and Bessarabia; there are many thousand cattle which are employed in taking salt to, and in bringing back corn from, Bessarabia; cattle plague often breaks out where those animals herd. These animals travel over the same roads which cattle from the stoppages travel over to reach Galicia, Austria, and other countries.

3090. This country and the west of Europe are in this position, that they want more meat and fear the cattle plague; do you think that we could ourselves adopt, and recommend other countries to adopt, any measures by which we could get these Russian cattle with safety?—I fear not; I think that Russia is placed under such circumstances with regard to the stoppages that she could not take effective means to stamp out the cattle plague.

3091. You are aware that we have prohibited imports from Russia?—I am aware of that.

3092. Were you informed of that communication that I had from some firm or firms, that they would guarantee a large weekly import from Cronstadt by sea?—I was not informed.

3093. But you do not think it would be safe to allow cattle to come in from Russia even to be slaughtered immediately?—I think not; even the Baltic provinces of Russia have no cattle to send of their own; they are importing departments themselves from the southern part of Russia.

3094. You know the system that we have gone upon since the passing of the Act, of having scheduled countries and non-scheduled countries, and obliging all cattle coming from those countries where we think there is real danger to be slaughtered at the port of landing; would your experience of the working of the Act induce you to keep up that distinction or not?—I should certainly keep it up; I think it is the best and most practical distinction that could possibly be made.

3095. There are two modes in which it might be changed; we might do away with the scheduled countries and have merely the possibility of prohibition where there is cattle plague, and allow all other animals to come freely into the interior; you would not have that?—No, I would not; because animals must find their way from Russia into Western Europe, to a certain extent, to feed Western Europe, then Holland and Belgium become, as it were, transmitting countries.

3096. And as regards Holland, you know that we would not allow animals to be imported into the interior of the country until we had got restrictions made which prevented the import of any animals into Holland?—Yes, I am aware of that, and I am in doubt whether Holland will be likely to keep up the restriction; I do not think she will be able to keep up the supply sufficiently to feed her own people and send animals here too.

3097. At present, she does so?—Yes; I do not think she feels it yet, but she will after a time.

3098. The other suggestion is from another point of view, and that is, that all countries should be scheduled, and that we should not allow any cattle to be imported into the interior, but that they should be all slaughtered at the port of landing?—I do not think that that would be judicious when we see that cattle plague does not exist either in Spain or Portugal, nor in Denmark nor Sweden; we want to bring both fat animals and store animals into this country to feed the people.

058.

3099. I do not know whether you happened to observe a suggestion coming from a quarter which is of great authority, namely, the "Times" newspaper, that all live import should be stopped, and that nothing but dead meat should be imported?—I have heard such a proposition made.

3100. Do you think it would be possible to carry out such a rule?—Certainly not.

3101. You are aware, are you not, that an Act will soon come into force which was passed to prevent the existence of private slaughter-houses in London?—Yes.

3102. Have you formed any opinion with regard to that provision?—I think it would be judicious to have abattoirs rather than private slaughter-houses.

3103. You have not studied that question much, perhaps?—No; I have not studied it very much, but I look at it as a general question.

3104. Now, I will come to what may be called our transit orders; you were consulted by the department, were you not, before the transit orders were issued, with regard to the conveyance of cattle by steamer and railway?—Yes; I was.

3105. I will first take, that part of those orders which affects cruelty to animals; do you think they have been of any effect as regards the import of cattle in foreign vessels?—I think that both foreign cattle and sheep are brought over better now than they were before the regulations were issued from the central authority; that is to say, before the division of vessels into pens, containing only a certain number of animals, and not bringing newly shorn sheep upon deck without protection.

3106. There were three chief causes of suffering which we attempted to avoid: first, the want of ventilation; do you think that is at all remedied?—It is only partially remedied; it is one of the most difficult things we have to deal with. The ventilation of vessels bringing cattle becomes worse as the vessels come up the Thames; if we could unload all our animals at Harwich or Thames Haven we should get rid of a considerable amount of inconvenience and suffering to the animals. When the ship slackens her speed coming up the river the windsails are not found to work so well, and less air goes down into the holds.

3107. As regards Deptford, do you think that the regulations that have been made by the City for allowing two or three vessels to be unloaded at once has at all removed that objection?—Yes, but the larger amount of the vessels going to the Deptford Market are vessels expressly built for the cattle trade, and the defective ventilation does not apply to those vessels to anything like the extent it does to vessels bringing general cargo.

3108. I suppose that animals coming over in cattle ships are very much better treated than those that come as mixed cargo?—They are treated well; they come in a very satisfactory manner indeed.

3109. They form a very large portion of the foreign import into London, do they not?—Yes.

3110. The foreign import to London is a very large portion of the whole foreign import?—It is.

3111. The next point is with regard to overcrowding; I suppose that separation into pens has had a beneficial influence upon that?—Yes.

P 4

3112. The

Professor
J. B.
Snowden.
31 March
1873.

Professor
J. B.
Sims.

81 March
1873.

3112. The third point, I believe, is to secure that the animals should be watered and fed to some extent?—Watering and feeding animals is scarcely required on board unless they are coming from Spain or Portugal, or other distant countries.

3113. But the Spanish animals do arrive in good condition, do they not?—Very good condition indeed; they are supplied with food and water on the passage; compressed hay is taken out for the purpose of feeding the animals on their way to this country, and about every 12 hours provision is made for giving the animals food and water.

3114. Do they come in English boats?—In English boats.

3115. Are the importers English or Spanish generally?—English mostly; when the cat trade ceases the other one begins. The vessels which had been employed in the Tanning trade will now go to Spain, and trade in cattle from Spain.

3116. If it pays to treat cattle well upon so long a voyage, that would be a reason for supposing it would pay to have as good treatment on the short voyage from Germany, would it not?—The voyage from Tanning or Hasum is not much above 50 hours, I think.

3117. And the voyage to Southampton from Spain is about five days, is it not?—Yes.

3118. It may be that animals are bought much cheaper in Spain; do you know how that is?—I can hardly answer that question; I may say that we have exhausted Spain very much in respect of her supply of cattle. In years gone by all the animals brought from Spain were old animals, which had been used for agricultural purposes, and then fattened, but now we seldom see old cattle imported from Spain; she is now sending her young cattle, as she has no others to send.

3119. When you speak of Spain, you speak of Spain and Portugal, I presume?—Yes.

3120. The animals coming from Denmark are well treated, are they not?—They are very well treated.

3121. How long do you think a beast can go without water, without great discomfort?—I do not think it would be prudent to let animals go more than 18 or 20 hours without water, whether travelling by rail or ship; I am perfectly aware that animals can go a very long time without water, sheep especially, but in summer sheep suffer very much in journeying by railway for want of water.

3122. You have given us your answers with regard to foreign import by steamer into London. I am afraid your remarks would not apply quite so much with regard to the improvement of the import into other ports?—No, there is a great deal that should be done at all our outports.

3123. Would you not except Harwich?—The vessels which come to Harwich are vessels which come chiefly from Holland; they bring passengers, but they do not bring a great deal of merchandise in the hold; the cattle trade is pretty well managed, and the accommodation is good.

3124. Your remarks also do not apply to the Spanish importation into the outports?—No, it does not.

3125. We will turn to the Irish import; have you had occasion to inspect ships arriving with cattle from Ireland?—I have never inspected ships arriving with cattle from Ireland.

3126. Therefore, that is a point upon which you cannot give the Committee personal information?—No.

3127. Now, with regard to railways; we endeavour to prevent overcrowding on railways; do you think that that attempt has been at all successful?—It has been successful to a small extent, but only to a small extent; the overcrowding upon railways is by store stock, and is also owing to a system which prevails of men hiring a truck, and crowding as many animals into it as they possibly can; the conveyance of Irish cattle from one part of the country to another is frequently managed in that way; a man hires a truck, and gets as many animals into it as he possibly can in order to save expense.

3128. Have you seen cattle from Ireland travelling in this country?—I have seen them travelling very frequently upon the rail from Holyhead, we will say, to Norfolk.

3129. Do they appear pretty well cared for?—They receive scarcely any care or attention on the part of the dealers. If a farmer purchases any animals in Ireland and gets them to Liverpool, or some other port, he takes care that they are not crowded into trucks, nor hurried off by the first train; he prefers to wait a short time, but the dealer wants to catch the earliest market, and he puts them at once into the railway truck; he scarcely lets them stand long enough at the railway station to get any food or water, but hurries them off to market as soon as he possibly can.

3130. That applies to store cattle, and not to fat cattle, does it not?—To store cattle.

3131. If the dealer can get the animals to the end of their journey alive, he does not much care?—He does not much care.

3132. Is there anything generally in charge of the animals?—The men themselves generally ride in the brake van; that is the only charge they have; if the train stops at any particular place they may get down and see if any of the animals are lying in the trucks, and if so, they make them get up if they possibly can.

3133. You are aware that we have ordered water to be provided at a vast number of stations?—I am aware of that.

3134. And the railway companies have carried out our provisions, and have done their best to co-operate in that matter?—Spalding generally, I think they have; the water supply has been pretty good in most of the stations, which I have myself personally inspected.

3135. Do you think that has resulted in the animals being better watered?—The animals are very many of them watered at the stations before they are put into the truck, but it all depends upon the time they arrive at the station; if they arrive late many persons would hurry them into the truck, and would not care about giving them any water.

3136. The provision in the Act is this; that the railway company is bound to provide water at the station, and are bound to supply it upon the man in charge asking them to do so, and the man in charge is liable to a fine if he or the owner allows the animal to go beyond a certain length of time without water?—Yes, that is so.

3137. Nevertheless, there have been several cases of great hardship in which animals have not been watered, and it has been strongly suggested

Professor
J. B.
Stroock.
—
31 March
1873.

gested that railway companies should be bound not merely to supply and provide water upon being requested to do so, but that they should be themselves made responsible for the animals being watered; would you suggest that, or not?—It depends entirely upon the system proposed to be carried out with regard to watering the animals; if it were made imperative that all the railway companies should have the animals watered before they went into the trucks at the station I think that would be the right thing to do, but it would be a very difficult thing to make railway companies provide and give water to the animals upon the journey.

3133. But you would go so far as to say that there are many cases in which animals should be watered before they are trucked?—Yes, I would go as far as that.

3139. How long are the animals that come from Aberdeen generally upon the journey?—About 36 hours.

3140. They are not watered as they come up, I believe?—They are not watered as they come up.

3141. In what condition do they arrive?—In very good condition.

3142. When you say they ought to have water at the expiration of 18 hours, your remark applies to their comfort, rather than to their health, does it not?—Rather than to the necessity for water.

3143. It has been proposed that the animals should be watered halfway between Aberdeen and London; that they should be untrucked, and trucked again; would you recommend that?—No, the untrucking of animals would be attended with a very great deal of labour and expense, and would disarrange matters very much; animals which come through from Scotland are often consigned to different individuals, some of them to go to one place, and some to another, and there would be a mixing of the animals when untrucked, unless there were special arrangements at each station. The untrucking of store cattle would be attended, doubtless, with a great deal of cruelty, and great delay in getting the animals out and getting them in again.

3144. Could not water be brought to the trucks?—I went into that matter rather fully with Captain Tyler; we had several contrivances suggested with regard to portable troughs, and so on, but we found none efficient, and that the delay and expense were so great that we at length determined that the only practicable solution of the problem was, that there should be special sidings at certain places, and that the cattle trucks coming up should be backed into the siding, and that the trucks should be furnished with doors which could be quickly lifted, the water and hay being given from stationary racks and troughs; a plan of that kind appears, I think, in the Transit Report.

3145. It would be a costly thing, would it not?—It would cost a very large sum of money; it would cost about £1. each for the alteration of the trucks, and the alteration of the trucks upon the Eastern Counties Railway alone would cost about 12,000 l.

3146. Could you rely upon the animals, after all, drinking?—We tried the experiment again and again, and found that the animals readily partook both of water and of food while they were upon the journey; some of them certainly did not; but speaking of them as a whole, they did.

3147. Then when it is stated as against this system that that would be useless, because the animals would not take the food or water, you do not believe that?—That is not correct.

3148. There have been several suggestions for animals to be watered while in transit?—There have.

3149. Have you seen any that you think really are practicable?—No, I have not; the one that I have already alluded to appears to be the best.

3150. That is not in the course of transit; that is while stopping at a siding?—Yes; but they are not untrucked.

3151. The arrangements which I allude to are those of a watering provision to be attached to the railway carriages, and the animals to be watered while in motion?—There have been several trucks which have been constructed for that purpose; on one occasion I went down to Boston, and accompanied a cattle train up with a truck which was made by Mr. Read, of Grantham, for that express purpose; the experiment certainly was not a successful one. I do not think that any trucks could be contrived which would really answer the purpose of supplying water and hay to the animals during the transit, or while the trains were in motion; it would be a very costly thing indeed, much more so than altering the present trucks.

3152. We will turn now to that part of the order which relates to disinfecting vessels; would you suggest any further order in that matter?—One difficulty experienced with regard to disinfecting vessels is that a very great many of them turn round directly they are unloaded, and go away to fetch another cargo of cattle; professedly these vessels are cleaned and disinfected upon the passage out; and as regards these vessels which bring cattle as part cargo, serious objections have been taken to disinfecting them.

3153. With regard to Irish vessels, how is it carried out?—Irish vessels are not, I believe, disinfected properly.

3154. Is it the case that vessels bringing cattle into the port of London are pretty well disinfected?—Yes; the special vessels are pretty well disinfected.

3155. I suppose I am right in saying that it is in vain to try to carry out those orders, either as regards the hardship to the animal or as regards disinfecting, either for the steamers or the railroad, unless there is pretty constant inspection?—Certainly that is so.

3156. You have had occasion to be acquainted with all the provisions relating to the persons that we are allowed by the Treasury to employ, and you are, I suppose, aware that we have no inspectors specially for railways?—That is the case.

3157. With regard to the foreign import, we have inspectors to examine the animals when they arrive?—Yes.

3158. But that does not apply to the Irish import, does it?—No; those inspectors who examine the animals when they arrive, as a rule, do not go on board the vessels.

3159. Still there exists the power, in that case, of examining the vessels, which does not exist with regard to the Irish animals?—Certainly, we can order the inspector to go on board and see that it is done to his satisfaction.

3160. With regard to Irish import, we have to rely either upon the local authority or upon one or two or three central inspectors being sent down from time to time?—Yes.

3161. I suppose

Professor
J. B.
Smead.

31 March
1873.

3161. I suppose that it is not a sufficient inspection to rely upon?—No, it is not a sufficient inspection to rely upon with regard to the disinfection and cleansing of Irish ships.

3162. You would suppose that it is hardly reasonable to expect the inspector of the port, who is appointed by the local authority to look after the interests of the port, to take that care which is required to prevent the importation of disease into the interior of the country?—No, I think that duty should devolve upon the inspectors appointed by the central authority.

3163. And with regard to the railways, I suppose, you make the same remark?—I make the same remark with regard to railways.

3164. I want to ask you a question or two with regard to the work of the department, and especially now that you are no longer connected with that department; in the first place with regard to the inspectors, what was the salary that you obtained from the department?—The salary which I obtained from the department, in the first instance, was a sum amounting to about three guineas a day; that arose out of the circumstance that I had to do with the organisation of the department originally, and at a time when cattle plague existed, and when one was called upon constantly to be going hither and thither, and working night and day to get rid of the disease. Subsequently to the extermination of the cattle plague the department was re-organised, and then the Treasury determined upon having only one inspector, and the amount the inspector was to receive was to be 1,000 £ a year. I felt it was not quite consistent to attempt to carry on the business with one inspector, and as Professor Brown had been working with me from the very commencement of the matter, I thought it would be more prudent for me to arrange and take a moiety of the money, and let Professor Brown have the other.

3165. Our arrangement was that we paid you 600 £ a year, and had a right to your services when we wanted them, but that you were not to be debarred from holding other offices?—No, I was not debarred from holding the Professorship at the Veterinary College; Professor Brown had 500 £ a year, but I had an extra 100 £ allowed to me in consequence of additional work which I had to do occasionally, and from having been actively engaged from the very first introduction of the cattle plague.

3166. And now that you have ceased your connection with our office you obtain a far higher pecuniary remuneration, I presume?—I have not suffered, in a pecuniary point of view, from having left the office.

3167. What might a thoroughly good veterinary surgeon expect to be his professional income?—The professional income of the profession varies considerably, as does the professional income of the medical profession; a man practising in London would expect to receive perhaps 2,000 £ or 3,000 £ a year, but in the country probably half of that; and in some of the rural districts a much smaller amount.

3168. I suppose we should not be able to perform the business of the department if the veterinary inspectors whom we send into the country were not generally acknowledged by the profession to be at the head of it?—Certainly not.

3169. Having had the opportunity of getting your professional assistance for several years,

since I have been connected with this department, I suppose you will bear me out when I say that from time to time very difficult and responsible matters have to be decided, and that almost immediately?—Very responsible matters, and which must be decided very promptly indeed.

3170. Matters affecting very large interests?—Very much so.

3171. Such a thing as an order for scheduling a new country?—Just so.

3172. That might have an effect for a short time upon the price of food in London?—Certainly, and very good proof was given, I think, by the recent introduction of cattle plague from Cronstadt: the Schleswig-Holstein animals has just been allowed to come in under a certain guarantee, and when it was found that cattle plague had been carried to Hamburg, it was deemed not only prudent but an absolute necessity to decide at once that animals which came from Schleswig-Holstein should go into the Deptford market, that is to say, that we should place Schleswig-Holstein again in the schedule.

3173. The questions which the persons in the position of the Lord President and myself have to decide, and that almost immediately, are questions upon the one hand affecting the price of food for the public, and the interests of a very large trade, and, upon the other hand, the possibility of an increase of disease throughout the kingdom?—That is so.

3174. I need not ask you whether it is not necessary when such questions have to be decided, to have a permanent staff of great knowledge and in such a position as to be responsible for the advice they give?—It would be quite impossible for matters to be properly brought before the Lords of the Council unless such a staff existed.

3175. Mr. Dent.] Before the cattle plague existed in this country, we had no record of the losses from disease in this country?—None whatever.

3176. Nor the losses from the importation of cattle from abroad caused by disease?—I do not know whether the Customs kept any record or not.

3177. Lord Robert Montagu, in Question 1216, gave the estimate of yourself and Professor Brown, with respect to the number of animals which had died from imported disease, the total being 1,275,000 between July 1842 and December 1867?—That estimate was fixed for all contagious diseases at about 1 per cent. during that length of time, and it was arrived at more especially from our own practical observations than from any statistical returns; we had, in reality, no returns before us which would be sufficient to enable us to form a correct opinion.

3178. I think you spoke of the consequences of the foot and mouth disease being more serious than the disease itself?—That is so.

3179. To what did you refer in that answer?—I referred to animals becoming affected with ulceration of the feet which might require, perhaps, many weeks to be cured, and many animals being affected in the mammary glands losing their milk entirely, and likewise being liable to cellular abscesses forming in several parts of their bodies, and other morbid changes.

3180. Have you ever noticed, when there has been a severe outbreak of foot and mouth disease, that pleuro-pneumonia has been at all more virulent?—I believe there is no connection whatever

Professor
J. B.
Smead.
—
31 March
1873.

over between pleuro-pneumonia and foot and mouth disease in that respect.

3181. But you have not noticed, after an outbreak of foot and mouth disease, that there have been more virulent attacks of pleuro-pneumonia in the country?—No, I have not; I think that attacks of foot and mouth disease might render animals more susceptible to the morbid matter or special poison of pleuro-pneumonia.

3182. You state that the foot and mouth disease was carried to New South Wales during a three months' voyage, and that the infectious cause of foot and mouth disease may last some time after the disease itself has been cured?—It would be difficult to fix a time when an animal would cease to give forth infecting matter; there probably might not be much difficulty in determining when an animal would be first enabled to disseminate the germs of the disease, but seeing that many ill consequences often arise out of the disease, one would be inclined to think that, for some time, morbid matter might be emanating from the body; besides which there would be substances by which infecting germs might hang about, such as hay, and so on.

3183. You gather from the fact that legislation has entirely failed in checking the disease, that we had better strike foot and mouth disease out of any Act for dealing with those diseases?—I think that legislation has failed completely, so far as foot and mouth disease is concerned.

3184. But do you not think that a very great deal might be done towards keeping the disease in check, by better regulations being carried out with respect to fairs and markets, and the transit of animals?—If we got a better inspection throughout the whole country with regard to infectious diseases in general, and prevent animals from being sold at fairs and markets, and travelled from place to place, I think this disease would be kept considerably in check, more especially if at the same time we adopted means which would have the effect of preventing any addition to the number of cases of the disease in the country, such as sending back affected store animals not fit to be killed for food.

3185. Many markets are held in the streets of towns; there is no possibility of keeping those streets properly disinfected and properly cleaned as they would be in a market; do not you think that some such rule as, that no market should be held except in a place where there was a market ground set apart for the purpose, would be advantageous for preventing the disease?—I think that if every town, at which a market has been held for a long time, was called upon to approve of a site for that market, it would be a great advantage; it is a nuisance, and a great inconvenience, for a cattle market to be held in the streets of a town.

3186. Do you think that something might be done in the way of registration of the sales of animals, so as to follow the disease?—I think there would be very great difficulty to follow the sales, as frequently men buy animals in a market and sell them again immediately, at a profit of a few shillings.

3187. You believe that neither foot and mouth disease nor pleuro-pneumonia originates spontaneously?—Neither of those diseases, nor cattle plague, nor sheep-pox, originates spontaneously.

3188. The probability is that these diseases may be considerably aggravated by the circumstances in which the animals are placed?—Certain

circumstances render animals more susceptible of being acted upon by infectious diseases.

3189. Animals crowded on board ship, or in a London dairy, would be much more susceptible to attacks of pleuro-pneumonia than animals placed in favourable circumstances?—Animals breathing vitiated air for a length of time would be rendered more susceptible to be acted upon by the special common infectious disease; but miasmatic mists, air causes would fall completely in producing the infecting material.

3190. The diseases you would deal with are pleuro-pneumonia, cattle plague, sheep-pox, and glanders in horses, are they not?—Yes; and sheep-scab.

3191. But scab is very easily got rid of, is it not?—Yes; but I would deal with it as one of the infectious or contagious diseases.

3192. But you would put the first four diseases that I mentioned under very stringent regulations?—Yes, certainly.

3193. The foot and mouth disease you would leave to be dealt with by the Act itself, and you would leave sheep-scab to be dealt with in the same manner?—Yes, I think it might be dealt with in the same manner; although it might often be found judicious to issue an Order of Council for the treatment of animals which are affected with sheep-scab.

3194. But sheep-scab is very easily cured, is it not?—It is easily enough cured, it men would set about the thing in the right way; but a great deal depends upon the application of the remedy; you may place the most effectual remedy in the hands of some persons, notwithstanding which, they will fail to get rid of sheep-scab.

3195. Sheep-scab is a disease that may arise very much from the carelessness of the shepherd, in not attending carefully to discover it when it first breaks out?—It would be impossible for a shepherd to point out when an acarus, which is about the size of a pin's point, travelled from one sheep to another.

3196. If he were careful he would very soon detect the presence of sheep-scab in the flock, would he not?—He ought to do so.

3197. And then, by dipping the whole of his flock, he would take steps to eradicate the disease at once?—He ought to do so.

3198. You would never think of putting sheep-scab in the same category as pleuro-pneumonia and glanders, would you?—No; but there is a great loss from the disease, owing to a loss of flesh, and also of quality and quantity of the wool of the sheep; and unless the disease is properly attended to it will spread rapidly; it is proverbial that one scabby sheep will infect a flock.

3199. You say that you would wish to see county or district inspectors appointed by Government?—Yes.

3200. Who should be qualified veterinary surgeons?—Yes.

3201. These veterinary surgeons being paid by salaries, and not by fees?—Yes, to be paid by salaries.

3202. Have you at all considered what would be a reasonable salary to give to a chief inspector of that class?—I have not considered that question.

3203. Would you consider 300*l.* or 400*l.* a year sufficient?—It should not be less than that.

3204. In the county of Norfolk you would think it requisite that there should be nine inspectors?

Professor
J. B.
Simonds

31 March
1873

inspectors?—The honourable Member for South Norfolk seemed to be of opinion that nine inspectors are required, under existing circumstances.

3205. You know the West Riding; a great many inspectors would be required in the West Riding, would they not?—No doubt, the number required would be far larger in some counties than others, and the amount to be raised by rate would be larger; that is to say, if those persons were paid by the local authorities.

3206. How would you deal with large boroughs, because in large boroughs there are dairies which are nests of pleuro-pneumonia?—I would give the chief inspector power over the boroughs as well as over the counties, calling upon the veterinary surgeon or inspector for the borough to certify when he found any subjects of contagious disease.

3207. Have you considered from what source the veterinary inspectors of the district should be paid?—I have not fully considered that question.

3208. You know that there is a jealousy between boroughs and counties, as far as payment out of borough funds and county funds goes; but I presume you would like to see in any legislation care taken that uniform action should be the rule in all cases?—In all cases; and I would place England, as England, entirely under the central authority in that respect. I would have no difference in carrying out the law in different counties.

3209. Would you not say that England, Scotland, and Ireland, should all be placed under the same legislation, and that the law should be administered in a similar manner?—In principle, I should consider it should be so, but Ireland is rather a difficult country to deal with.

3210. The central authority has more power than the local authority, unquestionably, but what I refer to is not so much as to what authority should carry out the Act, but that the action should be uniform in all the different districts?—It should be uniform in Great Britain.

3211. And Ireland?—And Ireland.

3212. You seem inclined to treat Irish animals as foreign animals?—Only as regards preventing disease from being introduced here from Ireland; I want to prevent the practice of store cattle being taken out of infected herds, and brought here, and to prevent the excuse which is now set up of the disease having been contracted during the passage; I think if we had the power to send diseased animals back as store cattle to Ireland, the dealers would take great care not to send us cattle from infected herds.

3213. Supposing the carrying out of legislation to be uniform in Ireland as well as in Great Britain, and the same restrictions, and the same care adopted in both countries, would not that enable us to deal with Irish cattle precisely in the same manner as with the English and Scotch cattle?—It might.

3214. The trade in Irish store cattle being as very important to the grazing districts of England, do you think it desirable to check it?—If we had in Ireland similar restrictions to those that are imposed in Great Britain, I think the disease might be kept in check, and we might, perhaps, then treat Irish cattle as English cattle.

3215. Do I understand you to say that the infection of pleuro-pneumonia only arises from the breath of the animals affected?—So far as the

experiments have been carried in this country, and they have not been few, we have failed to produce the disease, except by direct exposure to the breath of an affected animal.

3216. Then when an animal is slaughtered for pleuro-pneumonia the danger of infection ceases, according to that theory?—I could not take upon myself to say that.

3217. Generally speaking, the animals slaughtered have been buried in the same manner as in cattle plague, but if there be no infection except from the breath, it appears to me that we have been wasting, at all events, the hide, and probably the carcass as well?—I think the hides of animals which are killed labouring under pleuro-pneumonia might be saved, being disinfected upon the premises before they are allowed to be removed; I may add that when I was in Galicia and visited animals affected with the cattle plague, I saw that system carried out; the animals were frequently not bled in their hides, but the hides were disinfected on the premises under the supervision of the authorities, and then sent into market as dried hides.

3218. You went over especially to examine into the question of inoculation, did you not?—I did on one occasion.

3219. And your opinion of that was that it was a failure?—I have been of opinion from the time when first I investigated the system of inoculating animals that it has no prophylactic power at all. I believe that animals which have been inoculated are as susceptible to pleuro-pneumonia as if they had not been inoculated.

3220. Then you do not believe that pleuro-pneumonia may be taken by an individual going from an affected animal to another animal?—I have no evidence to prove that it is so; and the experiments which, as I have before said, have been carried out have not been successful in that direction.

3221. But in the case of the foot and mouth disease, a person handling or walking about amongst a lot of infected animals may undoubtedly take the disease to a lot of healthy animals?—Unquestionably; as I have already stated, I believe foot and mouth disease to be equally as infectious as cattle plague.

3222. With regard to the slaughter of animals in the case of cattle plague, do you think the carcasses of unaffected animals, supposing they were disinfected, might be removed, or do you think they should be buried?—I think that under proper regulations, animals which give no evidence whatever of the existence of cattle plague might be used for food, but all the skins should be disinfected.

3223. Supposing you have a lot of fat bullocks on a farm, and you find that some animals are affected with the cattle plague, you slaughter the whole herd; do you think that the meat, after the animal had been slain, might be used, and that the hide, being disinfected, might be safely removed?—Yes; presuming that it was done under proper supervision, but then it has often been proved that animals which were supposed not to be affected with cattle plague were really so affected, as shown by the examination of their viscera.

3224. With regard to glanders, would you slaughter all the animals affected with glanders?—I should be very glad to do so if I could.

3225. Is there a great amount of that disease in London now?—I believe there is a considerable

able amount of glanders existing in London at this time.

3236. And there is no effective means of checking the use of glandered horses at night time?—The provisions of the law with regard to glandered horses seem to be neglected altogether.

3237. Professor Brown made use of an expression with regard to foot and mouth disease, that farmers did not seem to care about it; would it not rather be true to say that they do not take sufficient precautions to prevent its spread?—I think Professor Brown is right to a very considerable extent. I am old enough to remember that a great number of farmers rather liked to have foot and mouth disease in their store stock, because they said that they thrived so well after they had had it. It was an advantage rather than a disadvantage.

3238. But they have rather changed their opinion with regard to that, have they not?—Yes; I think they have changed their opinion in many respects with regard to infectious diseases of cattle.

3239. Has it not been lately the fact, that animals have had the disease three or four times over?—Yes; but that is not a recent experience, because they had it three or four times over in 1840. When I lived in Twickenham, I kept a considerable number of animals, and experimented upon my own animals, and since then, when I have been engaged in agricultural pursuits, in addition to my profession, I have had animals which have had attacks of foot and mouth three times in succession.

3240. In what length of time?—In about 18 months.

3241. [Chairman.] Do you imagine that the animals were quite cured in the interim?—Quite so; I had no disease whatever on the premises.

3242. Mr. Dent.] But there is not, as a rule amongst farmers, the care as regards isolating new stock, and being careful to avoid going amongst their stock after being at market, and so on, which there should be with a disease of so infectious a nature?—Certainly not; the animals are sent on to the farm, and there mingled with the rest of the stock, and if any contagious disease should break out, the man does not find fault with his own acts at all; he complains merely of the person from whom he has bought the animals.

3243. You can speak of that from having been about amongst farmers, and seen a good deal of it yourself?—Yes; I can.

3244. With regard to transit, would you not rather say that delay in transit and in stoppages at junctions, causes far more hardships and suffering to the animals than anything else?—There is no difficulty, I think, in dealing with through traffic, as it is called, say from Aberdeen to London, or from any place in Scotland to London, but it is in the cross traffic and the delay arising from it, when the animals suffer specially from being kept without food and water.

3245. It would cost the railway companies very much less to send animals through by rather more expeditious trains, than to alter all their tracks, would it not?—If we could secure quick passage all over the country, through traffic and cross traffic, we should get rid of the evil almost entirely.

3246. Do you concur with Professor Brown in limiting the number of ports at which cattle should be imported from scheduled countries?—
0.58.

I think it would be prudent to do so, because so few cattle come in to certain ports, that no ill effects would arise from these ports being closed.

3247. And you would not think it unreasonable that wherever animals came in from scheduled countries, the ports should be bound to provide proper slaughterhouses within the defined port, and the proper means of disinfecting persons who come in contact with the animals?—I do not think that would be an unreasonable request to make of the local authorities of the ports.

3248. You would not think it unreasonable to make that a condition, of there being ports where cattle from scheduled countries might be allowed to be imported?—I would not.

3249. Mr. Clare Read.] I understood Mr. Dent to say that sheep-scab frequently spreads, owing to the neglect of the shepherd; but unless the insect was derived from another sheep, could it by any possibility be bred in the flock?—No, I should say there is as much chance that scab would arise spontaneously, as that you or I arose spontaneously.

3250. There must have been some seed for the disease?—The source of origin is the scab.

3251. And although some people say that it is very easy to get rid of, is it not a disease which ought to be well restricted, seeing that the animals which are affected with it now upon a farm may be kept and not dressed?—The local authority had permissive power, given by Order of Council, to cause a sheep to be dressed for sheep scab.

3252. Under the Act, they could keep a sheep upon a farm without in any way trying to arrest the spread of the disease, and therefore the local authority of the county of Norfolk sent up to the Privy Council, and asked whether they would pass an Order to allow them to insist upon the sheep being dressed?—Yes, that was so, I believe.

3253. And you think that it is quite necessary to keep up very strict regulations with reference to sheep scab?—I do; because a sheep being sent to a fair or market coming out of an infected flock might communicate the disease far and wide.

3254. You would not suggest any relaxation of the stringency as in the Act?—I think that the matter might remain precisely in its present condition, the local authority has now power to order the animals to be dressed, and I would allow that power to remain in force.

3255. That is only an order; do you think that it is a satisfactory order?—I do.

3256. And almost a necessary one?—Almost a necessary one.

3257. Did you see much of the sheep-pox in 1848 in Norfolk?—A good deal.

3258. Was it there spread by inoculation, in a great measure?—I think there were several cases which tended to the spread of small-pox among sheep in 1848; one was that the animals were allowed to have free movement about the country; sheep were sent to fairs and markets, which were the subjects of disease, and were offered also at public auctions; there was no legislation upon the subject. The disease in sheep was further spread by the confidence which was placed in vaccination, and also by improper inoculation, and possibly it might have been spread by inoculation proper.

3259. The system of inoculation in those days was very imperfect, and was it not very often fraudulently practised by some people who used

Professor
J. B.
Stansfeld.

3d March
1873.

Professor
J. B.
Smead,
—
31 March
1873

erose oil and such nonsense?—That was the case, and also with vaccination; people imposed upon the farmers by carrying about a mixture in bottles which they called vaccine lymph, and some of our largest flock owners contented themselves by having their sheep vaccinated. I could mention various names of people who had their sheep thus vaccinated; that is to say, they were operated upon by those individuals who carried about with them this spurious lymph, if you may call it so.

3250. What did that do?—It had no effect upon the sheep themselves, but it gave a false security, and false security, as we know, is worse than no security; those gentlemen thought that their sheep were protected, when indeed they were not protected.

3251. Do you recommend inoculation still in the case of an outbreak of sheep-pox?—Legitimate inoculation I should recommend certainly, under some circumstances, but not an indiscriminate inoculation, even when the thing was rightly and properly done.

3252. *Chairman.* Do you entirely disbelieve in vaccination for sheep-pox?—Quite so.

3253. *Mr. Clerk Read.* And in inoculation for pleuro-pneumonia?—And in inoculation for pleuro-pneumonia.

3254. But under certain favourable circumstances you would think it desirable in the case of sheep-pox still?—Under certain circumstances; for example, if natural sheep-pox has spread rather extensively in a flock, and it would take not less than a month before natural sheep-pox could spread to any great extent in a flock, I would then inoculate the rest of those animals, but I would not inoculate a healthy flock, although that healthy flock might be in close proximity to the diseased flock; I would not introduce the disease to a fresh flock.

3255. But you would rather try and prevent it by inoculation?—I will suppose this case: that if sheep-pox is introduced into a flock of sheep, 200, if you please, in number, I should find upon examination of those sheep, even a fortnight afterwards, that probably not more than six or seven of them would be the subject of the disease, although they all had been exposed to the infection arising from the difference in the susceptibility of the animal to be acted upon by the morbid matter; I would take away all the sheep which were the subjects of the disease, and kill them, and I would isolate the rest of the flock, and carefully inspect them, and take out day by day each animal which was infected, and slaughter it.

3256. You would kill the animal yourself, but would you make it compulsory to have them killed?—I would make it compulsory to have the diseased sheep killed and allow compensation.

3257. Is the disease easily discovered?—Yes, it is easily discovered; the eruption is unlike any other eruption that takes place in sheep.

3258. I think the animals affected generally walk in a peculiar way, do they not?—That would depend upon the amount of eruption; it generally takes effect upon the inner part of hind legs, and when that is the case the animal walks stiffly, but the constitution is affected, and the animal withdrawn from the rest of the sheep, and has a dull dejected appearance.

3259. Would you allow animals affected with sheep-pox to be doctored as they can be now, or would you think it wiser to order their immediate

slaughter?—I would not doctor sheep which are the subject of sheep-pox; I would slaughter them and make a daily inspection of those which had been removed from the diseased case.

3260. Do you agree with this paragraph of Professor Brown's Report, at page 23: "Considering the highly contagious character of sheep-pox, and the great fatality which occasionally attends its progress, it appears to be desirable that the stamping-out system should be applied in all cases in which the disease appears among sheep in this country. At least the slaughter of all diseased animals should be insisted on, and it will, under most circumstances, be found economical to destroy those which have been herded with them at the same time?"—I do not quite agree with the last sentence, that it would be found economical to destroy those animals that have been herded with the diseased animals, but I fully agree with the other statements.

3261. Professor Brown says, "under most circumstances;" I apprehend that such a particular circumstance would be its first outbreak in this country?—Sheep-pox is very peculiar as regards its rate of progress. As I said before, if you take a sheep which is the subject of the disease, and place him intentionally in a flock of 200, most likely you would not find above six or seven at the end of the first fortnight which would be affected. If you left them altogether, in the next week you would find probably 20 or 30; it would not be until the expiration of five weeks, or something like that, before you found that the greater part of the flock had become affected; the disease keeps gaining strength, as it were, and going on affecting a larger number of animals in proportion to its duration. If you take the very first outbreak we had of sheep-pox in 1847, as an example, there were, I think, 256 in a lot; 56 being the foreign sheep that brought the disease; the disease went on for six weeks, and I then isolated the healthy ones, or those that we thought were healthy, and if I remember rightly we saved 68 or 70 from the flock after all.

3262. The term "economical" would not apply to the owner of the flock, but would it not apply to the whole of the kingdom?—I think it would be a sacrifice of food to kill the animals which had been merely exposed to the disease, when we could isolate them, and by daily and careful inspection arrest its progress.

3263. I understand you object to the present law, which allows the owner of the sheep to doctor the sheep which are affected?—Certainly; if you rightly understand me, I would deal with them in this way: all animals affected with the disease I would take away and kill.

3264. I understood you to say, in answer to the Right Honourable Chairman, that you were quite satisfied with the Act as it stood with regard to sheep-pox; are you not aware that there is nothing that the local authority can do to enforce slaughter in the case of sheep-pox?—I thought the local authority had authority to enforce it; I was labouring under the impression that it was by the Act, and not by Order; that, with regard to the diseased animals.

3265. In 1839, do you remember the outbreak of foot and mouth disease in Norfolk?—I do.

3266. We always thought that that was the original outbreak, but you say it was not?—It was not the original outbreak; it was the original county outbreak. The disease appeared in August 1839, in the immediate neighbourhood of London,

London, and it was not until November that the animals in Norfolk became affected.

3267. Do you suppose that that outbreak was caused by cattle coming from the Metropolitan Market?—I have no reason to believe that that was the case; I was assured by the person to whom those animals belonged, that no fresh animals had come upon the place at all, and knowing the system which prevailed upon the farm with regard to the mode of dealing with the animals, I should hardly think that any animals had been imported to the farm.

3268. I believe that outbreak occurred within a short distance of the ports of Yarmouth and Lowestoft?—No; it occurred at Langley, which is distant from Yarmouth and Lowestoft some 14 or 15 miles.

3269. But Professor Brown told us that the cattle plague was introduced into Ireland, and taken there by other means than by cattle for a like disease into Ireland?—Yes; but the cattle plague was then existing in England, and you may say that foot and mouth disease was then existing in Holland, but I am not aware that there were any importations at that time of cattle either into Yarmouth or Lowestoft.

3270. I am aware that there were not, but I understand you to say if we were to get entirely rid of foot and mouth disease, and never did import a single animal, we should still, in consequence of our communication with the Continent, be running almost the daily risk of importing it somehow or other?—Yes, I believe so; but I can hardly believe that any material which was imported into Lowestoft or Yarmouth would find its way to Langley; I should think it just as probable for it to find its way into this Committee-room.

3271. People are constantly going from Langley to Yarmouth Market, are they not?—Yes; one farmer may go there once a fortnight, I suppose; if the Langley outbreak had been the first outbreak, we might have supposed that the morbid matter had been carried in such a way as you appear to think from one of those ports, but then it is notorious that the disease was in England for three months before it broke out in Norfolk.

3272. How did the disease get to Norfolk?—I cannot say.

3273. Although you cannot say how the disease got to Norfolk, you think it is impossible that the disease should have got through Yarmouth?—It is not impossible, but I think it far more probable that it should have been carried from London to Langley than from Yarmouth to Langley.

3274. We have never been free from the disease entirely?—Never entirely, but there have been times in which it has been so small in amount that no public attention has been directed to it, and then there have been those periodical outbreaks which are not satisfactorily accounted for; science has a great deal yet to explain with regard to outbreaks of infectious diseases. We have witnessed the same thing with regard to cholera, small-pox, and a variety of other affections which afflict the human subject.

3275. Is the "Veterinarian" published every month?—Yes.

3276. Is that merely a record of those diseases furnished by local veterinary surgeons as well as from the college in London?—The matter is furnished partly from local sources and partly through the kindness of Professor Brown, who is joint editor of the "Veterinarian," from official sources.

partly from the Veterinary College, and partly from the profession, as a whole.

3277. How long has that publication been issued?—The "Veterinarian" was first published in 1828, and has continued from that time down to the present.

3278. Before you held any Government office, how did the editor become acquainted with the diseases of the district; was it by contributions from veterinary surgeons all over England?—Yes, by communications with veterinary surgeons in England.

3279. I think it generally gives a brief monthly account of the state of health of cattle in England?—It does now.

3280. Did it not then?—It did not then, but it has done so since it came under my management; previously to that it dealt only with cases which were sent to it for publication.

3281. When did you become editor of the "Veterinarian"?—About 14 or 15 years ago.

3282. If there were six or 12 months elapsed with no record of foot and mouth disease in England in the columns of the "Veterinarian," would that be any sort of evidence that it did not exist at all?—Very little at all up to the time of the outbreak of cattle plague.

3283. Take a subsequent case; in 1867 you had monthly reports with regard to the state of health of the cattle; is it not the fact that for the last six months, and I believe for a longer period, there was no single record in the "Veterinarian" of a case of foot and mouth disease?—It may be so; I cannot charge my memory with that.

3284. If it were so you would not think the disease had died out, but simply that it was not worthy of record?—Yes, that it was not worthy of record; in 1867 it was considered that owing to the operation of the law for the suppression of cattle plague, we had got rid of foot and mouth disease; and, therefore, there being so few cases, we did not think that any special necessity existed for calling attention to it.

3285. You have got rid of it, except in a very few cases?—It was so diminished that we hoped we had got rid of it.

3286. It was the general opinion of the country that it was got rid of it, was it not?—Yes.

3287. But still you think that it was from those isolated cases which you say remained, that we had the present outbreak?—Yes; and from those isolated cases being supplemented by animals coming from Ireland in particular; it must be admitted that there were animals which came in from the Continent, which also were the subjects of disease, but those animals were dealt with in a way not to be productive of much mischief, if any, to the country.

3288. Did not the foreign sheep go out of the market?—Foreign sheep went out of the market, but not foreign sheep coming in the same vessels with the cattle.

3289. But after having been in the foreign market, and mixed with the cattle there, they were sent out?—There was not any foreign market then.

3290. From the Metropolitan Market the animals were sent all over the country?—They were sent all over the country from the Metropolitan Market.

3291. You have just stated that we received the foot and mouth disease from Ireland at that period;

Professor
J. B.
Simonds.
31 March
1873.

Professor
J. B.
Simonds.
—
31 March
1873.

period; is it not the fact that Ireland was entirely clear of the foot and mouth disease after the cattle plague, and that it did not get it again until we sent it to Ireland?—I have no proof of that whatever; the facts are, so far as I know them, that Ireland received the disease in 1839 at the same time as we did, and that it has continued with more or less severity in Ireland down to the present time; it has also been supplemented from time to time by animals sent from England which were the subjects of disease; the cases which I noticed were cases of animals sent from Southampton in 1869; there were also some cases sent subsequently from Bristol to Ireland.

3292. About the same time, was it not?—Subsequently; and Ireland week by week kept sending diseased animals into England; those animals were distributed to the northern counties, Cheshire, Lancashire, and so on; counties which you can hardly conceive that any foreign cattle, or even sheep would go to, except perhaps into towns like Manchester.

3293. I was not talking of the year 1869; I was talking of the outbreak which commenced, I believe, in the year 1867?—In 1867, as we have seen, there was but very little disease indeed, and I have no evidence whatever of the disease being then brought into the country from foreign sources or brought over here from Ireland; in those years that we had very little of it, Ireland had very little of it; I may add that the disease varies in the same manner upon the continent of Europe as it does in England; there are periodic outbreaks in Holland and Belgium, and throughout the whole of Europe; it follows there precisely the same law as it does here.

3294. Mr. Peil.] At what intervals?—There is no stated interval; we have sometimes gone as much as seven or eight years, without there being any great increase, and sometimes not above two or three years.

3295. Mr. Clere Read.] Do you think that the local authorities, particularly in counties, have done their best to enforce the Act of Parliament?—I think that the local authorities have not been uniform in their action, and I can scarcely understand that they could have done their best, unless there had been uniform action.

3296. Is not this the case, that the authorities in counties and the authorities in boroughs, have two separate and distinct interests in this respect, that whereas the boroughs care only about getting a good market, the counties have to consider the health of the cattle?—That is so, doubtless; but then, at the same time, the county local authorities have been doing one thing in one county, and the very opposite in another.

3297. Would it not be very necessary to take different action in different parts in England; take Norfolk, for instance, and compare it with the districts of South Wales; do you think it would be possible to carry out the same regulations, with regard to foot and mouth disease, in one county as in another?—I do not see why the same regulations should not be carried out in one county just as in another, if you want to get the disease down or to keep in check. It was the same thing with regard to the cattle plague; it was not until the same regulations were insisted upon on the part of the local authorities that we began to keep down the disease.

3298. Whereas, in a purely breeding district, you might have only one or two cases which you could deal with very summarily; in a large im-

porting county like Norfolk you have thousands of cases in a week, so that there must be great difference in the mode of treating those two counties, must there not?—Certainly, because in one case the danger may appear to be little, and the local authority would therefore take but little interest in the matter; but the local authority would take a very much larger interest in the matter where there was a larger number of cases, especially in Norfolk, which is an importing county rather than a breeding county.

3299. Do not you think that if there was an outbreak in a breeding county, the local authorities would take the best measures they could to suppress it?—Yes, no doubt they would.

3300. And that you might have a chance of succeeding in a small outbreak, whereas in a large importing county like Norfolk there would be no use in taking those measures?—The measures must be stringent in proportion to the evil you have to deal with.

3301. Do you think we might stamp out pleuro-pneumonia?—Yes, I think we might stamp out pleuro-pneumonia.

3302. I gather from your evidence and from that of Professor Brown that as soon as the animal is dead which is affected with pleuro-pneumonia, a great portion, if not the whole, of the risk of contagion is stopped?—We can only form a conclusion of the kind (it may be right or it may be wrong), as the result of experiments that we have instituted; we have failed in every way to induce an attack of pleuro-pneumonia except by exposing a healthy animal to another which was in a state of disease; all cases also of inoculation which have been had recourse to on the Continent and in England have failed to produce the disease. As Professor Brown has explained, we have taken the lungs of infected animals and placed them for experiment in boxes close to the healthy animals while they were still alive, and have failed to induce the disease; and we have taken sponges and saturated them with different secretions, and put them up the nostrils of healthy animals, and we have failed in that way. Indeed we have failed in every way to communicate the disease except by actual contact of animals.

3303. Still you are of opinion that it is communicated only by contagion?—That is my opinion.

3304. And it is communicated only by the breath of diseased animals?—I think so; I cannot speak positively upon that subject.

3305. But we might have a reasonable hope, if that theory is correct, of getting rid of the disease by slaughter?—Just so; and from the further circumstances that the disease is so unlike foot and mouth disease, and so unlike sheep pox, and also cattle plague in the rate of its progress; it is well known that the larger part of a herd in which the disease has appeared will escape.

3306. Whereas the whole of them would be affected with foot and mouth disease?—The whole of them would be affected in comparatively a short space of time with foot and mouth disease, with cattle plague and also with sheep pox.

3307. Chaireux.] That would make it very difficult to get the assent of the owner to the slaughter of a herd of animals one of which was affected with pleuro-pneumonia?—I think that the owners of animals are so satisfied now that nothing can be done to save the life of the animal affected,

affected, that nothing in the way of a difficulty would exist.

3308. The owners would be willing to consent to the slaughter of those affected, but as there is such a chance of animals which have herded with the affected animals escaping, they would not like to have them slaughtered?—I would not wish to have it done.

3309. Mr. *Clare Reed*.] If the animal actually diseased was killed, you would not require the rest of the herd to be slaughtered?—No; but I would have them as carefully watched and examined as I would have any flock examined for sheep-pox, and probably I might have to wait for a month before I had a second case, and I should deal with that in the same manner.

3310. Supposing that they were to follow that out, and stop entirely pleuro-pneumonia in this country, what sort of protection should we have that it might not again be brought in from abroad?—The protection would be, that we should slaughter all animals suspected of being infected with pleuro-pneumonia upon landing, and it is very well known that very few animals out of the hundreds of thousands that have been imported have found their way, with pleuro-pneumonia upon them, into the country.

3311. But if pleuro-pneumonia has an incubation of 30 days, and perhaps you would say it would have a longer period of incubation than that, if there is only 12 hours for inspection what is the use of inspection for pleuro-pneumonia provided we have got rid of the disease?—Inspection with regard to infectious disease is of no use whatever during the period of incubation of those diseases, but although that is the fact we cannot practically deal with it in that way, by saying that no animal should come into the country, simply because such a disease is incubated for so long a time; nor could we keep them in quarantine until the time has expired; that would be tantamount to shutting our ports against any animals coming in.

3312. I was talking about pleuro-pneumonia amongst dairy cows and foreign store stock, and I am supposing that we successfully carried the stamping out process, and got rid of it in England; could you tell us how we could provide against a recurrence of its importation from abroad?—You could only provide against it as you are providing against it now, that is, by slaughtering all animals at the port of landing which are found to be the subjects of disease, and also the others, on the presumption that the disease is being incubated in their systems.

3313. We, of course, could not enforce slaughter in other countries, but if we practised it ourselves we should still run the risk of re-importing it?—Yes, a slight risk.

3314. *Chairman*.] The questions of the Honourable Member for Norfolk seem to point to this, that in order to prevent the danger of the introduction of pleuro-pneumonia after it had been stamped out, inasmuch as it takes a long time for incubation, every foreign animal should be slaughtered at the port of landing; do you think that that ought in such a case to be done?—No, I do not; I think that we ought to have scheduled and unscheduled countries, and after a certain time the animals from scheduled countries should be slaughtered, but I think we ought to allow store stock to come into the country.

3315. You think that the loss to the agricultural interest of the possibility of importing

store stock would be greater than the risk we should run of importing disease?—I am looking to an increase of the difficulty of procuring food for the people, if we can get no store stock from other countries; if store stock could be got cheap enough to pay the agriculturist for feeding, it would be to his interest to have store stock coming in as well as to the interest of the consumer of meat.

3316. Mr. *Clare Reed*.] Do the Spanish cattle come in in ships specially set apart for the cattle trade, as a rule?—In ships which are used chiefly, but not entirely; because some Spanish cattle come into Liverpool as part cargo; but those that bring animals into Southampton are ships which have been engaged in the cattle trade especially. When the Spanish trade opens, the ships go there. Take the "Tonning," or the "Taurus," if these vessels had been bringing animals from Tonning, and that trade had ceased, they would then bring animals from Spain, and the same thing would occur with ships going to Corunna.

3317. Would you not consider the Port of Bristol very badly adapted for the importation of store stock, in consequence of the river being so narrow, and the channel itself being rather small and the vessels being a long time getting up. I understand you to say that when they are at sea the windmill work properly, but that when they come up the Thames the cattle suffer from want of ventilation; would that not be worse in the Port of Bristol?—It might be as bad, or it might be worse, but I know very little about the Irish trade. As a general principle I think it would be so; but I think a large number of Irish cattle are brought on deck, whereas few cattle are brought on deck into the Thames.

3318. Could not there be some machinery for ventilating the holds of cattle ships?—That is a question which belongs to engineers, I think. I have gone a little into the matter with engineers, and they have found great difficulties in it; but, so far as our cattle ships are concerned, I do not think that we could much improve the ventilation, if at all.

3319. You are speaking of cattle ships for Ireland, I believe?—I am speaking of ships that are engaged entirely in the foreign cattle trade.

3320. *Chairman*.] And coming into London?—Yes, the "Tonning," and the "Taurus," and that class of vessel.

3321. Mr. *Clare Reed*.] Those ships are specially built for the cattle trade, are they not?—Yes; the mischief is done by vessels which have part cargo, and which just fill in with cattle, to make up.

3322. That was the reason why I put to you a question about Spanish cattle, as they come in such small numbers that I thought they were brought as part cargo?—They are brought as part cargo to Liverpool.

3323. I gather from your evidence, with regard to watering cattle, that you believe that if they are watered before they are put into the trucks, and watered immediately after they are taken out, you could not do much more?—We could not do much more, except to expedite the cattle traffic upon the lines, that is to say, that trains should run through and not wait for other trains.

3324. It is owing to cross lines and to junctions that the greatest amount of suffering has prevailed?—Undoubtedly; you will see a track of sheep in the summer time frequently standing still for hours, and the animals panting and exposed

Professor
J. B.
Simonds.
31 March
1873.

Professor
J. B.
Stewart.

31 March
1873.

posed to the heat of the sun without any water, or any kind of protection, whereas if they were in a train which went through quickly, all that would be avoided.

3325. You had a good many false reports about cattle plague after the outbreak in Yorkshire; who originated those reports?—I could not say who originated those reports; they came up to the central office and were investigated.

3326. Were they from inspectors, or individuals?—They were from inspectors; in one case, the Leeds case, the Leeds inspector who reported it, had been a butcher.

3327. When the cattle from Schleswig-Holstein were scheduled, they were sent at once to the Deptford Market, were they not?—Yes.

3328. Did that diminish the number imported from there?—I do not think that it did; it was a proceeding which lasted for a very short time; I am inclined to think that sending animals to Deptford would not diminish the supply very much.

3329. Nor yet raise the price very much?—No, I think not.

3330. *Chairman.*] Are you aware that importers have stated that the reason that it did not affect the price was that it came at the latter end of the season, and that the arrangements were all made?—Yes; but we have reason to believe that the sending of scheduled cattle to the Deptford market does not very much affect the prices. If the meat will fetch a fraction more here than it does in Paris, the animals will come here.

3331. *Mr. Clare Read.*] There is an opinion abroad in the country that in the Veterinary Department there is too much red tape and Government sealing-wax, and not enough of veterinary science; is that your opinion?—If you simply calculate by numbers in the Veterinary Department, I should agree with you, but I do not calculate by numbers. There are only two inspectors in the department, and there are several clerks and superintendents who are absolutely necessary to carry on the department well; the professional part of the department is, compara-

tively speaking, very small in amount, as is shown by the number of individuals who are employed.

3332. That whereas there are something like 46 officials, only two of them are inspectors?—I think you will find that there are only 40 individuals, and I believe they have been fully engaged.

3333. In necessary work?—In necessary work; the work of the department is very heavy.

3334. The common opinion out of doors, that we want more inspectors and fewer clerks, is not correct?—We do not require more inspectors to do the work, as it has been done; but if the scheme, as it has been put before the Committee, is carried out, if the inspectors' work is to be carried out by themselves, inspectors would require to be distributed throughout the country.

3335. *Chairman.*] I understand you to say that more inspectors would be required if you carried out the new transit orders?—You would want more to send up the returns.

3336. *Mr. Clare Read.*] With regard to the railway companies, you think that it would be necessary to have Government inspectors constantly travelling about the country, seeing that the railway companies carry out the proposed regulations of the Privy Council?—If you divided Norfolk into sections, the Government inspector for each division would see that that was carried out amongst his other duties.

3337. *Chairman.*] You are of opinion that constant inspection of the railways is required?—Decidedly.

3338. *Mr. Clare Read.*] But had not that better be done by some one who is constantly going about, instead of by a man who is situated in one town and who would not have the power of following up the trucks?—But the proposition is that he would have the power of going about; I would not send him down from London; I would make him a country man.

3339. And paid by Government?—And paid by Government, the same as we have customs men at ports paid by Government.

Thursday, 3rd April 1873.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mr. James Barclay.
Mr. Jacob Bright.
Mr. Clay.
Mr. Dent.
Mr. Dodson.
Mr. William Edward Forster.
Mr. Kavanagh.

Mr. Lusk.
Mr. Monsell.
Mr. O'Connor.
Mr. Pell.
Mr. Clare Read.
Mr. Ridley.

THE RIGHT HONOURABLE WILLIAM EDWARD FORSTER, IN THE CHAIR.

Professor JAMES BRANT SIMONDS, called in; and further Examined.

3340. Mr. Clare Read.] In your evidence you suggested some slight modification of the law with regard to the removal of cattle affected with foot and mouth disease from one part of a farm to another; you said that you thought that in order to prevent their starvation they might be taken across a public road, although they were affected with the disease, in order to be fed?—I think that so far as foot and mouth disease is concerned, there would be really no objection to such removal, presuming that the disease is dealt with as has been proposed, by having no Orders of Council with regard to it, but just leaving it in the Act. I think that advantage would frequently arise to individuals by permitting animals to go from one part of a farm to another without incurring any very great risk.

3341. Might I ask you if you would approve of any relaxation with regard to pleuro-pneumonia; I would illustrate what I mean by this case: you know, do you not, that around Yarmouth there is a large extent of marshes where there is no shed or shelter within four miles?—I am aware of that.

3342. The local authorities for the county of Norfolk were placed in a very disagreeable position this last November; there were several lots of cattle there affected with pleuro-pneumonia, and the Act allowed them to remove animals which were actually the subjects of that disease, to a slaughter-house for immediate slaughter, but the Act would not allow the other portion of the herd to be removed; you are aware that in November, when the grass is down and the cold weather begins, if those cattle had been kept there for any length of time they would have absolutely perished?—That would be so.

3343. The local authorities did this, and I believe it is the only instance in which the local authorities for the county of Norfolk allowed an infringement of the Act; it said this to the owner: "If you give notice to the policeman of your being about to remove those cattle home for the purposes of sheltering and feeding them, and send extra help, you may do so, and we shall consider the place to which they are removed an infected place in room of the marsh from which they are removed;" do you think that any relaxation of that sort would be prejudicial?—I

think if the animals were examined by a professional man previously to their removal, that is to say, animals which had been exposed to the influence of pleuro-pneumonia, they might be removed by license under circumstances of that kind, without any material risk of spreading the disease being incurred.

3344. Provided the place to which they were to be moved should be considered as an infected place?—Yes.

3345. Instead of the marsh from which they had come?—Yes; there are many thousands of acres, as you are aware, of marsh ground in that district, and during the summer months nearly every marsh is covered more or less with cattle; many hundreds of cattle are grazed there, and I am inclined to think that a greater amount of risk of the spread of infectious disease would follow, the animals being so closely herded together without any separation beyond the mere ditches, than would be incurred by their being removed to the farmers' contiguous premises.

3346. Especially in the autumn, when the supply of grass had failed, and the animals would have starved if they had been kept there?—Yes, that is so.

3347. Mr. Barclay.] I understand you are of opinion that neither of these contagious diseases, pleuro-pneumonia, foot and mouth disease, nor cattle plague, is originated spontaneously in this country?—I am quite of that opinion.

3348. Are there any fatal contagious diseases which originate in this country?—There are some diseases which are to be viewed as being capable of being thus communicated, but they have a very limited sphere, such for example as splenic apoplexy, which is an affection of the blood.

3349. Is that a contagious disease?—It would appear to be so under certain circumstances. I remember a case very well which occurred in the county of Lincolnshire, of some sheep which were affected with the disease, and those sheep being removed to a pasture close by the premises, five cattle which were in that pasture contracted the disease, and the cattle being sent into the farm premises where there were some pigs, the pigs suffered from the disease; but it is just

Professor
J. B.
Simonds.
—
3 April
1873.

Professor
J. B.
Stearns.
—
3 April
1873.

one of those affections which does not spread immediately beyond its centre as it were.

3350. We have many fatal cattle diseases in this country, but not many which are of a contagious nature?—We have many diseases which are not of a contagious nature, but nevertheless fatal.

3351. I think you would divide those contagious diseases into two kinds; those of a fatal character, and those which might be considered non-fatal?—Yes.

3352. The non-fatal diseases would be foot and mouth disease and scab in sheep?—Yes.

3353. The non-fatal diseases, such as foot and mouth disease, you propose should not be dealt with by Orders of Council, but you would allow them to remain in the Act?—That is my opinion of the best way of dealing with foot and mouth disease, because unless we place foot and mouth disease under the same regulations as we should place animals affected with the cattle plague, I do not think we should ever get rid of the infection.

3354. Mr. *Clare Road*.] Except in the case of sheep-scab you would require the animals to be dressed, which the Act does not insist upon?—I think that the power might still be permissive on the part of the local authorities.

3355. Mr. *Bareley*.] Would you give power to the local authorities to enter upon premises, in the case of sheep-scab, and to see that the case was properly treated?—The power of entry is rather doubtful, I think; it is a thing which would require consideration. In the case of sheep-scab, I think, the case would be met by the Order of Council, namely, that the local authority may order the animals to be dressed. I do not think that there is any absolute necessity for power of entry.

3356. The inspector must have power of entry upon the premises to see that the animals are dressed?—I am not aware that the dressing is done under the superintendence of the inspectors.

3357. Sheep-scab is a disease which, undoubtedly, can easily be dealt with by care and attention on the part of those having the care of the sheep, is it not?—Yes.

3358. You can exterminate the disease within a very brief space by dressing the animal properly, can you not?—By proper dressing you can, but on the contrary, it does not matter how efficacious the remedies themselves may be, if they are not properly applied they will frequently fail.

3359. Then how are you going to see that the remedies are properly tried, and properly applied?—It would be an advantage, doubtless, to have the power of seeing that the thing was properly done, but at the same time I do not know that any great modification in the present regulations would be required.

3360. Would any disadvantage be likely to arise from the local authority having the power of seeing that sheep-scab was properly dressed and attended to?—Taken in connection with legislative measures altogether, I do not know that there would.

3361. Do you think that if left alone, and simply dealt with by the negative power of the Act, foot and mouth disease is likely to decrease, or disappear in this country?—I can only answer that by referring to facts, which are patent to every one who is familiar with the history of this disease, namely, that for several years in succession we hear very little of it, because there

has been very few cases in existence in the country.

3362. There was a very severe outbreak, was there not, in 1841?—Yes, an outbreak equally as severe as that which we have just experienced.

3363. *Chairman*.] You are aware that the Order which was issued with reference to sheep-scab, does not give a power of entry?—I am aware of that.

3364. I dare say you have been informed that we were legally advised that we could not, by any Order in Council, give that power of entry?—I cannot charge my mind that I have heard that you were so legally advised. I was speaking practically upon the matter.

3365. It being the case that we had no such power, would you, or would you not, recommend in any alteration of the Act, that there should be power to give the right of entry?—I am inclined to think that without the right of entry, the thing can be dealt with sufficiently well by an Order of Council, giving power to the local authority to order the sheep to be dressed. The dressing of sheep is not generally undertaken by the shepherd, but the dipping is usually done by him.

3366. Mr. *Bareley*.] But could the local authorities satisfy themselves that it was done without having the power of going upon the premises by their inspector?—A man is bound to give notice of the existence of the disease to the police, and the police would inform the inspector; then, I presume the local authority would give instructions for the dressing of these sheep; and, again, the farmer would have to report whether he considered the sheep free from disease or not, and the inspector would have the right to visit under these circumstances.

3367. You are assuming just now, that the inspector has the right of visiting the sheep?—Yes; upon receiving information from the police of the existence of a contagious disease.

3368. But under the present Act there is no such power?—The policeman has the power in the event of his receiving such information, and the professional inspector would have a similar power.

3369. In 1841, you say, was the first great outbreak of foot and mouth disease?—In 1840-41, 1840 chiefly.

3370. What was the next great outbreak?—The next great outbreak was in 1843.

3371. And the next?—The next was in 1862, and the next in 1861-62, which was continued into 1863.

3372. What was the next?—The disease was prevalent at the time of the cattle plague, but not materially so.

3373. Was that in 1846?—That was in 1865, and then it decreased under the Cattle Plague Regulations, and remained so till 1870-71.

3374. Do you think that the intervals of the disease would be likely to be lengthened if care continued to be taken as regards the foreign importation of disease?—It is very difficult to say, because we are unequipped really with the laws which govern the remarkable spread of this affection on the Continent, or in England from time to time.

3375. Does the particular type of the disease differ in the course of an attack in this country?—Invariably; when the disease is most virulent it is most severe, and that is most easily understood, because of the enormous multiplication of the poison.

3376. And

Professor
J. R.
Sewards.
—
3 April
1873.

3375. And it gradually decreases?—It gradually decreases as the animals become less susceptible, because, although it is true that animals are liable to second and even to third attacks of the disease, it is equally true that those cases are very few. An attack of the disease destroys the susceptibility of the animals to a very great extent, so that a disease of this kind would decline for want of victims, that is to say, for want of material to seize upon.

3377. I presume you do not put the whole weight of the disappearance of the foot and mouth disease in 1866 upon the cattle plague restrictions?—Probably not the whole of it, but there can be no doubt that those restrictions were exceedingly beneficial in keeping that and other diseases in check.

3378. The foot and mouth disease disappeared in 1841, without such restrictions, did it not?—That was the case.

3379. And it might equally well have disappeared in 1867 without any such restrictions?—It might; but judging from what I know of the affection as existing subsequently to 1841, I should not think the country was so clear as it was in 1867.

3380. I think you suggested that fat cattle affected with foot and mouth disease, might be allowed to be moved along a public highway to a slaughter-house?—Yes.

3381. If you had a drove of cattle following such fat cattle at an interval, say, of half a day, do you think that they would incur considerable risk by such a proceeding?—I do not think that the mere following of animals at an interval of half a day would be attended with any great amount of risk; the danger of taking animals along a road, arises in a great measure from this circumstance, that the animals go leisurely along, and frequently pick grass by the sides of the road, and thus leave saliva in so doing; that saliva coming in contact with other animals doing the same thing, namely, picking grass, would infect them, but I hardly imagine that the mere driving of infected animals along a road would do any harm, provided there was no morbid matter left upon the sides of the road by their chewing the grass.

3382. But is not that begging the whole question what are the chances of the morbid matter being left upon the road?—The chances are certainly great that the morbid matter would be left upon the road.

3383. If you had the disease very much reduced, would not allowing cattle to bedrive along a public highway be a very considerable means of allowing the disease to break out again?—I do not think it would, because there are very few fat cattle which would come off even a large estate at a time, the animals would come off by ones, and twos, and threes at a time.

3384. One fat animal would be sufficient to spread the disease, would it not?—One fat animal or one lean animal would be sufficient.

3385. Assuming one fat diseased animal to be driven along a highway, followed by 30, or 30, or 40, afterwards, would not that be attended with great risk?—There would be a risk, but I do not think the risk would be very great.

3386. What hardship would there be in killing the animals at home?—Country butchers generally complain of having to kill an animal at home, and they will not give so much money for it.

0.68.

3387. What would be the loss to the owner of a fat animal, by its being killed at home?—It is impossible to say what the loss would be, probably a pound, or something like that; the butcher would expect to be paid for visiting the place, and returning from it, and the extra labour upon the place, and not having his offal in the same state as he would at home; various little things of that kind, he would estimate that at least a pound, I think.

3388. Do you think that for a saving of a pound a head to the owner of these beasts, the public ought to run the risk of having the disease spread over the country, by allowing the infected animals to go along a road?—The risk is really so small, that I see no objection to allowing fat cattle to go by because to a proper slaughter-house.

3389. How is the disease propagated?—It is propagated probably by means of the respiration; morbid matter is given off by breathing, and it is also propagated by various secretions of the body, particularly the secretions of saliva, and the secretion of milk.

3390. I am speaking practically; how is the disease disseminated through the country just now, is it not disseminated by cattle driving along highways and travelling in railway trucks?—I think not; I think it arises from animals being congregated together, and in inhaling the morbid matter, as it were, from each other.

3391. How do they become congregated together; do you mean in fairs or markets?—In fairs or markets; supposing there is an animal which is the subject of disease in a fair or market, the animals contiguous to that animal would contract the disease; they would be removed home, and after the usual period of incubation had passed, these animals would show the disease; it is the congregation of animals which does the mischief.

3392. If an animal is removed along a highway, which is the subject of foot and mouth disease, is there any risk to animals in a field adjacent to the highway?—If the animals have their heads over the hedge, or gate, there might be, but otherwise I do not think there would be.

3393. Is foot and mouth disease infectious by the breath of an animal?—Yes; because the morbid matter is contained in the breath, and another animal which was sufficiently near to receive the breath, would of course receive the morbid matter.

3394. Do you think it would be of much service to have the cattle coming from Ireland inspected before being shipped?—I do not think it would be of much service.

3395. Do you think that it would act as a deterrent upon people bringing for shipment cattle which they knew to be diseased?—Only to a very slight extent, I think.

3396. I did not quite understand what your views were with regard to the loss of animals by foot and mouth disease; I think you said that in many cases it was equal to 2*l.* per head, but you did not agree in the total amount of the loss?—No; in some cases, I have no doubt that there is a decrease in value to the extent of 30*s.* or 2*l.*, but speaking of animals as a whole, I do not think that there is an average loss of 1*l.* per head.

3397. Do you think that 2*l.* would cover the loss to an owner of milk cows?—You are taking an individual case, and perhaps one of the worst that can possibly be taken.

x 5

3398. In

Professor
J. D.
Sewards.
3 April
1873.

3398. In the case of milk cows, should you say that the loss on an average is 2*l.* or more, or less?—If the milk cow belongs to a dairyman, a man who sells his milk, there would be a diminution of the amount of milk supplied by the cow, and there would be a serious loss in that instance, but if the cow, on the contrary, belonged to a farmer who consumed the milk himself, the loss would be comparatively little or nothing.

3399. *Chairman.*] With regard to the estimate which has been made of an average loss of 2*l.* per head, taking all the animals affected, do you consider that to be a correct estimate?—I consider that it is far in excess of the actual loss; there are very many animals, store animals for example, which soon recover from the disease, and do not suffer to any appreciable depreciation in value; very many of these are not worth more than 2*l.* to 3*l.* at the time they are attacked.

3400. *Mr. Dent.*] But with respect to milk cows in the hands of a farmer, is it not a very dangerous thing to use that milk for calves or pigs, or any stock upon his farm?—There can be no doubt that the milk of a milk cow suffering from disease is very dangerous to calves partaking of that milk, and serious losses have resulted from it. I can give you a notable instance occurring on my own farm of a loss of that description. When I was farming, it was my custom to wean four calves at a time from a cow. When I had a cow which produced a calf, I bought three other calves and placed them upon the cow, and allowed them to take her milk regularly up to a certain time. On one occasion on my return home from London in the evening, my headman reported that the calf, the produce of this cow, was dead; it was a calf which had been dropped to a pedigree short horn bull; and I was a little vexed to think the calf was dead; however, I did not think very much of it at the time, and I went into dinner, and when at dinner, the headman came and reported that another calf which was sucking from this cow was ill; I went out to find it dying, and before 10 o'clock (the report came to me originally at seven) a third calf was dead. I examined the cow, and found she was in a high state of fever and excitement, and I believed that she was sickening, so to speak, for the foot and mouth disease. On the following morning she was the subject of the disease; those three calves died in that space of time simply from partaking of her milk. The fourth calf did not become affected, which was to me a matter of some surprise, and I spoke to the headman about it, and he said I can explain that, for on the Sunday, the previous day, I did not think this cow was giving quite enough milk, so I took one calf from her, and placed it to another cow; that calf never ailed anything.

3401. *Mr. Barclay.*] In dealing with those diseases which might be called contagious diseases, you recommend one chief inspector for each county, and possibly more?—One chief inspector for each county, and more where there is a large cattle population; but I imagine that probably not more than three would be needed in our largest counties, or where there is the largest number of cattle.

3402. Did I understand you that the inspector should be appointed by the Central Department?—I think he should.

3403. What should be his relations to the local authority?—The inspector should report to the local authority the existence of the disease.

3404. Would the local authority be his superior or masters?—I think he should receive instructions from the central authority, but the inspector ought to report to the local authority, because the local authority would call upon the police to see that the law was carried out.

3405. Is that inspector to be responsible to local authority or to the Privy Council Department?—He should be responsible to the Privy Council Department, I think.

3406. Would he be amenable to the orders of the local authority?—It would be a question of detail which that I am scarcely now prepared to answer, with reference to whether the central authority should put itself in direct communication with him or with the local authority, so that he might receive instructions from the local authority. To expedite matters, I think it would be better that the inspector should receive instructions direct from the Privy Council.

3407. What would be the duty of the local authority?—To receive the reports and to see that orders were properly carried out.

3408. Reports from whom?—From the police.

3409. The local authority would have the control of the police simply?—The local authority would have the control of the police.

3410. The local authority would have no control over the inspector?—I think not.

3411. What part would the police play in the matter?—Guarding against the movement of animals without a license; for example, if foot and mouth disease existed (that would be the simplest case to take), a farmer wishing to send an animal to a slaughter-house, it would go with a license, and it would be the duty of the police to see that the animal did not go without a license.

3412. That would apply in the case of foot and mouth disease?—Yes; and in the case of pleuro-pneumonia; no animal could be moved off a farm without a license, which had been herded with a diseased animal; and the same thing would apply to small-pox in sheep.

3413. What would be the duty of the inspector?—The inspector would receive reports from the attending veterinary surgeon, and it would be his business to visit the place, to ascertain the existence of the disease, and to take the number of the cattle, and so on; and to report full particulars of the outbreak to the central authority.

3414. Who is to order the slaughter of the cattle?—The order for slaughter would come from the central department.

3415. From the Privy Council Department?—From the Privy Council Department; he would be the medium between the individual to whom the animal belonged and the Privy Council Department.

3416. If I understand this question rightly, it is the Privy Council Department that is to take the whole control of the disease in the country into its own hands?—Of contagious diseases, namely, cattle plague, small-pox, and pleuro-pneumonia. Cattle plague we have very rarely had in this country; small-pox very rarely indeed; the regulations would be for the purpose of stamping out pleuro-pneumonia and other diseases.

3417. Do you suggest any means with reference to how disease, pleuro-pneumonia, for example, might be discovered in its earliest stage?—Pleuro-pneumonia is a disease which is discoverable only in very many cases by a very close inspection of the animal; it requires a professional man to detect the existence of the disease.

3418. I asked

Professor
J. B.
Simonds.
—
3 April
1873.

3418. I asked this question, because you seemed to contemplate in your examination in chief, a complete system of inspection; would any practicable system of inspection be adequate to discover pleuro-pneumonia in its earlier stages?—Inspection by professional men; I will take the case of an animal falling ill upon a farm, the nature of the disease not being known. I presume that a veterinary surgeon, the ordinary attendant upon the cattle there, would be sent for, and he would give good heed to the nature of the disease, and I think that that individual in all probability would be able to detect, if not upon the first examination, at least by an examination on the following day, the existence or non-existence of pleuro-pneumonia. It would then be his duty to certify or to report to the officer who had been appointed by the central authority, the existence of this disease. The officer would visit the place, and then he would examine the animal and satisfy himself as to whether the disease did or not exist.

3419. I understood you in your examination in chief, to refer to a complete system of inspection all over the country by officers either of the local authority or of the Government?—I referred only to inspection when called upon; my plan would be this, that the veterinary surgeon as general attendance, detecting contagious disease, should certify or give notice to the superior officer of the existence of such disease upon a farm.

3420. And you would depend to a considerable extent upon the veterinary surgeon, and not the inspector, for getting a knowledge of where the disease existed?—Just so.

3421. Do you think the veterinary profession would have an objection to doing so?—That I cannot say; I should imagine not.

3422. And no special prejudice against it?—I should think not; the plan was in operation some years ago in Hanover, and it was found to work very well.

3423. Assuming that the Government took the control of these fatal contagious diseases, have you any idea what proportions the department would assume?—The department need not at any time, I think, be a very large department, because it would consist only of those individuals who were employed for making examinations, and they would be appointed by the central authority, and the returns would not be more numerous than they are now; it does not appear to me that it would be more than the addition of just the number that would be required for each county; one, two, or three, as the case may be.

3424. The duty of the department is principally to collect statistics and information, is it not?—Yes, I believe it is; there is a great deal of departmental work, doubtless, with regard to Orders of Council and statistics, and so on.

3425. Under these new arrangements, they would be called upon to make returns in all these different counties?—The Privy Council Department is called upon now, it might be said to almost an equal extent, to give instructions to the local authorities; the department is continually receiving information from the local authorities, and instructing the local authorities.

3426. Is that in consequence of the local authorities not doing their duty?—I cannot say; the departmental work I am not well acquainted with; it is some time since I was connected with
0-58.

the office, so that I do not know that the evidence which I could give with regard to that would carry much weight.

3427. You think that all animals labouring under pleuro-pneumonia ought to be slaughtered forthwith, as the most economical method of dealing with them?—I do.

3428. You do not propose to make it imperative that those animals which are in contact should be slaughtered?—Certainly not.

3429. To whom would you give any discretion as to the slaughter, or otherwise, of animals under this scheme; would you propose that the Privy Council should take that charge?—The case would very rarely arise; pleuro-pneumonia progresses so remarkably slow in a herd. You rarely see more than two or three diseased animals in extensive cases, unless it is in a London dairy, or a dairy in a large town. Taking out and slaughtering those animals which are the subjects of the disease, and watching the others, would, I think, be quite sufficient.

3430. Would you give any power to slaughter animals in contact in the case of pleuro-pneumonia?—I can imagine that there might be cases in which it would be prudent to slaughter animals that had been in contact, but they would be exceedingly rare; perhaps, it might be as well to provide for a contingency of that kind.

3431. It might be more economical, in certain cases, to slaughter the whole of the animals at once, might it not; you can fancy that such might be the case?—In very rare instances indeed.

3432. To whom would you give the discretion?—The discretion, I think, should be vested in the central authority upon the report of its officer. If the officer recommended that that course should be taken, he should receive instructions from the central authority.

3433. All animals affected with sheep-pox should be slaughtered forthwith?—All animals which are suffering under the disease, I think, are best slaughtered, but not animals which have been in contact with them.

3434. In the case of cattle plague, you would recommend that not only the animals affected be slaughtered, but also those in contact?—Quite so.

3435. Your answer to Question 3055 was, that you would not have all the animals in contact with those affected with sheep-pox slaughtered?—That is what I intended by the answer.

3436. In the case of animals labouring under sheep-pox in a flock, if they were promptly isolated and slaughtered, do you think it might stay the progress of the disease without its going through the flock generally?—Yes, I am decidedly of that opinion; for I have frequently seen that in a large number of sheep congregated together, there have been, probably, not more than half a dozen animals which were originally affected with the disease, and by taking away the healthy animals, or isolating the diseased ones, the affection has spread only to a very limited number beyond those originally attacked, but then it is absolutely necessary that these animals should be daily inspected to see whether the disease is progressing or not.

3437. Do you recommend inoculation for sheep-pox?—I do, under certain circumstances, but only under certain circumstances.

3438. Do you think that slaughtering is a much more effectual process, generally speaking,
a 4

Professor
J. B.
Steed.
3 April
1873.

in a case where it is early detected?—Yes, but if the disease had made much headway, which it usually has done in the flocks of men not knowing what was the matter with their animals, then I think that when the disease has got great hold of a flock, the best thing is to inoculate; for this reason, that the natural disease generally destroys 50 per cent., sometimes 70 per cent., and occasionally more, whereas the inoculated disease very rarely destroys more than five per cent., even when the animal is attacked very severely with the inoculated disease.

3439. That might be the most economical process for the owner of the stock, but what would you recommend in the public interest in the case of a large attack of sheep-pox?—Where the disease existed in a flock to a considerable extent I would not slaughter those that were unaffected; I would take away the diseased ones as quickly as I could and inoculate the others; but when the disease first appeared in a flock, I would slaughter those that were affected, and watch the others carefully, slaughtering them as they became affected with the disease.

3440. Do you think it is very easy to isolate a flock under those circumstances, so that there would not be any risk of their spreading the disease to their neighbors?—Very easy indeed on most farms.

3441. Is care taken in such cases that disease shall not be allowed to spread?—Of late years great care has been taken.

3442. In the case of cattle plague you propose to slaughter not only the animals attacked, but also those in contact, and you propose to give the local authority also power to slaughter adjacent animals?—Yes, that was my proposition.

3443. What do you understand by "contact"?—Animals placed in a condition in which they can touch each other, or where materials which we may say are interposed between them so constructed that it becomes almost positive contact between the animals.

3444. Animals within the same inclosure?—Yes, but I think you ought to consider such a case as this as contact: suppose a number of animals were upon a farmer's premises, and that he had, for convenience sake, divided his yards into compartments, simply by posts and rails, all those animals which were in the yard divided merely by posts and rails, ought to be considered in contact.

3445. But those in separate houses upon the same farmstead, you would not say were in contact?—Certainly not.

3446. You are in favour, are you not, of reducing the local authorities very considerably, and having only one local authority for one county?—I think that great advantage would arise if that were the case.

3447. Is there any conflict between the interests of boroughs and counties in respect of this proposal of dealing with disease?—The interests of the local authorities in a town are very frequently opposed to those of the local authorities of a county.

3448. In what respect?—Farmers and individuals have to feed the people who are in the towns, and the towns want to get as much meat as they can into the place, therefore they want as few restrictions as possible.

3449. Did you see the memorandum of suggestions which I submitted to the Committee the other day?—I have seen it.

3450. Is that memorandum in there any point in which the interests of boroughs and counties are likely to conflict?—I cannot answer that at this moment; my engagements are so very numerous that I have scarcely been able to make myself master of the various papers which have been handed in.

3451. The conflict would arise, would it not, from counties wishing to place certain restrictions which the boroughs would not approve of?—Yes.

3452. Supposing that you did not give the local authority power to place such restrictions upon the movements of animals, is there any other way in which the interests are like to conflict?—I think not.

3453. Only with regard to the movement of cattle?—I think that is all.

3454. And not of diseased cattle, but of presumed healthy cattle?—Of presumed healthy cattle.

3455. Mr. Ridley: I understand you to advise with regard to the Irish import, a quarantine of five or six hours at the port of debarkation?—I should recommend a detention for about that space of time for the purpose of ascertaining whether the animals really were or were not suffering from foot-and-mouth disease.

3456. But you would call that quarantine, would you not?—I would not call it quarantine; I think it would hardly be correctly named, if it were called quarantine.

3457. You agree with Professor Brown, who entertains strong objections to quarantine stations, which he says are likely to become centres of infection; do you not think that a detention of five or six hours would be very much the same thing?—No, I think not; the places where those animals would be detained would be very similar to what we have now at all the ports, and we do not find that the disease spreads from those ports; it is a very different thing from quarantine spreading over several days, where a large number of animals are brought together, and are daily added to by fresh arrivals. In my opinion, if the country wished to propagate contagious diseases, it would be the very best means the country could adopt to erect quarantine stations; they would become immense posthouses.

3458. With regard to the inspectors at the port of debarkation, would you recommend that inspectors should be appointed by the Government at all the ports?—I would recommend that inspectors should be appointed by the Government at all the ports.

3459. Whose duty it should be, during those four or six hours' detention, to see whether the animals were diseased or not?—Yes.

3460. Do not you think that fields and lanes used for the temporary reception of cattle by the consignees of the cattle, are also very liable to become nests of infection, doubtless; but the places where the animals are kept, are places which are under supervision; we have no fields where the animals are turned in upon their arrival from abroad or from Ireland, that I am aware of; the place that they are detained at, is near the port of debarkation.

3461. But, for instance, at Bristol and at Liverpool, and other places, are there not private lairs?—I would not allow them to go into private lairs. I would have a proper place for their reception; it might be provided by the local authority, but it should

should be approved of by the the central authority.

3462. And there should be always a power of inspection by the Government Inspector?—Decidedly.

3463. I suppose you attach considerable value to the disinfection of railway tracks?—Yes, I attach considerable value to the disinfection of railway tracks, but I attach almost more importance to the well washing, and the thorough cleansing of railway trucks, than I do to the mere use of a disinfecting fluid. I have often seen railway trucks which have been mopped out with lime-water, or with, perhaps, some very excellent disinfecting compound in itself, while feculent matters have been left in and about it; there has been no cleansing of the truck whatever, beyond sweeping it out. I think they might just as well have done nothing.

3464. You are aware that railway companies have considerable difficulty in getting these regulations carried out?—I am told so.

3465. I see you recommend that there should be Government inspectors in all cases to see this provision carried out?—I think there should be.

3466. Are you aware that any local authority has taken action in that matter upon their own responsibility hitherto?—I am not aware of that.

3467. You also think a proper cleansing of establishments important?—Yes.

3468. Would it be possible to see that no ship returned after having disembarked the cattle without a certificate that she had been properly cleaned, washed, and disinfected?—There ought to be no difficulty in carrying out such a regulation, but practically it is not done; the ships return directly after having unloaded cattle, with a promise on the part of the captain that the vessel shall be cleaned and disinfected on her way out. Cattle ships, I believe, are usually dealt with in that manner, and I believe as a whole satisfactorily; but it is with vessels bringing merchandise with the cattle on part cargo where the difficulty exists with regard to disinfection, and with regard to many other regulations.

3469. You were asked with regard to animals in contact upon the same premises; do not you think that in the case of animals being in an adjoining field where they could not be said to be in contact, but where there was running water going from one field to another, there is more danger of infection than even when their heads were near each other; owing to the animals affected watering there, the animals lower down would be liable to infection?—There is no doubt that disease is frequently propagated in that manner; it was doubtless the case with cattle plague; it has been made the subject of direct experiment; cattle plague matter has been mixed with water and given to animals to drink, and the disease has been produced in that way.

3470. Then, as regards slaughtering animals who have been in contact with others affected with cattle plague, you would leave it to the local authority to say whether they had been so circumstanced that animals two or three fields off had been practically in contact with the diseased cattle?—Yes; I think every case must be investigated and dealt with by itself.

3471. Do you think if this were done with regard to foot and mouth disease; in fact, if it were left impossible for the farmers to take care of

themselves, that it would be possible to keep up the restrictions at present existing upon the foreign trade?—I think so; those restrictions would, doubtless, be complained of; but if we are fit to move animals ourselves which are diseased, under certain conditions, I do not think that we ought at the same time to give countenance to importing more diseased animals into the country.

3472. You do not think that it would be unfair to the foreign importer?—I do not think so; I think we have a perfect right to shut the door against any addition to the existing amount of disease.

3473. Even although at home, we may think it is of no importance?—I think we have a right to say that we do not choose to add to the amount of disease we have to deal with.

3474. In that case you would deal with the Irish cattle as with the home cattle?—Except that I do not think Irish cattle should be allowed to add to the disease existing in the country. I should propose as a preventive measure, in order to ensure that the Irish dealers should take their cattle out of healthy herds, that the store stock found to be diseased should be sent back.

3475. You would put the Irish trade upon the level of the foreign trade as far as store stock is concerned?—As far as the store stock is concerned. I think an owner should declare whether an animal was a fat or a store animal, and if it was a fat animal coming into the country, we should slaughter it and use it for food; but if it was a store animal, the owner should take it back and take care of it himself.

3476. Do you mean that that should apply to the Irish owner of cattle as well as to foreign stock?—Yes.

3477. And then in the event of animals being found affected at Bristol with foot and mouth disease, from having been in contact with foot and mouth disease, supposing them to be declared fat cattle, would you order them to be slaughtered?—Yes.

3478. As in the case of foreign cattle?—Yes.

3479. Mr. Jacob Bright.] On a cargo of cattle arriving in this country, if there is any contagious disease on board, the whole cargo has to be slaughtered at the port, is that so?—Yes, that is so.

3480. What are the diseases which require the whole cargo to be slaughtered at the port?—All contagious diseases.

3481. Chairman.] All diseases declared to be contagious diseases by the Act?—Yes.

3482. Mr. Jacob Bright.] How many diseases are there which subject the whole cargo to slaughter?—Five; namely, cattle plague, piezopneumonia, foot and mouth disease, small-pox, and scab.

3483. That is all?—That is all.

3484. An importer of cattle has told me that sometimes a cargo of this character will arrive, namely a cargo consisting of 300 or 400 oxen, and 1,000 or 1,200 sheep, 200 calves, and 300 or 400 pigs. Now, upon a cargo like that arriving, if one or two sheep are found with the sheep-pox, does it require that all these animals should be slaughtered at the port?—Animals of the same kind, all the sheep would require to be slaughtered, not the pigs nor cattle, they are not susceptible of the disease.

3485. Then all the other animals would be allowed to come into the country?—All the other animals would pass into the country.

S

3486. That

Professor
J. B.
Simonds.
3 April
1873.

Professor
J. B.
Simonds.
—
3 April
1873.

3486. That is with regard to sheep-pox; now, with regard to foot and mouth disease, if any of that disease is found in such a cargo, does it require that the whole cargo should be slaughtered?—The whole cargo has to be slaughtered at the port.

3487. Including all those animals that I have named?—Yes.

3488. Then in case there are several thousand animals in the cargo, and you had one discovered with foot and mouth disease, does that require that the whole cargo should be slaughtered?—Yes, on the detection of the disease.

3489. In one single animal?—Yes.

3490. *Chairman.* When you speak of several thousands, what is the largest number of cattle you have known to arrive in one cargo?—I have known 400 cattle to arrive from Tanning, and a few hundred sheep also in the same vessel, but if a vessel brings as many as 400 cattle, or about that number, she would bring but very few sheep.

3491. *Mr. Jacob Bright.* I may be misinformed, but the list of animals that I read to you was given to me by an importer of cattle, to show that that number of cattle did sometimes come at once?—It is very seldom that we have pigs and calves brought in with cattle and sheep; it does happen sometimes.

3492. But with a large cargo of mixed animals, the discovery of disease in one single animal, if it be foot and mouth disease, compels the slaughter of all the rest at the port?—Yes, it necessitates the slaughter of all the rest.

3493. Is it of much consequence to the importer of those animals, whether they are slaughtered in that way at the port, or whether they have admittance into the country?—I do not think it is a matter of much importance to the importer, looking upon the importer as a consignee.

3494. And to the exporter?—I do not think the exporter would realise so much money.

3495. Have you any idea what would be the loss upon, say a thousand animals?—I have very little idea as to what the precise loss would be; I believe the losses have been magnified very greatly.

3496. Does not it seem a very severe measure that for one animal found with a disease of that kind, the whole of those animals should be slaughtered?—No, I think not; all those animals are likely to communicate the disease, and the greater the number the greater the necessity for killing them, because they would spread the disease far and wide, just in proportion to their number.

3497. *Mr. O'Connor.* Did I understand you to say that foot and mouth disease had been sent to New South Wales by cattle from this country?—According to statements which have appeared in official reports, such is the case.

3498. Are you aware in what state of disease the cattle were when they arrived in New South Wales, whether the animals had got over it or whether they were actually suffering from it?—In one case the animals were reported as still suffering from it on their arrival; that was in New South Wales.

3499. How long do you consider an animal which had had foot and mouth disease would be likely to be dangerous to other animals?—It is quite impossible to say how long a time would elapse before an animal would cease to give off a certain amount of infecting matter from its body.

3500. Would you have any means of knowing

upon inspecting a cargo of animals, whether they had been suffering from foot and mouth disease; supposing they were not at that moment suffering from the worst form of the disease, how long after recovery would you know that they had had it?—That would depend upon the severity of the disease, and what had arisen out of the attack; some animals for example, remain lame for a considerable time, in consequence of a detachment of the horny part of the foot.

3501. But with regard to this inspection which you propose to have, of Irish cattle when they arrive in England, would you propose to send back animals which were found to be in that state?—If I had clear evidence of the existence of disease in a form which would be likely to spread the infection, I should send them back.

3502. Do I understand you to say, that if as board one of those ships with a cargo of cattle you find one suffering in this way from the effects of foot and mouth disease you would send back the whole cargo, both the healthy and the unhealthy stock?—If they were store stock coming from Ireland or from abroad I should.

3503. *Chairman.* You would have all the fat stock slaughtered?—I should have all the fat stock slaughtered.

3504. *Mr. O'Connor.* Have you considered what the effect of that would be upon the Irish export trade?—I think that the effect of it would be this, that men would be exceedingly careful as to where they got their store stock from, and instead of sending us, as they do now, cattle gathered out of infected herds, they would send us about the same number of animals gathered out of healthy herds.

3505. But, in your opinion, as a matter of fact, would not it be very hard upon the dealer who had shipped a number of healthy stock, to have those animals sent back to him, because somebody else had sent some infected stock?—Every man must look out for himself in this matter; I deal with the question of principle.

3506. You heard Professor Williams's evidence, did you not?—Yes, I did.

3507. In Question 1114, Professor Williams was asked, "Do not you think that it would have a very deterrent effect upon dealers if the cattle were to be subject to inspection at the port were they were to be landed, and were to be liable to be turned back upon them?" And his answer was, "I say that it would be enough to stop the trade, I believe." Do you agree with that answer?—I cannot say that I take precisely the same view of the matter as Professor Williams does.

3508. Do not you think that the Irish farmers would have very just cause of complaint if at the very time you were removing restrictions upon the foot and mouth disease in England, you were to increase them very much in regard to the Irish import?—Doubtless, they would complain, but we must not attend to everybody's complaints, otherwise there would be no legislation at all.

3509. You would propose this legislation without any reference to the effect which it would have upon the trade generally?—Without reference to what effect it would have upon individuals who are themselves dealers in cattle.

3510. Could not those regulations which you propose, be carried out just as well at the port of embarkation as at the port of disembarkation?—I think not.

3511. Is

3511. In what would the difference consist?—In the latter case, a longer space of time would be allowed; an animal may be just sickening for the disease upon the other side of the water, and that animal would give evidence of the existence of the disease when it arrives upon this side of the water.

3512. But some of the animals on board would be just in the same state when they arrive, they might be only just sickening then, and the disease would not be detected, and then you could not send them back?—The chances would be far greater of our detecting disease upon this side the Channel than upon the other; I think the punishment would be hardly enough to send the animals back from the other side to the farm; I would rather send them back from this side.

3513. But the punishment is to apply not only to those that are guilty, but to those that are not guilty?—Then those persons who are guilty must take the consequences of any measures which the persons who are not guilty may choose to adopt.

3514. In answer to Question 3214, you say that if there were the same regulations in Ireland as in England, Irish cattle might then be treated as English; as a matter of fact, have we not practically as much restriction in Ireland as in England?—I have not been in Ireland, and I know very little of the restrictions imposed by the Irish authorities.

3515. According to Professor Brown, the law in England has never been carried out?—It has been established beyond all question and doubt, that a very large number of animals have been sent from Ireland to this country, which are the subjects of foot and mouth disease. I am perfectly satisfied, from what I have seen of those animals, that they have been taken out of infected herds by the dealers, who have collected them together to send them here.

3516. Are you aware that there is a good deal of discontent already amongst Irish dealers, in consequence of the restrictions which are at present imposed?—I can readily understand that.

3517. There was a deputation to the Council Office last year, I think, upon that subject?—Probably there was.

3518. Mr. Phil.] I think you have been to Deptford Market?—I have.

3519. You consider that that market has all the appliances which should belong to a large market of that sort?—It has.

3520. Would you not make an exception with regard to railway accommodation, in which it is deficient, for the transport of meat?—A question of that kind has been entertained, but I believe there were some difficulties in the way.

3521. Is it not the fact, that at the present time, there is no railway or tramway coming into the market, by which the dead meat can be conveyed away?—That is the case.

3522. Will you inform the Committee how the dead meat, after being slaughtered, is got away from the market?—It is taken away by butchers' carts.

3523. Which is the nearest railway station upon which it can be placed?—That is a question which I cannot answer. I have never inspected the railways in the immediate vicinity of the market, to ascertain where the meat could be taken upon the rail.

0.58.

3524. But still it would be some considerable distance?—Yes, there are two railway stations within about a mile of the market.

3525. Are you aware that one of those stations has no appliances for loading goods?—There is no appliance whatever at one of them, I know.

3526. So that virtually it comes to this, that there is only one station?—There is only one station. I believe they might get a junction by New Cross, as has been proposed.

3527. You have told the Committee that, in your opinion, it is not desirable to continue the restrictions with regard to foot and mouth disease, which are put upon it by the local authorities?—I think all those restrictions have failed to keep the disease in check.

3528. And therefore in your opinion, in short, you would not have those continued any longer? I would not deal with the disease by Order of Council. I would just leave the foot and mouth disease in the Act, and let the farmers take care of themselves.

3529. Simply that it should be illegal to drive an animal with disease upon it along a highway, or to expose it in fairs or markets?—To drive an animal along a highway should be illegal, with the exception of driving it along a highway from one part of a farm to another.

3530. You have suggested one check to the spread of the disease with regard to Irish cattle, namely, that if they are found to have the disease on landing, you would return them?—That was with reference to store cattle.

3531. That suggestion you make as a check upon the Irish importer sending diseased cattle over?—Yes.

3532. Then with regard to foreign cattle, I think you said you would pursue the same course?—Precisely so.

3533. So that that would be a mitigation of the present evil to which reference has been made by the honourable Member for the county Sligo?—It would.

3534. Chairman.] I think I understood you to say, in answer to my question, that you thought it would be a more severe measure with regard to importers, to send back the store animals than to have them slaughtered?—I think it would be a more severe measure.

3535. Mr. Phil.] One question with regard to the cargo which has been referred to: did you ever hear of a cargo containing that extraordinary number of cattle?—I think it is not unusual for a couple of hundred of cattle to be brought on board one of our large ships with something like a thousand sheep, but I do not know that calves have been added, or pigs, to a large cargo of that kind.

3536. You told the Committee, and so did Professor Brown, that there was an idea that the stock of foreign cattle, with the exception of Russian cattle, was very seriously diminishing, and almost exhausted; at least so much of it as they could spare to come to this country?—That appears to be the case from all the information which one can gather from the trade.

3537. Upon what do you base that opinion; where have you got your facts from?—I take the state of things as existing with regard to Spain as a proof, we found some years ago that all the animals which arrived in this country were old animals; they were keeping all their young animals in the country, using them for breeding purposes, and for working, and so on;

8 2

now,

Professor
J. B.
Simonds.
—
3 April
1873.

Professor
J. B.
Simonds.

3 April
1873.

now, we have exhausted that supply, and we are bringing young animals from Spain, and also from Portugal.

3338. May it not be that the Spaniards imagine that we prefer to eat meat something short of 12 or 13 years of age, and that they are sending us a better article?—I believe that is not an explanation of the fact; I am told by those who gather animals in Spain for export, that they have the greatest difficulty in getting them together; that all the old animals have been used up. The general statement that one hears from importers from the Continent is that, with the exception of Schleswig Holstein, if you take Prussia, and all Central Europe, they have very few cattle to send us, and when you come to look at the fact, that in Bohemia and Moravia animals come from Hungary, Styria, and adjacent countries, to be fattened at the distilleries, I think it is a pretty good proof that they have but little stock of their own to send.

3339. Could you refer the Committee to any statistics of the amount of cattle in foreign countries?—I could not.

3340. Then after all the statement you have made, is the result of a somewhat irregular inquiry?—Somewhat so, but I have no reason whatever to doubt the correctness of it.

3341. You will admit, if the statement could be substantiated, that if the supply of European cattle, exclusively of Russia, is almost exhausted, there would be a strong pressure put upon Government to introduce Russian cattle?—I think some of the witnesses that were called before the Committee on Trade in Animals gave evidence to that effect; I remember Mr. Robinson stating distinctly in the Committee-room that we should have to go to the Ukraine for a supply.

3342. Do you know whether the importation has been very much less this year than last?—I do not know what the returns are.

3343. Now I wish to ask you a few questions with regard to the ventilation of the holds of cattle ships; have you seen the last journal of the Royal Agricultural Society?—I received it last night only.

3344. Would you just look at that little plan. (Handing a *Plan* to the Witness.) Have you ever seen that appliance on board ship?—No, I have not.

3345. Is it not stated in that Journal that that apparatus effectually ventilates cattle holds, and that the cost of it is very inconsiderable; 15 *l.* it states in the Report?—Yes, it states so.

3346. Does it not state that that plan has been used on board ship with success?—It says so; some of the steamboats of the Dublin Company, and also of the North German Lloyd's, are fitted with the blast ventilators.

3347. I think it states that the hold is found to be very much cooler when fitted in that way?—Yes.

3348. Now, going back to the foot and mouth disease; have you any hope, as a professional man, of discovering a cure for it?—I scarcely understand what you mean by "discovering a cure for it."

3349. I mean a specific?—A specific to prevent the disease?

3350. Either to stop it, or when you see an animal is attacked with it, to cure it?—It cures itself in 89 cases out of every 100; I think the effect of treating animals affected with the foot and mouth disease is to create a severe case out

of a mild one; I will put it in this way: all infectious diseases run through their own particular course, and supposing that I were to take a sheep which had been exposed to small-pox, and which had received the virus into its system, I know of no means by which I could prevent that virus from developing itself, and when it had developed itself, the disease would pass through its several stages; it is the same with all these maladies; we cannot purge them out of the system, nor can we inoculate the system with anything to render the poison inert.

3351. But you see no prospect of arriving at any preventive of this disease like vaccination for smallpox?—No; vaccination in this case has no virtue at all.

3352. Have any experiments been made with the view of preventing the spread of disease to healthy animals?—I have experimented in the production of the disease again and again, but knowing what I do professionally, that no means that I could take would prevent the development of the disease, poisoning the animal to be susceptible, I have not thought it worth while to go into any experiments in that direction.

3353. Treating it as a helpless attempt?—You cannot purge the morbid matter out of the system.

3354. With regard to the constitution of the Veterinary Department, previously to this year or down to the early part of last year, records were kept of the number of animals attacked with foot and mouth disease, I think?—I believe so.

3355. Had you left the office then yourself, or were you still connected with the Veterinary Department at the commencement of last year?—I think I had not left the department when these returns ceased to be sent.

3356. I suppose that recording these attacks of foot and mouth disease must have caused a great deal of work in the office amongst the writers and clerks?—It caused, doubtless, a very great deal of work, but this is a matter that I know very little about; I had nothing to do with the Statistical Department. I used to have a return regularly sent to me by Dr. Williams's order, of the number of attacks and of the general progress of the disease.

3357. Would you not imagine that when the department ceased to register a disease which was so prevalent as this was and still is in England, the number of the officials might be diminished, and the cost of the department lessened?—I do not think that the number of officials could have been diminished at that particular time; at that time there was a very great deal of work to be done in the office, and I know that the work did not arise entirely or exclusively from the extent of foot and mouth disease.

3358. But still the work of the office must depend upon it to a certain extent?—The work of the office, I suppose, must have been diminished, but whether that diminution was sufficient to lessen the staff, I do not know.

3359. You would naturally expect, would you not, that when that ceased to be done in the office, the expenses of the department would have dropped?—I should have supposed so; my impression, however, is that there have never been more hands than have been absolutely necessary to do the work which the office has been called upon to do.

3360. They had no more hands than were required

Professor
J. B.
Suttons.
—
3 April
1873.

required to do the work last year, and now they have enough to carry the business on?—The men work over time very frequently I think, in order to bring out returns in time for publication.

3561. Mr. Keenan.] I think you stated in your examination, that you first came across the foot and mouth disease in the month of September 1839, in the village of Laleham?—Yes; myself individually.

3562. And that the disease was brought to the village of Laleham by some suckling calves?—That was so.

3563. And those suckling calves, I think you stated, were purchased in the Metropolitan Market?—In Smithfield Market.

3564. Do you know how the disease got into the Metropolitan Market in 1839?—I do not know how the disease got into Smithfield Market in the year 1839, but on every market-day there was a large number of animals affected with the disease in the market during the latter part of 1839 and throughout 1840.

3565. You have never traced where that outbreak arose?—The first evidence which we had of the existence of the disease in London was in the neighbourhood of Stratford and Bow, then it spread to Islington, and subsequently it extended its radius, and also entered the London district; the disease was early diffused throughout the whole of the metropolis.

3566. When once it got into the London dairies it became a very difficult matter to deal with it, did it not?—Very difficult indeed.

3567. Do you think that that outbreak of the disease in 1839 was produced by the importation of merchandise?—It is possible that it might have been; I have no evidence as to how the disease was introduced; all investigation has failed to throw any light upon the manner in which the disease was introduced here.

3568. You can trace it to nothing?—I can trace it to nothing; in fact, it was supposed that the disease came through the atmosphere, and was thought to be an epidemic, and was known at that time by the name of "the epidemic." The Royal Agricultural Society sent out a circular to inquire into its cause and progress, in which it was designated "the epidemic."

3569. Do you believe the disease to be in the nature of an epidemic?—Only so far as it affects a number of animals at the same time; but if I look upon it exclusively as an epidemic or epidemic, deriving its force from atmospheric influences, I do not believe that it is an affliction of that kind.

3570. Do you believe that it can be conveyed by any other means than contact with an infected article, because, you say that merchandise can convey it as well as cattle?—The germs of the disease must be brought in contact with an animal in order for that animal to be affected; but how those germs may be carried I cannot say; they may be carried by individuals visiting animals, and handling them, or they may be carried by substances which have become imbued with the infecting material.

3571. Do you think it might be carried by a strong wind?—I should rather think that a wind which was not very strong would diffuse it better than one which was, because, we generally find that these poisons are speedily burnt up in an atmosphere through the medium of the oxygen. If a number of animals were congregated together, and were giving off, as they would
0.58.

do, a large amount of moribund matter, that matter would be wafted by the air, and spread among adjacent animals as is often the case. This shows the desirability in fatal contagious affections of killing the animals that are in dangerous proximity.

3572. Would you suggest any limit to the distance?—I could not put any limit whatever. I explained that a limit of 500 paces might be considered for practical purposes to be safe.

3573. Then you would say that 10 miles was perfectly safe; the wind could not carry the infection 10 miles?—No, certainly not; I believe the whole of the infecting material would be burnt up by the oxygen of the air before it had travelled 10 miles.

3574. You are of opinion that foot and mouth disease is one of the most infectious diseases that we have?—I believe it to be equally infectious with cattle plague, if not more so.

3575. You have said that you believe the disease to be capable of being conveyed by an article of merchandise, and I think Professor Brown said, that he believed it possible to infect a bullock 200 miles away with a load of hay, or that the infection might be carried by the hides and hoofs?—If I intentionally took a quantity of this matter any given distance and used it, I could infect other animals, that is to say, if those animals were at the time susceptible of being acted upon by the moribund matter.

3576. You stated in one of your answers that restrictions on movement had no effect whatever on foot and mouth disease?—I think that answer was in general terms; namely, that we have seen that all the restrictions which have been imposed by the ordinary operations of the present Act, and by Orders of Council have been ineffective for good, and that the disease has been just as wide as it was in 1840, when there were no such restrictions.

3577. You stated that you believed that if the country were cleared of the disease, it would be very soon re-introduced?—I think it is unlikely that the disease would be re-introduced under proper regulations; but we must incur a little risk in regard to all these diseases; we cannot guard entirely and effectually against them.

3578. In your opinion, it would be impossible to guard effectually against the introduction of disease?—I think so.

3579. You gave it to the Committee as your opinion, that the farmers in England would not stand any very severe restrictions being put upon the foot and mouth disease?—At the present time farmers seem to be more alive to the necessity of doing something towards keeping the disease in check; but, as I before remarked, I remember the time very well when the farmers would rather have the disease amongst their store cattle than not.

3580. Without the co-operation of the farmers, the Government would be powerless to carry out any effectual system of keeping the disease in check, would it not?—Decidedly so.

3581. You state that, notwithstanding the highly infectious nature of the disease, you would take off the restrictions in this country?—I would, because the restrictions seem to me to have done little or no good, and in order to keep the disease effectually in check we should require to make the restrictions very much stronger, and apply absolutely the same restrictions which are in operation with regard to cattle plague.

Professor
J. B.
Simonds.
3 April
1879.

3582. In answer to the honourable Member for Forfarshire, you said that you thought the risk was very slight indeed, in allowing cattle to be driven across a highway?—Yes, from one part of a farm to another; there is a risk unquestionably, but I do not think it is very considerable.

3583. In another part of your evidence you stated, that you believed that the Irish animals might become infected on board the ships?—Yes; that is if they have been in contact with diseased animals, or have received infection in any manner before leaving Ireland.

3584. The animals might leave Ireland sound, and become infected on board the ships?—They might apparently leave Ireland sound, but they would not become infected with the disease unless they had received the virus into their organisations.

3585. Might not the animals receive the virus on board ship?—If the ship were not properly cleaned and disinfected they might.

3586. Professor Brown mentioned instances of cattle leaving Ireland sound, and being found infected in Norwich?—Yes, that is a very common thing indeed.

3587. With these facts being admitted, do you consider it a very fair restriction to impose upon the import of Irish cattle, that all infected animals should be sent back?—All found infected being sent back would, I think, be the best means of protecting us against these very virulent outbreaks which we have experienced.

3588. Is it not possible that the effect of that check would be to stop the import of animals from Ireland altogether?—No, I do not think it would have a very injurious effect upon the trade.

3589. Would you be surprised to hear from witnesses, who could give good information, that it would have that effect?—I should not be surprised to hear that.

3590. If it would have that effect, do you think that it would be at all a serious consideration as regards the public?—I think we require so many Irish animals in this country as we can receive with safety, and the more we have the better. We require the animals, but we do not require the disease, which they are likely to bring with them.

3591. Do you think that if the effect were as I say, the entire stoppage of the Irish trade, that is a consideration of any importance?—No doubt it is a consideration of the most serious importance.

3592. You have admitted to many honourable Members that you believed the cattle supply in Europe was very much exhausted?—I have reason to believe that that is the case.

3593. France, Germany, and Belgium are not producing more than they themselves require, are they?—Belgium never has been an exporting country to any extent; she has been a transmitting country. France receives animals both from Italy and Germany, to feed her people; chiefly from Italy; she imports large quantities of animals.

3594. And with regard to Spain, you have already stated the circumstances in connection with that country?—Yes.

3595. It naturally follows, that with that exhaustion all over the Continent, Russia is the only place from which England can expect a meat supply?—I have great confidence in Ireland;

I think Ireland ought to do far more for us than she does.

3596. I was not asking about Ireland?—If it were left to me, I would not have a single Russian animal brought into this country, but if I could increase the supply tenfold from Ireland I would do it.

3597. You stated that there was considerable danger in allowing the import of Russian animals?—There is considerable danger in allowing animals to come directly from any part of Russia under any circumstances.

3598. In one of your answers, you stated that if the same restrictions were practised in Ireland as are practised in England, Irish cattle might be treated as English cattle?—Yes, if care were taken in Ireland to keep the disease in check, and animals which had been exposed to the disease out of the hands of dealers I think we might then deal with Irish cattle as we do with English cattle. There would be no absolute security against our receiving the disease from Ireland in the measures which I have suggested; it might so happen that a number of animals might be found to be free from disease upon inspection after being detained six hours or so, which might not absolutely be free.

3599. Can you tell the Committee anything about the system at present in force in Ireland?—I have never been in Ireland; I know very little about it, except from information I have received from others who have been there.

3600. You heard Professor Brown's evidence, I believe; he stated that he approved of the Irish system, and that it only wanted more efficiency, and in another answer he stated that the most efficient protection which could be given to this country would be that the Veterinary Department in Ireland should have a sufficient staff to work it?—Yes.

3601. Are you of opinion that it is so?—If Professor Brown, who has been there and knows the whole system, says that measures of that kind would give greater security, I should agree with his opinion.

3602. In another of your answers you said that Irish vessels were not disinfected properly?—I think I observed that it was not from my own personal examination of the vessels; that I had never been to any of the ports, Liverpool or Bristol, for such a purpose; I gave that free evidence which I had received from Professor Brown, not from my own investigation.

3603. You stated in another part of your evidence that you would recommend stock coming from Ireland to be detained six or eight hours, for the purpose, I think, of ascertaining whether they were diseased?—Yes; and not only for that purpose, but for the purpose of resting the animals and refreshing them after their voyage. The plan now is to hurry them off directly from Liverpool into the trucks, and they are sent on to the county of Norfolk and elsewhere, as you instance just now, where they may be found to be in a state of disease upon their arrival; I would have that detention for the purpose of inspecting and feeding and watering them.

3604. And not only for a protective purpose?—For sanitary and for humane purposes also.

3605. You stated that in cases of plume-pneumonia you would detain animals longer than in the case of foot and mouth disease?—I should deal with Irish stock all in the same way, and consequently

Professor
J. B.
Sims.
—
3 April
1878.

consequently with the diseases to which those animals are liable; pleuro-pneumonia doubtless exists in Ireland as it exists in England, but a more detention of six hours upon this side would be of very little avail in detecting the existence of pleuro-pneumonia, unless the animal was absolutely suffering in a visible form from it.

3606. Do not you think that pleuro-pneumonia is a disease with which we should deal much more severely than with foot and mouth disease?—As a general rule certainly, but I do not think that an Irish dealer would send an animal over here which he thought was suffering from pleuro-pneumonia; among animals which we receive from abroad, we very seldom get any that are the subjects of pleuro-pneumonia; they are not likely to be sent from the other side when they are visibly affected, and if we put those animals in quarantine, and dealt with Irish and foreign stock in the same manner, we should have to detain them for something like 10 or 12 weeks, to be certain of their freedom or otherwise from pleuro-pneumonia.

3607. Do not you think it would be a very wise rule to slaughter all animals at once affected with pleuro-pneumonia?—I do; as I have already stated I think it is a very good way of dealing with pleuro-pneumonia.

3608. Pleuro-pneumonia might be got rid of in that way?—I think it might be got rid of in that way out of the country.

3609. But foot and mouth disease never could?—I think not.

3610. I want to ask you a question with regard to an opinion which Professor Brown expressed; he stated that he did not consider that starvation, hardship, crowding, and bad ventilation would produce disease. Is it not a medical fact with human beings that an empty stomach makes a man more liable to infection, and that a state of plethora is unfavourable to absorption, whilst the opposite, of course, facilitates it, and that therefore an animal with a full stomach would, of course, be less likely to absorb disease than a fasting animal would; and might it not be that animals with empty stomachs brought into contact with slight germs of disease might become infected, whereas if they were in a state of plethora they would escape?—There are various causes which would render animals susceptible of being acted upon by the virus of any particular affection, but in general terms it matters not whether an animal is being fasted or being fed, if it is brought in contact with such matter as cattle plague matter, or the matter of foot and mouth disease, or sheep-pox, it will become diseased; fat sheep will take small-pox just as readily as lean sheep, and fat cattle will take cattle plague just as readily as lean cattle.

3611. I did not mean fat animals as against lean, but an empty stomach against a full one?—As to the mere repletion of an animal's body with food, it is just possible in a very extreme case to imagine that the vital forces being a little stronger might for the time being ward off disease, but there is no practical value in statements of that kind.

3612. Does not food fill the blood vessels?—The blood vessels are never empty; it is the loss of solid matter from the blood which leads to the sensation of hunger, and of fluid to the sensation of thirst.

3613. But a state of fullness in that way would make absorption or infection more sluggish, would it not?—

It not?—No, I do not think so; I do not believe if I went without my breakfast and dinner one day, and was exposed to small-pox infection, that I should be more susceptible of taking the disease than if I had had my breakfast, and lunch, and dinner.

3614. You do not agree with medical men who state that they consider it a matter of great importance always to have a meal before they go to any place of infection?—No; I have known medical men state that if people carried about a bit of camphor in a bag, and smelt it, it would keep off disease; I have as much confidence in the one as I have in the other.

3615. In one of your answers you referred to the import of cattle from Aberdeen?—The transit of cattle from Aberdeen to London by railway I referred to; not otherwise, I think.

3616. That was with reference to live cattle?—Yes.

3617. Is it possible that any infection could come from Scotland?—If disease existed in Scotland, it could just as easily be conveyed from Scotland to England as it could be from one parish to another in England.

3618. You would not propose to treat the Scotch cattle as you would treat the Irish?—No, I do not think we could consistently do so, because Scotland is a part of England; the countries are continuous with each other.

3619. But Ireland is a part of England too, is it not?—Ireland is a part of England, but it is unfortunately separated from us by a strip of water.

3620. If we were to institute in Ireland a thorough plan of local inspection, so that no disease could exist without its being known, and then strictly to prevent any animal being moved, that in your opinion would protect this country from infection from Ireland?—Yes; and I think that if we were to put such a regulation as I have suggested into operation to-morrow, it would be the best means of enforcing a strict surveillance of cattle in Ireland.

3621. Do not you think that strict surveillance of cattle in Ireland would be much better than the plan you recommend?—Until that is effected, I would keep the other system, and after it was effected it would have no operation, because animals would then arrive here in a healthy state.

3622. Do you not think that the plan I suggested would be better than your plan?—I do not think so.

3623. Under your proposition, the cattle if they come here in an unhealthy state are sent back?—Yes.

3624. So that they would have to make two journeys, and would have the chance of infecting cattle upon their return to Ireland?—Yes.

3625. Do you think that there would be no harm in that?—I would leave the Irish authorities to deal with that as they saw fit.

3626. Mr. Maxwell.] Do I correctly gather from your evidence, that if the same precautions were taken in Ireland as are taken in England against the spread of disease, you would be prepared to treat Ireland just the same as the rest of the United Kingdom?—I would, if there was no disease in Ireland.

3627. But if there was no more probability of the Irish cattle bringing the disease than Northumbrian or Scotch cattle, you would treat them in the same way?—I would treat them in the same way.

3628. You

Professor
J. B.
Simonds
—
3 April
1873

3628. You are not aware, as you have very fairly stated, of what system is pursued in Ireland?—I am not aware of that.

3629. Then, passing from the question of Ireland, do I correctly gather your opinion to be, that you would rather do away with the existing restrictions with regard to foot and mouth disease, and that you would make the restrictions more stringent with regard to pleuro-pneumonia?—Yes, that is my opinion.

3630. Would you consider it to be sufficient, with regard to dealing with pleuro-pneumonia, to have compulsory slaughter of the animal diseased, or would you require also the compulsory slaughter of any animal that was brought into contact with a diseased animal?—I should only require compulsory slaughter of the animal diseased, for the simple fact, which I stated before, that the disease progresses so remarkably slow among a herd of cattle; it is incubated for a considerable time, so that if we isolate animals and set them off from the centre of mischief, we are, generally speaking, enabled to arrest the progress of the disease.

3631. Will you take that into your hand (*holding a paper to the Witness*); that is a report from Holland of the result of the state of disease of pleuro-pneumonia under three different systems. The first table contains the number of animals diseased in the first three months of the year, in which there was neither compulsory slaughter in the case of animals diseased, nor the compulsory slaughter of animals brought into contact; and the second table is under a system of compulsory slaughter of animals diseased, and the third table is the result of compulsory slaughter not only of the animals diseased, but also of the animals brought into contact with them. Would you be so good as to read out that return?—In the first period in the year 1871, when there was no slaughter, the number reported is 1,689; in the second month, 969; and in the third month, 757.

3632. That was when there was no compulsory slaughter?—Yes. When there was compulsory slaughter, namely, in 1872, in the first month there were 429, in the second 587, and in the third 545. When the animals that had been in contact were also slaughtered, namely, in 1873, the numbers were 284 in the first month, 274 in the second month, and 220 in the third month.

3633. Would those results accord with your *a priori* views upon the subject?—I think the evidence is not sufficient to form any correct opinion upon. In the first place, three months is a very small space of time, for we know that very frequently pleuro-pneumonia varies considerably in this country, and I think we might find variations almost as great as those.

3634. Still it is the fact, is it not, as far as one can judge from the figures extending over such a small period, that compulsory slaughter of the diseased animals has produced a marked result, and that a still more marked result was produced by the slaughter of the animals in contact?—Yes, so far as it goes; but I do not think the data are sufficient to form a correct opinion upon.

3635. Do you know of any other place besides Holland in which the experiment has been tried?—I am not aware of any.

3636. What is the treatment of pleuro-pneumonia in Switzerland?—I have not heard directly, but I think I heard that they are dealing with

foot and mouth disease there in almost the same manner as Holland has been dealing with pleuro-pneumonia.

3637. Does foot and mouth disease prevail largely in Scotland?—Yes, at times.

3638. Could you gather information as to what the result has been of the use of stringent measures?—I think that information could be obtained if it were applied for.

3639. But you would recommend in this country that we should adopt a system of compulsory slaughter of the animals brought in contact with diseased animals suffering from pleuro-pneumonia?—Not the slaughter of animals brought in contact with animals suffering from pleuro-pneumonia; I think we could greatly increase the food supply of the country by not doing so; I would depend upon isolation and strict examination.

3640. Mr. (Clerk.) I understood you to say on the last occasion that you entertained no doubt that the last outbreak of cattle disease in the East Riding was imported by the "Joseph Seames"?—I think there cannot be a doubt of it.

3641. Those boats were never landed?—They were never landed.

3642. And you quite agree with Professor Brown that the disease was not communicated by the carcasses that were washed on shore?—Quite so.

3643. May I ask you to explain to me, because I have not been as yet able to understand it, in what way you connect that outbreak of cattle plague with this case?—Professor Brown obtained all the particulars of that outbreak, and he estimated that the animals were purchased in the Hull market, which were first affected with cattle plague in the neighbourhood.

3644. But how were those animals connected with the "Joseph Seames"?—Only as far as this, that persons going on board the "Joseph Seames" went into the cattle market and came in contact with the animals which were in the market.

3645. If it was introduced in any way, that could be the only way, I think?—That appears to be the only way, in which it could have been carried, or was carried.

3646. You think it was carried by some person either not disinfected, or not sufficiently disinfected?—Quite so. I do not know whether there was any disinfection of the persons who went on board the "Joseph Seames."

3647. On the last occasion you were here, you made some suggestion with regard to the improvement of the arrangements generally in Hull, with reference to an alteration of the defined area, and so forth; was that suggestion the same, or very nearly the same, as that made by your department a considerable time ago, and with reference to which there were deputations to the heads of your department, and which amounted, practically, to an entirely new area?—My suggestion was one which originated entirely with myself, from what I had observed in going down to Hull at different times. My suggestion was that the Albert Dock should be the place for cattle coming from scheduled countries, and that the present cattle market and the Humber Docks should be used for cattle coming from unscheduled countries.

3648. That would only involve an alteration, not an entire change, but an addition to the existing area?—The existing area would be done away with entirely, under my scheme; I would erect proper places upon the Albert Dock for cattle

cattle coming from scheduled countries where they would be dealt with and slaughtered according to the provisions of the Act; and I would open the Humber Dock altogether, and do away with the present defined area.

3648. I suppose it has been no part of your duty to go into that plan as a question of expense?—Not at all.

3649. You are satisfied that, whatever it might cost, that would be the most satisfactory arrangement which could be made at present?—It seems to be so to me.

3651. Have you ever spoken upon the subject to any of the local authorities?—No; I do not know that I have beyond the inspector of cattle at Hull. I remember, upon one occasion, when I was at Hull, upon the Albert Dock, looking at some animals which were then landed, and which were detained 12 hours for his inspection, that I made that suggestion, with which he seemed to accord, and to have thought a good thing to do.

3652. Were you with Professor Brown, at the first news he got of the outbreak on board the "Joseph Soumes"?—We went down to the docks together from the hotel. I arrived at Hull a few hours before Professor Brown, having gone down, at the request of the Vice-President of the Council, to see what could be done, and to assist in the matter.

3653. Did you make any application to the local authority, or give them any information of the cause which had brought you to Hull?—Immediately upon my arrival at Hull, which was rather late, I think it was about 11 at night, I took a cab at once at the station, and drove to the house of our inspector, and ascertained from him where the cattle were, and where the vessel was lying, and so on.

3654. *Chairman.* Whom do you mean by your inspector?—The port inspector; the acting inspector for the Veterinary Department; and I inquired of him whether Freeman, who was inspector for the local authority, knew of it, and he told me that Freeman knew of the animals being in Hull on board the "Joseph Soumes." Professor Brown arrived a few hours afterwards, and on the following morning we went down to the dock, and met the inspector for the local authority.

3655. Mr. Cley.] Professor Brown stated that he did not consider that it was part of his duty to communicate with the local authority?—I do not remember his stating that; I think he stated that we were engaged during that day in contending with certain difficulties which existed in the matter; and I remember well that on the following morning, just as we had finished breakfast, or just at breakfast time; I almost forget whether we had commenced breakfast or not, Professor Brown saw the clerk to the local authority passing the window, and he went out and spoke to him on the subject.

3656. That was on the Saturday, I think?—Yes.

3657. You had arrived upon the Wednesday?—Upon the Thursday night; there was one day interval.

3658. Do you take the same view as Professor Brown, that it is not part of your duty under unusual circumstances, such as these were, to communicate with the local authority?—I think Professor Brown has made it a custom to communicate with the local authority, and, answering for myself, I can say that I have invariably, so far as I know, put myself in communication with the local authority; we saw the inspector of the local authority, and ascertained the facts from Mr. Atkinson, a member of the corporation, to whom the ship belonged. In fact, the thing was notorious to everyone of the "Joseph Soumes" having arrived in Hull with these cattle on board. I do not think the department, as a rule, through its officers, has ever had much difficulty with the local authority; we have been sometimes, perhaps, obliged to act a little firmly, where we have had reason to believe that the local authority has been a little remiss; I recollect that in the case of the introduction of disease into Harlepool I found it necessary to have all the animals buried, and got rid of as quickly as possible, and on my arrival I at once sent for the representative of the local authority, and finding he was not at home, I sent for the resident magistrate, and communicated to him what I thought was necessary, he declined to act without first communicating with his colleagues, so that I was obliged to take it upon myself to order that the animals should be properly disposed of to prevent the spread of infection.

3659. Mr. Cley Read.] Did you hear that there was a proposition made to quarantine Russian cattle upon the other side of the water, at Cronstadt, and do you apprehend that if such quarantine was properly and rigorously carried out, you might then have Russian cattle imported?—I should very much question whether proper quarantine could be carried out in Cronstadt; we have had Russian cattle sent here which have been fed out of the country, and if Prussia is content to undertake the risk of importing cattle from Russia, and feeding them for us, I should be content to take them, but not cattle from Russia direct.

3660. Under no circumstances would you approve of the importation of live cattle direct from Russia?—No, certainly not.

3661. Have you ever suggested that Thames Haven should be used as a place of quarantine for this country?—Certainly not; I have been constantly opposed to any system of quarantines in this country; I do not like, as I said just now, creating large pesthouses.

3662. Then, with regard to the dealers in Ireland going into an infected herd and buying infected cattle and sending them to England, do you think that they would do that, knowing that disease must break out in a day or two?—I think, not only Irish dealers, but English dealers, would do that if they could get 5s. out of it.

3663. But if they knew that the cattle must of necessity fall down from the disease before they got as far as Norfolk, do you think that they would venture to do it?—It is very difficult to fix an Irish dealer, whether he sends to Norfolk or anywhere else; he is a sort of bird of passage.

3664. How long is the incubation of the disease?—Taking it upon an average it would be about three days.

3665. Would not three days have to elapse before the dealer could remove those cattle from a market in the centre of Ireland, and put them in a market in the centre of England?—Yes; and more than three days; but they are not exposed always to infection in the centre of Ireland; they come from different places.

3666. *Chairman.* The Honourable Member's question goes to this, that if a dealer knew the animals to be infected before he parted with them

Professor
J. B.
Sims.

3 April
1875

Professor
J. B.
Semmels.

3 April
1873.

he would be aware that he would be unable to sell them; that is upon the supposition that he remains in possession of the animals till they get to Norfolk?—Yes. I was going to add, that when a dealer has bought animals out of diseased herds he frequently sells them immediately, and they change hands again and again.

3667. Mr. *Clare Read*.] If you have one animal diseased in a herd, would not the probability be that in 12 hours you would have another?—Not from contagion with that animal, but from the source of mischief from which the first animal became affected.

3668. Is it not often the case that you have one animal simply affected in a herd, but that the majority of them would be exposed to the same contagion which had infected that one?—All animals would be exposed to some contagion by the introduction of one single diseased animal; all of them would not be equally susceptible of taking the disease, and the period of incubation would not be the same in each individual case, and hence you have variations with regard to the outbreak in the whole of a herd.

3669. Take 20 bullocks, for instance; how many do you suppose would ultimately escape the disease?—Not one.

3670. How long do you think it would be before it ran through the herd, from the first development of the disease?—Probably the whole of them would become affected in a week.

3671-2. If that was the case, surely this man, if he knew that he would be punished for removing these cattle with foot and mouth disease upon them, would run the risk of losing a great deal and gaining very little?—He would probably sell them again.

3673. *Chairman*.] Is it not the custom of the trade for a dealer to sell the cattle upon their

arrival at an English port?—A very large number are so disposed of.

3674. Mr. *Clare Read*.] But you do not find that to be the case at Liverpool, although they do it at Bristol?—It is done sometimes.

3675. As a rule, would it be a profitable thing for a man to go and buy animals out of a diseased herd?—If it be true that farmers, as a rule, do not care about the disease, dealers would not mind buying a few animals out of a diseased herd in the market or elsewhere.

3676. Were you consulted about the passing of that Act in 1869?—I was in part consulted; that is to say, when it was drawn out, and properly prepared to be placed before the Lords of the Council, I saw the clauses and provisions in the Bill.

3677. Did you suggest that foot and mouth disease should be excluded from the Act?—I do not know that I suggested that foot and mouth disease should be excluded from the Act, but I said that I had very little confidence in any regulations for the suppression of foot and mouth disease.

3678. You were of opinion that the regulations which were in the Act would be of very little use in suppressing the disease?—I feared that a would be so.

3679. And your fears have been realised?—It appears so.

3680. Mr. *Kerranagh*.] Can you particularise any single instance of a dealer, to your knowledge, having bought cattle from an infected herd in Ireland?—I have never been in Ireland, as I have before explained to the Committee.

3681. Therefore the charge which you bring against Irish dealers is only from hearsay or supposition?—I am knowing what is the ordinary custom of the men who are concerned in carrying on the trade.

MR. CHARLES EARDLEY-WILMOT, called in; and Examined.

Mr. C. E.
Wilmot.

3682. *Chairman*.] You are Chief Clerk to the Veterinary Department, I believe?—I am.

3683. You were appointed in December 1866, were you not?—In December 1866.

3684. Before that time you had been engaged in official positions, had you not?—I have held appointments, civil or military, the greater part of my life. I commenced as Private Secretary to the Governor of Tasmania, before I was 20; I then served in the Army, and was on the staff on active service; and I have since held numerous appointments in the Colonies for many years.

3685. What was your salary when you were first appointed?—£.400 a year, and in the following June the Lords of the Council recommended, and the Treasury sanctioned, an increase to £600 a year, such increase to date from the period of first appointment.

3686. That was during the outbreak of cattle plague?—It was.

3687. Then there was a time in which the salary of the chief clerk was much lower?—There was a reduction in 1866-70, and the office of chief clerk was struck out of the Estimates.

3688. That was when the cattle plague had ceased, and before the present Act was passed?—It was.

3689. And when it was very doubtful whether, in fact, there would be a Veterinary Department or not?—I had no doubt of it, and I accepted a

very inferior position, feeling sure that the office which I was deprived of would be restored to me, otherwise I would not have accepted the lower appointment.

3690. You believed that there would still continue to be a Veterinary Department?—Yes.

3691. Upon the present duties being imposed upon the department by Act of Parliament the department was reconstituted, and your salary was placed at what sum?—At 600 l.; I did not receive a rise, but a restitution; I was, from April down to the end of the year 1869, at a salary of 5 l. a week, and at the end of that year I was restored to my position, and the difference between 5 l. a week and 600 l. a year was given back to me.

3692. Will you inform the Committee what are the duties of chief clerk?—Under the secretary, he has entire charge of all the interior economy and work of the office.

3693. I suppose that means that, while the secretary, when he is able to be at the office, is chiefly occupied with matters of policy, and in giving advice to the Lord President and Vice President, it is your business, as chief clerk, to superintend the details of the work, and to superintend the work of the other clerks?—It is.

3694. You have, I suppose, the correspondence all before you?—All the correspondence comes before me; every letter that arrives at the office

is brought to me in the first place, and read by me, and the hour of its arrival is minuted by me, and then it is sent out to be registered with a private mark of mine if it appears to be of importance, in order that it may be registered immediately.

3693. As it is your business to open the letters, you can give the Committee some idea of what is the nature of the correspondence which the office has to carry on?—I can.

3696. In the first place there is a good deal of correspondence, is there not, between the office and the local authorities as to their legal power to carry out the Act?—There is a large amount of correspondence upon that point.

3697. Then there is a very important branch of correspondence with the Foreign Office to obtain information with reference to the existence of disease abroad?—There is.

3698. These letters are generally sent from the Foreign Office to the Privy Council, but with the understanding that they are sent to your office for a draft reply?—They are, and they are generally sent straight to the Veterinary Department.

3699. And you generally draft the replies?—I do; they are submitted to the Lord President, the Vice-President, or the Committee of Council, and signed by the Clerk of the Council.

3700. They are letters which require, not only a knowledge of the state of the disease, but require some acquaintance with the manner in which diplomatic correspondence should be carried on?—They are; there is also a large amount of correspondence with regard to giving the local authorities powers under the provisions of the present Act which involve a question of taxation. These letters are also signed by the Clerk of the Council, and drafted in our office.

3701. I suppose that, with regard to an Act with all these provisions, letters requiring information frequently come up from the country?—Every post brings inquiries from one local authority or another. We have letters from local authorities requiring explanations of the articles of the Orders and sections of the Act; we have letters from the inspectors of local authorities, who constantly communicate direct with us; we have letters forwarding memorials to be presented to the Privy Council; we have letters from all classes of persons who can suggest anything which they think will improve the condition of animals in the country, either as regards cure or further legislation.

3702. With regard to the Orders, have you anything to do with the preparation of the Orders in Council?—As a rule, I receive instructions from the secretary when he is at the office. With regard to any Orders in Council, which are directed by the Lords of the Council to be drawn, they are, as a rule, drafted by the clerk next under me, with my assistance and advice; and if they are of importance, they are handed over to our legal adviser for revision, but they are frequently passed without such revision.

3703. You consider yourself responsible, as regards general business, for the duties and conduct of every clerk?—Yes.

3704. And you are also responsible for all the returns that are made?—I consider myself responsible for the whole of the work of the office, but, in subordination to the Secretary when he is present.

3705. A question was asked by the Honourable Member for Leicestershire, with regard to some of the returns of foot and mouth disease being
O.58.

discontinued last year. Can you give the Committee any information upon that point?—They were discontinued at the end of 1871.

3706. Was that discontinuance of returns followed by a diminution in the staff of clerks?—Before that discontinuance we had been overworked and underhanded. The clerks were kept for some time to work up the backwork, and then sent away. We dispensed, I think, with five clerks.

3707. The result of that discontinuance was to get rid of overwork, and also five clerks?—Yes; but the returns for foot and mouth disease were not so complicated as those for other diseases, and that discontinuance did not make such a very great diminution of the work of the office.

3708. You have informed the Committee of your general work. There is a great deal of extra work, I suppose, as there must always be in a department of this kind?—Yes.

3709. The office was instructed to prepare an explanation of the Act soon after it was passed, was it not?—It was.

3710. This "Handbook," in fact?—Yes.

3711. I think that fell upon you, did it not?—The secretary prepared the skeleton of it; but the compilation of it fell upon me, assisted by the senior first class clerk.

3712. Then we had to issue several fresh Orders, did we not?—Yes.

3713. And it was thought again necessary to issue a description of those Orders?—We issued a second edition of the "Handbook," which I think contained the amendments in the law; then, after the passing of the Orders of 1871 we had to publish a new series of the "Handbook."

3714. The explanation of the Act, I believe, you found to be rather a tough business?—Very much so, indeed; but no local authority or other person hitherto, to my knowledge, discovered a mistake in the "Handbook."

3715. This "Handbook" was sent round to everybody, was it not?—To every local authority and every inspector; about 4,000 copies of the last "Handbook" were sent out during last year.

3716. Then, again, there were instructions issued for the veterinary inspectors?—I drew the regulations for that.

3717. Then in addition to this regular duty of superintending the details of administration, whenever the secretary is absent from illness or from being sent off on official work, as he was at Vienna, or taking, so far as he has been able to do, the customary holiday, you are responsible for advising the Lord President and myself as to matters of policy?—I am.

3718. I think the last communication with the railway companies, with regard to the provision of water, was made when Dr. Williams was at Vienna?—It was when he was absent from the office on service; I am not sure of the cause of his absence, but the correspondence fell upon me; that correspondence is not contained in the account of registered letters handed in by the Secretary, and consisted of upwards of 100 letters.

3719. You found that the railway companies were very ready to co-operate with you, not only in giving provisions for the water, but also in giving information as to how it could be supplied?—Quite so; it was a semi-official communication which I addressed to them, and I found them very ready to meet the wishes which you desired me to express.

3720. Will you just tell me, with regard to any paper of average importance, what is its mode of
T 2 treatment,

Mr. C. E. Willett.
—
3 April
1873.

Mr. C. E.
Wheat.
3 April
1873.

treatment, from the time of its arrival in the office till it is disposed of?—The process with a paper of average importance is as follows: on its arrival I open and read it, and mark it off at its exact period of arrival, and send it to the registration room, where a clerk fastens it in a covering paper, endorses upon the covering paper the subjects to which it alludes, and writes a précis of the contents of it; then it is handed over to another clerk, who enters it in the registration book and gives it the official stamp and number; and it is then handed to a clerk, who goes over it again, and sees what former papers it has reference to, and draws these former papers and fastens them to it, in order that the whole history of the subject may be seen at once, and he then returns the paper to me to deal with as requisite.

3721. Can you give the Committee any notion of the number of such papers?—I think the Secretary handed in a return of letters received which was compiled in the office; I do not remember the number, over 5,000 per annum, I think.

3722. The clerks being under your superintendence, will you state to the Committee what is the discipline of the office?—Every clerk is under my supervision, and I carry out a very strict discipline in regard to every one of them.

3723. What are the hours of work?—The recognised hours for which they were engaged are from eleven to five.

3724. That is six hours?—Yes.

3725. That is, I believe, the general length and the regular hours in every Government Office?—Those which I am conversant with; they are the regular hours in the War Office, the Privy Council, the Board of Trade, the Admiralty, and I believe others.

3726. Have you had much experience of overtime?—The fact of all the clerks being able to leave at the end of the six hours has been the exception during my experience, which is now of some seven years.

3727. Occasionally you have had a great spurt of work?—Occasionally we have had a great spurt of work in consequence of course of our being overworked and under-handed. It has been very rarely the case that all the clerks have been able to leave the office at five o'clock. I have known cases in which they have been constantly at the office till twelve, and the messengers have been detained for many hours over their official engagement without any compensation whatever.

3728. Has there been no pay for overtime?—There have been instances in which overtime has been paid for, but there have been many instances in which no money has been received for it.

3729. There have been some payments for overtime in the department?—Yes.

3730. When was the last payment made for overtime?—After the last outbreak of cattle plague in the East Riding, all the clerks who had any large amount of overtime were paid at so much an hour by the Treasury for it.

3731. I was obliged, then, to inform the office that I could pay no attention to the regular six hours?—I believe you did; that has been very frequently the case.

3732. I suppose that six hours has not been your maximum work generally?—For many months during the time I was reduced from my position as chief clerk, I was at work from half-past 9 o'clock in the morning to 9 o'clock at

night, and then taking work home and doing it there; I have been at work on one occasion from 9 o'clock in the morning till 5 o'clock in the afternoon of the next day without any intermission, except to take refreshment.

3733. As you are acquainted with the clerks, and as it is your business to be responsible for them, I may ask have you reason to be satisfied with their conduct?—I consider it only an act of justice to be allowed to speak in the very highest terms generally of every clerk in the office, and particularly of those who are most near to myself in position and responsibility. There are three first class clerks only, Mr. Tennant, Mr. Bucknall and Mr. Russell; I cannot speak too strongly of the efficiency, and zeal, and loyalty of Mr. Tennant who has worked night and day for months at a time without any compensation whatever. The second clerk, Mr. Bucknall, was selected out of about 150; he was appointed by the late Vice-President, Lord Robert Montagu, and he has worked in the same manner with an enormous amount of overtime. Mr. Russell was appointed specially to take charge of the branch relating to the transit of animals, he having had much experience of ship and rail, and he is most efficient officer. There is another officer whom I should like to mention, namely, Mr. Orford, who has been there since 1866, and who has been for years past the confidential clerk of the secretary, private secretary. I might say, early that, in the Civil Service, infers an extra salary which Mr. Orford does not receive; he has filled a very confidential post, and has worked night and day, sometimes Sundays included, for years.

3734. What is his salary?—His salary rises to 230*l*. I think he has arrived at his maximum.

3735. The Honourable Member for Norfolk wished to have some information with regard to the expenses incurred by the Office, which are not on our Returns, because they merely pass through other offices. The first was postage; have you made inquiries at the Post Office?—Inquiry has been made at the Post Office, and it was found that no separate account was kept for the Veterinary Department, but that the whole was charged to the Home Office, of which the Veterinary Department was at first a branch.

3736. Your amount is included in the Home Office?—Yes.

3737. The Estimate for the Home Department in 1864 was 2,445*l*.?—Yes, including this department.

3738. That was all the information you were able to obtain with regard to postage?—Yes.

3739. Now, with regard to legal expenses, you can furnish to the Committee, I believe, some of the payments to counsel in fees for services in connection with the Veterinary Department for the years 1869, 1870, 1871, and 1872?—Yes.

3740. In 1870, what was the amount?—The amount was 227*l*. 11*s*.

3741. And in 1871?—£.448 9*s*. 6*d*., and in 1872, 403*l*. 1*d*. 6*d*.

3742. And in 1873?—The estimated amount for the quarter ending 31st March 1873, is 24*l*.

3743. In 1870, it was only part of the year I think?—In 1869, which was a part of a year, it was 171*l*. 4*s*.

3744. In 1871 and 1872, it was a much larger sum?—It was a much larger sum.

3745. That was in consequence of the difficulty in preparing the long and complicated Orders which we had to issue?—To a certain extent, it is consequence of the general Orders in 1871 and

1872, and the constant references from the local authorities upon legal points which we thought it desirable to refer to our legal adviser.

3746. Our legal expenses have been almost entirely, have they not, owing to the preparation of Orders, and the solution of legal questions which arise either from the administration of the Act, or of the Orders?—Yes.

3747. And we have found by experience, that it is most necessary to have good legal advice in the framing of the Orders?—Yes, we have.

3748. With regard to stationery, has the department communicated with the Stationery Office?—The Stationery Office has been applied to, and they can furnish an estimate of the expenses, if an account of all the stationery, printing books, and small stores, can be supplied to them; they are able to make that out, and we shall be able to do that in a short time.

3749. I think the same remark can be applied to the expense of furnishing the office by the Board of Works?—The Board of Works has promised to send us in an account.

3750. Mr. Barclay.] Would not the work in your department be very much simplified by a reduction of the number of local authorities?—If the local authorities were reduced in number, we should have a smaller amount of correspondence I presume, for one local authority would write one letter fewer than two; but I am not sure that the work as regards returns would be reduced much; the statistics would not be reduced in any way.

3751. Sometimes you get returns from each of the inspectors, numbering about 1,600?—That is so.

3752. And assuming instead of having numerous inspectors in each county, you had only one inspector in each county, so as to tabulate the statistics in the first place, and then transmit them to the department, do you not think that would simplify the work very materially?—From my experience of the figures of inspectors, I should say that that would increase the difficulty; the returns of inspectors are very inaccurate generally, and the correspondence in my department is very large in consequence of the inaccuracy of the inspectors.

3753. Do you think it would complicate the system to have only 50 or 60 inspectors reporting to you, instead of 1,500 or 1,600 inspectors, as at present?—That would depend upon what class of inspectors were appointed. If a higher class of inspectors were appointed, they would be able to perform the duties better. Where three men report now, one could report then probably.

3754. I suppose a large proportion of them are not men of a high class?—A very large proportion of the inspectors of the local authorities are police constables; and I confess as an old police magistrate, that I have not a high idea of the intelligence of the police force.

3755. Do you find that qualified veterinary surgeons give you accurate returns?—A great many of them do, but as a rule the veterinary surgeons are not a very intelligent class of men; we have a guarantee that they have a certain amount of education, but some of them much more than others.

3756. Assuming that you have one high class inspector for each county, with whom alone you would have to deal, leaving out of account his difficulty in dealing with his subordinates, would it be less difficult for you to deal with each

county, than it is under the present system?—Certainly it would be easier for our department to deal with one educated man in a county than with 20 unintelligent ones.

3757. I suppose the Statistical Department occupies a good many junior clerks in the office?—It occupies 18 out of the whole number, the whole number being 50 in round numbers.

3758. Mr. Dodson.] Were not your statistical labours very much diminished by the abandonment of the returns for foot and mouth disease?—Not so much as would appear upon the surface, as the foot and mouth returns were not of such a complicated class as the returns for pleuropneumonia; they were much more simple.

3759. Latterly the returns for foot and mouth disease were reduced to a summary, were they not?—We receive no returns for foot and mouth disease now.

3760. But before they were altogether abandoned, they were reduced, were they not, to a summary?—They were.

3761. But before they were reduced to a summary when you had the full returns, were not the statistical labours of the department very much larger?—They were very much larger.

3762. Were they double?—No; they were so much larger that we reduced the department by five clerks in consequence of their being removed.

3763. How many clerks have you engaged on the work now?—In the financial year of 1871-72 we had three first-class clerks, eight temporary clerks, and 25 of a lower class of temporary clerks or writers. In 1872-73, we had three first-class clerks, eight temporary clerks, 15 temporary clerks of a lower class, and five writers. In the Estimate for 1873-74, there are three first-class clerks, and eight temporary clerks in figures, but actually only seven, for a vacancy which has recently occurred has not yet been filled up, and 17 temporary clerks of a lower description, and three writers. That is only a difference in figures from the previous year, but not in fact, for in consequence of a Treasury order two of the writers who had been originally temporary clerks, and had been reduced to writers, were restored to their position as temporary clerks.

3764. But I understand from you that in consequence, first, of the curtailment of the returns of the foot and mouth disease, and next to the abandonment altogether of them, you were enabled to reduce your staff by five in the Statistical Department?—Yes; but I may add that as work is normal or abnormal we send away the writers; although we are permitted by the Treasury to have a certain number of writers, we do not always require them. I sent away two only the other day, because we can send for others when we want them.

3765. The foot and mouth disease being the disease that has prevailed most, were not those returns equal in number to the returns of all the other diseases put together?—It is not so much in the number of returns as in the intricacy of them; the pleuro-pneumonia returns would be greater, inasmuch as in the case of pleuro-pneumonia, declarations are returned as well as the cases; pleuro-pneumonia being governed by different rules from foot and mouth disease; the rules are different, therefore the returns are different, and much simpler in the case of foot and mouth disease.

Mr. C. E. Filmer.
—
3 April
1873.

Thursday, 24th April 1873.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mr. William Edward Forster.
Mr. Jacob Bright.
Mr. Cawley.
Mr. Clay.
Mr. Dodson.
Mr. Kavanagh.

Mr. Lusk.
Mr. Monsell.
Mr. O'Connor.
Mr. Pell.
Mr. Clare Read.
Mr. Bidley.

THE RIGHT HONOURABLE WILLIAM EDWARD FORSTER, IN THE CHAIR.

Professor THOMAS BALDWIN, called in; and Examined.

Professor
T. Baldwin.
—
24 April
1873.

3766. Mr. Monsell.] WHAT office do you hold in Ireland?—I am Superintendent of the Model Farms and Agricultural Schools of the Board of Education.

3767. How long have you held that office?—I have held my present office upwards of eight years.

3768. How many model farms are there?—Of all classes of schools, there are about 200 at the present moment.

3769. They are scattered all over the country?—Yes, they are scattered all over the country.

3770. And it is your business to go about and inspect them, and therefore you are brought into contact with people connected with farming throughout the whole of Ireland?—It is.

3771. You had previously been lecturer on agriculture at the Glasnevin Agricultural Schools?—I had been.

3772. And you had also some connection with the Royal College of Agriculture at Chesham?—I had.

3773. What was your connection with that college?—I was invited to lecture there for several sessions; I gave it up on receiving my present appointment.

3774. Have you paid attention to the subject of cattle diseases?—I have been compelled to pay attention to it, inasmuch as I have had live stock, the property of the Government, to the value of several thousand pounds, under my care.

3775. Do you attend fairs and markets?—I do.

3776. And are brought into intercourse with the agricultural classes?—I am.

3777. Were not you appointed by Lord Kimberley, when Lord Lieutenant, to serve upon the Committee in Dublin Castle with regard to cattle diseases?—Yes, I had the privilege of serving upon that Committee.

3778. The diseases that you have paid special attention to, and that you are going to speak about now, are foot and mouth disease and pleuro-pneumonia?—Yes, I have paid some attention to these diseases.

3779. You believe that these diseases are infectious?—I believe they are both produced by infection, and by infection only.

3780. Could you kindly give the Committee an outline of any experiments that you have made upon these diseases?—Taking foot and mouth

disease first, I have communicated that from diseased to healthy animals in a variety of ways: by inoculation; through the medium of milk, through the medium of water, and through the medium of my own clothes.

3781. How did you communicate the disease through water?—I took buckets which diseased animals had been using, and gave them to healthy animals, and in that way produced the disease.

3782. Have you any reason to believe that the disease is ever conveyed by streams?—I have.

3783. Will you state what has happened within your own experience in that matter?—Perhaps the Committee will allow me to say this, that last year I was very much puzzled when the disease broke out on one of the three farms attached to the Glasnevin Institution. For various purposes we have divided the land, which consists of 200 acres, into three farms: 1st, a spade-labour farm for cottiers; 2nd, a 25-acre farm, which is managed with the ordinary appliances of husbandry; and 3rd, the large farm of 150 acres, which is managed upon what may be called high farming principles. Thirty acres of the large farm are under permanent pasture upon the one side, and 25 acres upon the other. On one of those sections of permanent grass the disease broke out, and inasmuch as we had purchased no cattle for some time previously, I was unable to account for its appearance. Upon examination, I found reason to believe that it was conveyed through a little rivulet which supplied our cattle; we pump the water for these cattle, and are compelled to do so (having no pond of our own), from this little stream; and going backwards about 300 yards, I came into what are called "dairy" lands, locally called the Bishop's Lands, and upon these lands there were grazing at the time between 200 and 300 cattle, and on examining them I found that there was scarcely one of them free from foot and mouth disease; the pond that watered these animals overflowed on to our land, and the water pumped to our cattle. That suggested to me at once that the water might possibly be the means of communicating the disease. I issued a circular to a number of stockowners, and to some of my own pupils. I drew their attention to this fact, and I asked them to follow it up; and, in reply, got a great number of answers from persons of careful habits of observation, to the effect that the disease went down the stream. From my own observation,

observation, and I would prefer to confine myself to what has happened under my own observation. I found that on the model farm at Belfast the disease broke out last summer; no disease could have been imported, because we had not purchased an animal for a long time, and in going up the stream a large herd of cattle was found badly affected with the disease. We have a model farm upon our property near Limerick, and we have never had the disease upon it, whereas the adjoining lands of Mr. Cooper, of Cooper's Hill, were a regular hotbed of disease last year; he takes in grazing cattle, and not one of our beasts caught it; the water that supplies our beasts rises in the model farm, and flows down. Coupling all those facts, I have no doubt that the disease is communicated by water, and in running streams.

3784. Have you tried any experiments with regard to propagating the disease by water?—I have. I have referred to it already. I have taken the buckets, for instance, that have been used by diseased animals, and put a little water into them, and conveyed the water to a healthy animal, and it generally produced the disease.

3785. Mr. *Clare Road*.] How far was the water conveyed?—A very short distance.

3786. Mr. *Mossell*.] Have you tried any sufficient number of experiments to make any reliable deduction from them?—I have tried the experiment on more than fifty animals.

3787. And in every instance produced the disease?—No; there are some animals which will not take the disease at all.

3788. In what proportion have you produced the disease?—As I should like to give the Committee no statement that would not be quite accurate, I cannot give the figures without reference to my note-book; but I should say that only 5 or 10 per cent. would not take it.

3789. There were only 5 or 10 per cent. of the animals which would not take it?—Yes, in the experiments made by me; my books would tell the precise proportion.

3790. Do you suppose the disease is often propagated by water?—I think not often.

3791. *Chairman*.] In all those cases in which the disease has been propagated by the side of a stream, it was the watering place for cattle?—Yes, the water supplying the cattle.

3792. Mr. *Mossell*.] Now, with regard to clothes; you say that the disease is propagated by clothes?—I have over and over again propagated the disease in that way. I propagated it last year in heifers. In experimenting with clothes and porous materials of any kind, you must be extremely cautious. You must get the material thoroughly saturated with the virus of the disease; if you take your coat and merely expose it to a little infection, the virus becomes destroyed by the porous nature of the clothes, but if you put your coat into the mouth of the animal, as I have done over and over again, and leave it there a quarter of an hour, until it becomes saturated, and the porous nature of the material loses its action in oxidizing or destroying the poison, and then go a short distance with your coat, you will communicate the disease to healthy animals. I have done that myself.

3793. Have you ever known any instance of the disease being propagated by that form of infection which clothes might ordinarily take from a diseased animal?—Never, in my experience.

3794. Therefore it comes to this, that you may propagate it in that way, but that it is not so propagated ordinarily?—I believe that, ordinarily speaking, it is not propagated in that way. I may mention a fact in my experience of the cattle plague, when sent over here, which bears upon that point.

3795. *Chairman*.] Do you mean the rinderpest?—Yes; I have known a gentleman to have been through herds known to have been infected, in England, and to have gone immediately through herds in Ireland, and he certainly did not communicate the disease to the Irish cattle.

3796. Mr. *Mossell*.] Is it not a notorious fact that the rinderpest has been communicated by clothes?—I do not deny it; but I am not aware that an experiment of a careful nature has been made upon that subject.

3797. Mr. *Clare Road*.] How long an interval elapsed between the man you spoke of handling cattle in London and going to Ireland?—Three days.

3798. Mr. *Mossell*.] Have you had any means of forming an opinion as to the distance that the foot and mouth disease is conveyed through the air?—It is difficult to venture a very strong expression of opinion upon a point of that kind, but, so far as my observation has gone, I should say it is conveyed a very short distance.

3799. Can you adduce any facts in support of that view?—I can adduce this fact, which occurred upon the Glasnevin farm last year. Adjoining a field on the large farm where the disease broke out, and separated from it by the approach to the building, were 12 cattle upon the 25-acre farm, and not one of those 12 cattle got the disease from the large farm; and the remarkable part of it is, that the disease broke out suddenly, and apparently most mysteriously, in the three cattle upon the 54-acre farm, which were housed upon the Belgian system; it passed over the 25-acre farm, and suddenly appeared in the midst of those three animals. I was very much puzzled, and Mr. Jenkins went over on behalf of the Royal Agricultural Society just as it broke out, and the suggestion that occurred to me was this; and I think it is interesting as bearing upon the way in which diseases are propagated, and also as bearing upon the sewage question. A short time before this I observed that the sewage which was applied to the farm by my predecessor upon Mr. Mosch's plan, had passed into the drains as it went upon the land. The soil had become so saturated with the organic matter which the sewage contained, that it lost its power of absorbing this matter. When the disease passed over the 25-acre farm, a distance of about one-eighth of an English mile, and appeared in the midst of three cows in the 54-acre farm, I called to my recollection the circumstance that the sewage passed through the land; and I came to the conclusion that it was this sewage, or rather the drainage water, passing from the large farm in the way that I spoke of, which communicated the disease to those three cows. The 32 cattle upon the large farm were diseased, and the poison was given off by them and conveyed in the drainage water to a little pond used by those three cattle. I state this, of course, as a matter of opinion.

3800. But I gather from your answers, that you do not very much believe in the propagation of the disease through the air?—I do not.

3801. If foot and mouth disease be capable of being

Professor
T. Baileys.
—
24 April
1875.

Professor
T. Baldwin.
—
24 April
1875.

being propagated in the various ways suggested, have you any hope that we can ever get rid of it?—I believe it is quite possible to get rid of it.

3802. What do you propose?—Speaking of Ireland, with which I am of course best acquainted, I should close all fairs and markets for the sale of store stock for a period sufficiently long to destroy all the poison of the disease; I believe it is a short-lived poison, and I believe that six weeks or two months would be a period sufficiently long for that purpose, to begin with.

3803. At what period of the year could that be done without any great inconvenience?—Immediately after the great May fairs, and the great sales of store stock. Supposing the Committee were to adopt my view, or even favourably entertain it, if they were to make an early intimation to stock owners upon the subject, and enable them to dispose of their stock in May at the great fairs, then no practical inconvenience would arise. Of course, there would be a little inconvenience here and there, but there would be no national loss, because the stock is in the country, and the demand for it would still remain.

3804. Are you perfectly satisfied that six weeks would be sufficient for the stamping out of the disease?—I should certainly think so, as a period to begin with; but I would say it was better to err on the safe side, and say two months. In experimenting upon my own clothes, I have suspended them for varying periods, and I have never found the disease communicated by my own clothes, no matter how I saturated them, after a fortnight. Speaking from that experience, I should say that it was a short-lived poison. I would recommend closing after the great May fairs during June and July.

3805. *Mr. Clere Read.*] You think that from the first of June would be the best time?—I do; immediately after the great May fairs.

3806. *Mr. Monell.*] But the stoppage of fairs and markets would not prevent the disease being transmitted through running water?—That is true; but the amount of the disease propagated in that way is so small that it would have really no effect. And besides that, there are some other considerations; for instance, if I am right in thinking that it is a short-lived poison, even supposing that the disease were carried to some slight extent by running streams, yet I think that six weeks would go far to kill out the disease in the country.

3807. Would you interfere with the trade in fat cattle?—I would not. I think it would be unnecessary to interfere with the trade in fat cattle.

3808. Why do you think it would be unnecessary to interfere with that trade?—Because that cattle do little mischief. They gravitate from the farms to the capitals of the country; the disease, as a rule, goes the other way; it goes backwards, and is carried by store stock. I think it is very seldom that you find fat cattle do much mischief in carrying the poison of disease.

3809. You would leave the trade in fat cattle from Ireland free?—Yes, I would, subject to certain safeguards.

3810. You believe that by the course you propose the foot and mouth disease could be stamped out?—I believe it could.

3811. Have you consulted upon this matter much with any persons to whose opinions you

attach weight?—I felt it my duty, having formed that opinion, to consult large stockowners and landowners, and other men concerned in the matter, and they all agreed that that system, so far as they could understand it, is likely to succeed. They say that some little difficulty will be raised; that people will not be very much pleased, to start with, with closing fairs and markets for two months; but if you could get rid of so great an evil by such a remedy, I have no doubt the country would support you in adopting such measures.

3812. Even if you did get rid of the disease in that way, would you not still be liable to re-import it?—That is true; but I would deal with every animal that showed the disease afterwards, as you deal now with cattle plague. I think you can have so half measures in dealing with these infectious cattle diseases.

3813. Would you compensate the owners?—I would apply the police and compensate the owners so as to make it their interest to declare the disease.

3814. You think that measure would stamp out the disease?—Yes, I think so.

3815. You think that the number of cases in which the disease would reappear would be very few indeed?—Very few indeed.

3816. Assuming that the foot and mouth disease should die out in Ireland, in the first instance, by closing all the fairs and markets for a certain period, and the police were vigorously applied, do you think the means you propose of killing every infected beast would afterwards involve much expense?—I should say the cost would be very little indeed; our experience with the cattle plague, I think, is quite conclusive upon that point.

3817. Can you furnish the Committee with an estimate of the loss which Ireland suffers annually from the foot and mouth disease?—Any estimate that I could make would be, at the most, approximate.

3818. Did you turn your attention to that subject?—I did. In a paper which I read before the Statistical Society some time ago I stated that the annual loss by preventable diseases of all kinds was equal to the whole of the local taxation of Ireland.

3819. How much is that?—Between 2,000,000*l.* and 3,000,000*l.*

3820. *Mr. Clere Read.*] That is what it averages annually?—Yes; in 1872 it was, I believe, more.

3821. *Mr. Monell.*] How did you arrive at the result set forth in the paper you read?—I issued a circular to a number of my own students, and to persons of intelligence and character throughout the country; and then my own range of observation is very considerable. My office brings me into all parts of Ireland, and with such evidence before me I came to that conclusion, and I see, according to the estimates made by a very able man in England, Mr. Algernon Clarke, that, relatively speaking, he makes out a higher estimate for all England.

3822. How is it in a disease, like foot and mouth disease, which rarely causes the death of animals, such a loss is produced?—In store stock there is loss of condition; in dairy cows there is an enormous loss of condition, and there is a very great loss of milk, and you predispose the system of the animal to other diseases.

3823. *Mr. Clere Read.*] They are liable to abortion,

abortion, are they not?—Cattle are liable to abortion, and even in sheep it has occurred to a very large extent.

3824. *Mr. Muswell.*] Can you lay the grounds of your estimate before the Committee; can you inform them generally of the mode in which you have arrived at that result with regard to the loss; you can afterwards give your reasons more in detail?—We know pretty well the total value of the cattle in Ireland, and from a wide range of observation one can approximate the per-centage of loss.

3825. There is very little mortality in foot and mouth disease?—In foot and mouth disease there is very little indeed, except in old cows.

3826. It is the less first in the condition of the beast, and then the loss in dairy cows by their falling in milk?—Yes, and then the loss in calves. It has been suggested by the honourable Member for Norfolk that there is abortion produced, and you are liable to have lung disease following an attack of foot and mouth disease.

3827. It has been suggested before this Committee that foot and mouth disease is generated in ships crossing the Channel; what is your opinion on that subject?—I do not believe it can by possibility be generated on board the ships, or in the holds of the ships.

3828.—Will you give your reasons for that opinion?—In the first place, I believe that all competent witnesses who appear before the Committee will agree in the opinion that this disease is of foreign origin. I should hope that there is no difference of opinion amongst competent witnesses upon that point. I cannot see, then, how it could arise spontaneously in a ship.

3829. But when cattle are overcrowded?—No doubt, if by any course of treatment you weaken the constitution of your cattle, the per-centage of loss is thereby increased, but that is a totally different thing from generating the disease.

3830. Is there not a considerable importation of cattle to Ireland from Spain?—Yes; and our experience of that trade seems to be conclusive upon the point. We import largely from Spain and Portugal. I have been on board the boats; they are not so good as the boats which cross the Channel, yet we have never had a case of foot and mouth disease imported from Spain or Portugal.

3831. *Mr. Clare Read.*] Not pleuro-pneumonia?—Of neither, so far as I can ascertain.

3832. *Mr. Muswell.*] You say that this disease is of foreign origin; but has it not now taken sufficient root in this country to be possibly generated here spontaneously?—Unfortunately it has taken deep root in the country, but I do not see any connection between its wide-spread existence in the country and its arising spontaneously, or of its having acquired there a home.

3833. You are firmly convinced from your experiments that the disease does not arise spontaneously, and that it is always propagated by some sort of infection; and it is upon that you found your opinion that, if you once stamp it out, and then adopt vigorous measures with regard to any disease which should be imported, you would be able to stamp it out altogether?—Quite so; but I know the notion prevails that it has acquired a home in the British Isles, and that, therefore, it is almost useless to try to deal with it. Now I would respectfully submit that

you can no more say that this disease has acquired a home in Ireland or Great Britain than cattle plague or Asiatic cholera. I do not think that you have any ground whatever for assuming that it has acquired a home here, and I think it is impossible that it could have done so.

3834. It has been suggested by one or two witnesses before this Committee that Irish animals discovered in England to be affected with disease should be sent back to Ireland; how do you think that suggestion, if it was acted upon, would work?—To begin with, I think it is an extremely clumsy mode of dealing with the question; and in the next place, I regard it as inadequate; and, finally, I think it would be found to prove very vexatious in Ireland.

3835. Why do you regard it as inadequate?—Because, in the first place, I hold that by any system of inspection, it is impossible to ascertain the existence of the disease in a latent state; that is, until it is developed; and therefore the most that you can do by that process is to send back a few animals, so that you do not get rid of the evil.

3836. The suggestion was that all the animals in a cargo should be sent back?—That appears to be a proposition so extraordinary, considering that Ireland is part of the United Kingdom, that I am satisfied it will not be entertained. I think it would be such a frightful hardship upon the men who bought sound and healthy cattle in the Irish fairs, and who had no means in the world of knowing that the seeds of the disease were in them, that I should hope that public opinion would not support anybody who made such a proposition; and then if you were to deal with them in that exceptional way, it would, I think, aggravate the feeling which already exists, that in England you wish to deal exceptionally with Ireland.

3837. What do you think would be the feeling among farmers in Ireland, if so stringent a plan as that which I have mentioned of sending back the cattle were to be adopted; would they acquiesce in it, and would they co-operate with you, or would they resent it?—If you want to irritate the farmers, who are a very numerous body in Ireland, I should say that you could not adopt a more practical measure; it would fail, and failing, it would be regarded as vexatious and exceptional.

3838. Upon the other hand, what do you think the feeling of the farmers of Ireland would be with regard to the plan you have suggested for stamping out the foot and mouth disease; do you think they would feel aggrieved by it, or would co-operate with the Government in carrying out so stringent a measure?—I should say that the enormous loss caused by the foot and mouth disease in Ireland in 1872, has so thoroughly educated the Irish stockowners as to the necessity of something being done, that they will cordially co-operate with you in any practical measure of that kind which really does not become vexatious.

3839. Have you arrived at any definite conclusions as to the way in which pleuro-pneumonia is propagated?—The only definite conclusion which I have arrived at myself with regard to pleuro-pneumonia is, that the poison of the disease is eliminated in the breath, and nowhere else.

3840. Can you give the Committee any instances of that?—Several persons, for instance, have inoculated with the matter pressed from the lungs of diseased animals without producing the disease.

Professor
T. Balfe.
—
24 April
1873.

Professor
T. Baldwin.

24 April
1873.

disease. I have done that myself over and over again. I have also inoculated with almost all the secretions, including the discharges from the eyes and the urine, and I have never yet produced disease in the lungs of animals by inoculation with any one of the secretions, but I believe that I have produced the disease in this way: I have taken pieces of porous material, such as bits of sponge, and put them into the nostrils of diseased animals, and left those bits there for some time until I had reason to believe that the pores were thoroughly saturated with the virus of the disease, and then those bits of material were taken a very short distance and put into the nostrils of healthy animals, and the disease did break out in a very large per-centage of the cases so operated upon.

3841. Mr. (Mr. Read.) Was that a different herd, although a short distance away?—It so happened that we had upon the Glasnevin farms three herds, and I conveyed the disease from the large farms to the 25 acre farm. I mentioned this circumstance to Professor Simonds, of the Veterinary College here a few years ago, and he has operated upon one animal, I believe, and has published the result in the Journal of the Royal Agricultural Society of England. In this animal, he says, he failed to produce the disease, but it appears to me that it is not enough to operate upon one animal; and that a negative result upon one animal is worth very little.

3842. Mr. Mowell.] Have you tried many experiments yourself?—I have.

3843. Upon what proportion of cases did it take?—About 50 per cent.

3844. How long did the disease take to develop itself?—The shortest period was 17 days, and the longest 44.

3845. Do you think that those two numbers would represent the limits during which the disease is incubated?—I could not venture to offer an opinion so precise as that. I should say that the period of incubation would depend a good deal upon the constitution of the animal.

3846. But still, so far as your experience goes, it is something between 17 and 44 days?—So far as my experience goes, it is.

3847. Are all cattle equally liable to the disease?—No; in healthy store stock, two or three years old, for example, in good condition, you will have a much less per-centage of diseased than of dairy cows; you would get a larger per-centage of disease in old dairy cows than in young dairy cows. If you take vigorous bulls, the per-centage is very little. I have never known this disease in a young vigorous bull, though placed in the same shed with diseased animals.

3848. The result of your investigation is that the disease is always produced by infection?—I have no doubt that the disease called pleuro-pneumonia, which I regard as a plague, is invariably produced by infection.

3849. Has pleuro-pneumonia ever broken out among any of the Spanish cattle imported into Ireland?—No; and I should tell the Committee, in relation to that point, that I have consulted Mr. Cuff, an extensive salesman in Dublin, who has had for years the sole charge of those cattle, and he has mentioned to me that no disease has appeared amongst them; and I have seen them myself both in the boats and on landing.

3850. You have stated that the cattle are really worse cared for in those boats than in the

trans-Channel boats?—The boats are not better, and the voyage is longer.

3851. May it not be that there are other forms of lung disease which may be mistaken for pleuro-pneumonia?—Yes; I have no doubt of that. I pointed it out years ago, and it is now admitted by Professor Ferguson and others. I found cases arising here and there, but it does not spread from herd to herd, or from district to district.

3852. Have you formed any kind of estimate with reference to the annual loss to the Irish farmers resulting from pleuro-pneumonia?—At present the loss is not so great as from foot and mouth disease. I should say that fully 12 per cent. of the dairy stock of Dublin would be the minimum loss by pleuro-pneumonia, but all over the country the loss is not so great; certainly it was not so great in 1872 as from foot and mouth disease.

3853. Have you any suggestion to offer as to the best mode of dealing with pleuro-pneumonia?—I think there is only one way of dealing with pleuro-pneumonia; that is, to apply the poleaxe to every animal that is diseased, and to every animal that comes within the range of infection. The experience gained in Holland and the experience which we got in our working out of the cattle plague, and the experience which you got in England, and in the two outbreaks of cattle plague in Ireland, for instance, which I went to see myself, leave no doubt whatever upon my mind on the question.

3854. And you feel no doubt that just as cattle plague was stamped out, so pleuro-pneumonia, by these equally vigorous measures, might be stamped out?—Most decidedly.

3855. What would you do with the carcasses; would you allow them to be sold?—It seems a very strong measure to recommend, particularly inasmuch as many of the carcasses which would come within the range of infection would be sound and good, and even the carcasses of diseased animals; but yet it is so important, I think, regard being had to the general public, to destroy the trade in diseased meat, as it is in diseased cattle, and therefore I would beg very respectfully to submit to the Committee that the right course is to bury every one of them, giving adequate compensation to the owners; and I should recommend, as an essential condition of the mode of dealing with either of those two diseases, that you must deal generously with the stockowner, more especially in a country like Ireland, which depends now for its main source of wealth upon its agricultural live stock.

3856. And why do you propose such very strong measures with regard to pleuro-pneumonia, and not for foot and mouth disease, which you say causes a greater amount of annual loss?—To begin with, pleuro-pneumonia kills a very large per-centage of the animals affected.

3857. What per-centage do you suppose?—Fully 60 per cent.; it amounts to 60 per cent, I know, in my own experience, when you get the disease into a herd, unless you take extraordinary precautions to get rid of it. In the Dublin district more than 60 per cent. have died from it.

3858. Cheever.] You think that, of the animals attacked, at least 60 per cent. die?—I feel justified in saying from my experience, that 60 per cent. of them would die.

3859. Mr. Mowell.] Therefore it is not amenable to treatment?—It is not amenable to treatment.

treatment, like foot and mouth disease; and in the next place the period of incubation is so long, and the disease is altogether as insidious in its character, that I venture to take the liberty of urging very strongly that there is only one way of dealing with it, and that is to poleaxe every beast that comes under the influence of the disease.

3860. What would be the view of the owner of the stock?—I think the view of the owners of the stock in Ireland and elsewhere, after the experience they have had, would be this: that if you deal with them generously, giving them adequate compensation, they would support you.

3861. But you do not mean giving the whole of the value of the beast that is killed, do you?—I do not see why you should not give the whole of the value of the beast, because I think if you want to succeed you must be generous to the stockowner. I am, perhaps, an independent witness before you upon that point. I have stock to the value of several thousands of pounds under my care, and I have no interest in it, except that which a man should have for the benefit of his pupils and for the benefit of the public. I wish to make as much out of that stock as possible. If you come to me and destroy these cattle for the benefit of the public, why not give me their full value.

3862. Do you think that doing that would be the way to make owners of stock very careful as to whether they got pleuro-pneumonia or not?—There your system of inspection would come in; that is if you have a system of inspection at all, it would there become useful.

3863. Would it be wise to altogether annihilate the principle of self-interest?—No; but I think it is entirely advisable to annihilate the principle of what is called the local authority; in this case you must deal with the disease vigorously.

3864. But the principle of the local authority is not the same as the principle of self-interest. We will come afterwards to the question of local authorities, but if you were to give full value for every animal that was killed, would you not entirely relieve the mind of the owner of the animal of any anxiety whether he got pleuro-pneumonia, or whether he did not?—I can only put it in this way as representing the stockowner: if I were an owner of stock, and you came to me and said, "I want to destroy your stock for the public good," I hold, as a first principle, if you want to destroy them for the public good, you should pay me for them. I do not say that a particular parish or county should pay me, but I maintain that it should come out of the general taxation of the country. Every man who wants to have good milk, and cheap meat and butter, is interested in the question.

3865. Could you adduce any facts taken from Irish experience to show that the disease is always generated by infection?—I can mention two very leading facts which appear to my own mind very conclusive upon the point, and it is for the Committee to consider what weight they will attach to them. The first fact is this, that, as a rule, in all the rearing or breeding districts of Ireland there is no pleuro-pneumonia. I know districts in the north-west, and in the west, and in the south-west, and in the north-east, which are quite free from the disease; districts where, except at the first outbreak, it has never appeared. I believe that you will find in every country, that the capital is the head centre,

so to speak, of the disease; that it spreads backwards from the capital to the provinces. I know it is so in Ireland. Dublin is really a hotbed of disease. Our Smithfield Market, as it is called, for dairy cows is a hotbed of disease; every one who buys beasts in that market knows it thoroughly well. I would add this fact from my own actual experience, that of the total number of model farms under my superintendence, there are very close upon 20 managed for the public account; these are scattered through the four provinces, and in the eight years that I have held my present office, I have not had a single case of pleuro-pneumonia upon any of these farms outside the Glanevin Farm. We have them in Belfast, and in Cork and Limerick; two of them are very close to your own property, and we have never had a case of pleuro-pneumonia upon them.

3866. But in the case of Limerick, surely, although there may not have been pleuro-pneumonia upon your two agricultural farms, there has been a great deal of pleuro-pneumonia all around them?—I think that proves my case, because we do not go into the ordinary cattle trade. It exists in Limerick very largely.

3867. And is very widely spread over the country?—It is very widely spread over the country. I think that is evidence rather bearing out my view of the case.

3868. Have you had any experience of inoculation as a means of getting rid of the disease?—At Glanevin I have tried it over and over again, and, so far as I can judge, it is perfectly useless.

3869. But you are aware that some of the best authorities in Ireland and elsewhere have reported that it has succeeded in their hands, are you not?—I am aware that Professor Ferguson, reported in an address to the Scottish Chamber of Agriculture, has given a qualified support to the system, but only a qualified support, and certainly his support is not based upon his own experience. I should like to add, that I have examined all the so-called successful examples of inoculation as a means of dealing with pleuro-pneumonia in Ireland. I visited one of the districts, where it has been most extensively tried, about the town of Tipperary, where pleuro-pneumonia prevailed to a very great extent. I visited Lord Beshborough's, where it was tried. I visited several other places, but it appeared to me that in none of these cases were the conditions for a successful experiment observed; and for this reason, that no herd was operated upon until the animals had been exposed to the infection.

3870. I asked you merely whether you considered that any means short of what you suggest would be sufficient for dealing with this disease?—I do not.

3871. You do not consider the present regulations for preventing the spread of infectious disease adequate to the wants of the case?—Certainly not.

3872. You are acquainted with the English system, I presume?—Very imperfectly.

3873. Do you approve of the localised system or of the centralised system; which do you consider to be the one most efficacious, the system of dealing with the disease by local authorities, as is the case in England, or by the central authority, as is the case in Ireland?—I feel almost unwilling to express an opinion upon that question; but it appears to me that the results before you

Professor
T. Balcan.
—
24 April
1873.

Professor
T. Balders.
—
54 April
1873.

you are very interesting upon that point. I take it that the localized system has utterly failed in England. I think that we have been in that respect better off in Ireland.

3874. Are you aware that complaints have been made from time to time of the restrictions imposed upon the Irish cattle trade by the Irish Government?—I am aware that complaints have been made, but I still think you would never have heard of those complaints if you had introduced a system of stamping out the disease, giving at the same time what I call adequate compensation to the stock owners. You will have grumbling and growling until you do that.

3875. But do you think that the grumbling and growling, as you call it, has been very much confined to the stock owners in Dublin, or has it generally prevailed throughout the country?—Naturally enough, a few wealthy men in Dublin who are largely interested in the question, take it up very warmly, but I should certainly say, speaking from my own observation, that they do not represent necessarily the public opinion.

3876. Do you think that the arrangements of the Irish Veterinary Department are satisfactory?—I should say the department is working pretty well. I know this much, that having seen what has been done from the time of Lord Kimberley down to the present, the Irish Executive has shown great energy and wisdom in dealing with the question.

3877. Has the Irish Executive had a sufficient staff at its disposal?—The staff at its disposal, I think, is utterly inadequate to carry out the object that it has had before it; but I think myself that that object is not the right object. I think they began at the wrong end. If I were to believe in inspection, which I do not, I should be compelled to say that the Irish system was starved out by the Treasury.

3878. You say you do not believe in inspection, do you mean that it is useless to have inspectors; take the case of Ballinasloe, do you consider that having the cattle inspected, and the diseased cattle picked out and removed, does no good at all?—I should not go so far as to say that it does no good, but having been in the fair of Ballinasloe myself during the whole time, and paid some attention to the subject, I would venture to express this opinion, that if the whole of the veterinary surgeons in Ireland were in Ballinasloe they would really not meet the difficulties of the case, because they could not discover the great evil, which is, that while a number of the beasts, of course, come diseased to the fair, the great source of evil is the vast number of animals which come to the fair with the seeds of disease in them, and how could any system of inspection discover that.

3879. Have you any suggestion to make to the Committee for rendering the system more effectual?—I am unwilling to make any suggestions. I think you must begin at the beginning; in my judgment you must kill out the disease and keep it out; all you would require then is a central authority to deal with the disease when it appears, and I think you will want a very small staff indeed for that purpose then.

3880. The result of your evidence is this, that no system would be effectual except the very stringent system which you have recommended; you believe that that would be effectual, and might be carried out at a very small cost?—I think it could be carried out at a very small cost,

and I believe that no other system will succeed. I think this proof might be adduced in support of that view, that the Irish Executive is really thoroughly in earnest. I do not think that you can have a man more thoroughly imbued with the importance of dealing vigorously with this disease than Lord Spencer. I do not think that you can get a man of greater natural ability to govern the Veterinary Department than the man who is at the head of it. I do not believe you can get a more efficient body for the purpose than the Irish constabulary; and yet, in the face of these three facts, we have had some 15,000 centres of infection reported upon by the department in 1872. I should be disposed to say that there were fully 20,000 centres of infection in 1872. I believe the Irish is a far better system than the English system, as a whole, but yet you have before you the broad result.

3881. Under that system, worked as efficiently as possible, there has been a loss, as far as you can calculate, of about three millions last year?—I believe that in 1872 there was a loss of between two and three millions from all preventable diseases.

3882. You do not consider that even if there were a much larger sum of money spent than is now spent in inspection, the result would be very different from that which it has been?—I think any addition to the staff would not cure the evil.

3883. [Chairman.] You have been eight years manager of these fairs, I believe?—I have been so for eight years.

3884. Have you had any sheep-pox amongst the sheep?—Never.

3885. You have had no practical experience of sheep-pox, I believe?—Sheep-pox has not been in Ireland.

3886. You have had pleuro-pneumonia upon your farm at Glanevin, have you not?—Yes, repeatedly.

3887. When pleuro-pneumonia breaks out in a herd, I suppose the danger is very great of the whole herd catching it?—The danger is very great indeed.

3888. And you say that of those animals which do catch it, 60 per cent. die?—Sixty per cent. would die.

3889. Therefore, if a farmer has the misfortune to have pleuro-pneumonia in his herd, he may be almost certain that they will entail upon him very great loss?—Very heavy loss indeed.

3890. If all the animals are ordered to be slaughtered, and the full value is paid for those animals, although you may say it is solely for the public good that that money is paid, is it not also enormously to the private advantage of the owner of the herd?—It is to his advantage, certainly.

3891. But is it not to his advantage in this way: that supposing he had a herd of a hundred beasts, the strong probability was that all would catch it, and that 60 per cent. would die, and instead of having that very great loss, he would be able to sell them all at their full value?—I think that if any skilful stockowner who breeds his own animals, and merely buys in a few beasts occasionally, were to isolate his purchased animals, and keep them away from his own stock, he would certainly confine the disease to those animals; and then if you come in and kill all the animals which are not liable to the disease, you are bound to give him ample compensation.

3892. But your suggestion was to kill those which

which were diseased, and those which have been in contact with them?—But in a small farm, such as Glasnevin, you would be quite safe in saying that the whole farm would be an infected farm.

3893. And in that case you would be paying the farmer for animals which probably would have entailed great loss upon him. If you consider the question of pleuro-pneumonia appearing upon such a farm as Glasnevin, the strong probability is that all the animals upon the farm would catch the disease, and that such a large proportion would die, that if the State comes in and pays full value for all those animals, it is very much to the private advantage of the owner of the farm?—I make a distinction between the man who really adopts an efficient system of disinfection and isolation, and an ordinary stockowner, and I illustrate my case by saying that it is a great hardship upon the first man to be compelled to give up to you all his animals, if he does not believe there is danger, if he adopts isolation and disinfection.

3894. But I understand you to say, that upon your farm the danger of its spreading would be very great?—I say so still.

3895. Then in so far as that danger exists, surely the owner of such a farm is a great gainer by the State coming in and paying the full value of those animals?—That is to say, he is a gainer to the extent that you would pay him for the proportion of beasts that would die; to that extent he is a gainer.

3896. I also understand you to say, that the whole of the animals would be in great danger of catching the infection, and that 60 per cent. of those that caught it would die?—They are all in danger of taking the infection, unless the owner adopts a very strict mode of isolation.

3897. I do not suppose that you would suggest that the animals should be slaughtered which had not come in contact with diseased animals?—I do not see any necessity for slaughtering any, except those that have come within the range of infection.

3898. That is to say, that you do not slaughter any except those that have come in contact, and there is a very large chance of those animals catching it; that would be a very great public good, and also very much to the private advantage of the owner?—Yes; but I desire that, in whatever measure you propose, you should have the cordial co-operation of the stock-owner.

3899. You think that the cordial co-operation of the stockowner would be obtained by his being able to find a market by State purchase for his dangerous or diseased animals equal to what he would have had if there had been no disease?—I should say certainly, unless you give them something very close to it, they would be tempted, as they have been tempted even in cases of cattle plague, to conceal the existence of the disease.

3900. Now, with regard to foot and mouth disease, you do not propose to slaughter animals affected with foot and mouth disease?—Not in the first instance; not till I kill out the disease.

3901. You thought that six weeks would be sufficient to stamp out the disease?—I said a period of six weeks or two months to begin with.

3902. You propose the stoppage of all fairs?—I propose the stoppage of all fairs for store stock.

3903. You would not stop fairs for fat stock?—No, I made that distinction.

3904. Would you take no steps except the stopping of fairs; would you leave the private sale of store stock without any restriction?—I should say it was difficult to interfere with private sale, but I would certainly advocate stopping all movement of store stock.

3905. That is a very different suggestion from the stopping of fairs and markets?—In Ireland it means practically the same.

3906. That is because they go to fairs and markets for the sale of animals; but supposing there were no fairs and markets to go to, would it not be necessary to stop the movement, in order to carry out that object?—My suggestion implied that.

3907. Your suggestion therefore involves not only that all fairs and markets should be stopped, but also all movement?—Yes, of store stock.

3908. How long is an animal generally ill which is affected with foot and mouth disease; I refer to attacks which would leave the animal still contagious?—About a week.

3909. Not more?—Not more, in ordinary cases.

3910. Your notion would be that these six weeks would give time for all the diseased animals to be cured or to die, and that the steps that you would take would prevent any movement?—I should hope so.

3911. How would you propose to work such a system in Ireland; the fairs, I can understand, would be at once stopped by order; how would you stop the movement?—Through the constabulary.

3912. Would you imply that no person was to be allowed to move cattle without a license?—Without a license; and if a man was found moving his cattle without a license, I would impose a penalty so high that he would be very unlikely to do it again.

3913. And you feel confident, from your experience, that six weeks of that kind of regulation would be sufficient?—I should be very strongly inclined to say that six weeks would do it. I do not say that positively.

3914. During the prevalence of cattle plague in Ireland there was restriction of movement, was there not, in the cattle-plague district?—There was.

3915. That was carried out by the constabulary?—It was carried out by the constabulary, and it had a marvellous effect in stopping the spread of disease.

3916. Of what disease?—Foot and mouth disease, and pleuro-pneumonia also.

3917. How long have you had the foot and mouth disease badly in Ireland now?—It has been in Ireland since it was introduced some 30 years ago.

3918. But it has been much worse lately, has it not?—It was worse in Ireland in 1873 than I have ever known it.

3919. There seems to have been an impression upon the minds of some of the witnesses that the disease had completely died out in Ireland, and was reimported during the last three or four years?—I should be very much inclined to say that at one time we had very little of it, or possibly none at all; but it came in in some Lancashire calves.

3920. Will you just tell me what are the present regulations in the case of foot and mouth disease breaking out; can you give me the last case in which foot and mouth disease broke out upon either of your farms; what was it your duty

Professor
T. Balch.

24 April
1873.

Professor
T. Baldoon.
—
24 April
1873.

to do in consequence of any regulation?—My first duty is to report it to the nearest police station; the police are bound to report it to the Veterinary Department in Dublin Castle. I could not move any cattle without a license for any purpose after that.

3921. Does that apply to foot and mouth disease?—Yes.

3922. Do you mean by that that you could not move the animal away from land in your occupation?—I could move an animal from farm to farm.

3923. Could you move him across a high road?—In my own experience a case of that kind has not occurred; the letter of the law certainly is against it.

3924. Of course I understand that working very well with your farm, because you would know as well as the veterinary surgeon would that the disease had broken out, and you would no doubt at once comply with the law; but supposing that the farmer has not the knowledge to at once detect disease, what happens?—Foot and mouth disease is really so unmistakable a disease that he could not fail to perceive it. I should say that the smallest farmer in the country ought to know foot and mouth disease, as the symptoms are so very plain. There are, of course, some other diseases that he might confound with it.

3925. He might know the disease, but he would not be willing to subject himself to the inconvenience of reporting it?—I would compel him to do so.

3926. But I am asking about the present regulations; supposing foot and mouth disease breaks out in your neighbourhood, and the farmer does not wish to say anything about it, what steps are taken by the State to find out if the disease does exist?—I have no doubt that the Committee would get much better information as to the operation of the department from the gentleman who is at the head of it. I have only concerned myself with it as dealing with stock, but I know that any man who does not obey the regulations is liable to be brought before the magistrates and fined, and I am sorry to say that some of the Irish magistrates have not acted very rigorously when such cases have been brought before them, which I think is a great misfortune.

3927. But, adopting your suggestion, which is first getting rid of the disease and then keeping it out, what kind of inspection do you look forward to after the six weeks or two months have elapsed, supposing you have succeeded in getting rid of the disease?—Any appearance of the disease is immediately reported to the central authority, and they send down an inspector to the spot, and if he finds any disease he immediately applies the poleaxe, and buries the carcass.

3928. But supposing these measures have not succeeded in exterminating the disease, so that it still might recur, although if proper steps were taken it would very soon be got rid of, I want to know in what way you look forward to its recurrence being reported and the proper steps being taken for its suppression?—The same steps that are now taken to report it.

3929. But supposing that a farmer does not choose to report it, there would be great danger of its coming up again, would there not?—Not if you impose a heavy fine, and instead of bringing

him before a local magistrate, bring him before a paid magistrate. I hold that these things should not be dealt with by the local authority. I object to the thing being dealt with by local magistrates.

3930. I want to know what would be your mode of dealing with it afterwards; your former suggestion is that he should be obliged to report it to the stipendiary magistrates?—To the constabulary under an authority which would effectually deal with it.

3931. You think that ordering the farmer to report, and fining him if he did not report, would be sufficient, and that it would not be necessary to have a veterinary surgeon travelling over the country to find out if there was disease existing?—I think so.

3932. Do you think the police can be relied upon for finding out the disease?—I think the farmers themselves can be relied upon much better than the police if you make it their interest. I think the police have done their work very fairly.

3933. Pleuro-pneumonia is in some respects more important to stamp out than foot and mouth disease?—I think it is.

3934. But pleuro-pneumonia is more difficult to detect, is it not, on account of its long period of incubation?—It is.

3935. And other diseases being so much more like it?—Yes.

3936. Do you think that you could rely upon the farmers and the police in the matter, and that it would not be necessary to have a veterinary inspection?—I do not say that you could walk any scheme without veterinary surgeons, or competent men to deal with the disease; but what I submit upon that point is this, that the number of centres of pleuro-pneumonia at the present time in Ireland is really so limited, that I think you could deal with the disease with a very small staff.

3937. You have had the disease there all the time that you have had to do with the management of cattle, have you not?—It has always been in Dublin. In 1870-71 we were free from the disease; latterly it has been brought in by a few cattle which had been purchased.

3938. Mr. Moss (C.) Purchased where?—At different fairs. I shall be glad, if it would interest the Committee, to give them a return of the progress of the disease. At the present moment at Glasnevin we have had a good deal of it, and it has been confined so far to the purchased cattle.

3939. (Chairman.) What stock has it occurred amongst?—cattle purchased at different fairs from time to time.

3940. When you said home-bred, you meant bred upon the farm, I presume?—I meant stock bred on the farm.

3941. You do not mean Irish bred?—No, certainly not; bred upon the farm.

3942. As regards the loss from foot and mouth disease, upon what principle have you estimated it?—We know, as I said before, pretty well the aggregate value of the live stock and sheep in Ireland, and everybody will estimate, of course, that a certain per-centage is lost.

3943. Do you mean dead?—No, lost; because, as a rule, the foot and mouth disease does not kill.

3944. Upon what principle do you estimate the loss?—Upon the idea that a certain per-centage of the property is destroyed annually.

3945. Upon

Professor
T. Balch.
—
24 April
1873.

3945. Upon what principle do you estimate the per-centage?—As I stated before, I put myself in communication with the most competent authorities in different parts of the country to find out what the average loss in each district is.

3946. Mr. Dedon.] By destruction of property, do you mean loss of life only, or loss of condition?—Destruction of property.

3947. Chairman.] Will you describe the answer from one of these correspondents so as to give the Committee an idea of how your correspondent arrives at the loss?—Take a man living in Meath. He knows a district containing 30,000 cattle; he lives by cattle, and he goes to fairs and markets, and he tells you that there is an annual loss of 8 per cent. ordinarily. I dare say you saw the report of the meeting of the Hereford Chamber of Agriculture, the president of it detailing the amount of loss there.

3948. Do you mean by the 8 per cent. that the animals have sold for 8 per cent. less value?—No, the owner may lose 8 per cent. without selling an animal at all; he may lose upon the condition of the beast, and he may lose 8 per cent. of the crops in getting that condition up again. Perhaps I can explain the matter a little better in this way: A man has 40 head of store cattle, and the disease appears and runs through the whole lot; the loss will probably be from 30s. to 21s. a head, and it is a matter of easy calculation then what the per-centage is.

3949. I want to know how you arrive at the certainty of this loss of 30s. a head?—You cannot arrive at it as you would work out an equation or a problem in mathematics; it is an approximation at the best.

3950. Do you mean to say that if you were to sell them to-day there would be that amount of loss?—In that case the loss would be considerably more, but an intelligent practical man knows the condition of cattle when the disease happens and the condition in which the disease left the animal, and he would say to himself that it would take 30s. worth of food more to restore the animal to his previous condition than would be necessary otherwise. Then, taking dairy cattle, there is the loss of milk besides loss of condition. I have never had an attack of foot and mouth disease among dairy stock in Glaucevin, without incurring a loss of 8 l. per head.

3951. What is the worst attack of foot and mouth disease that you have had upon your own farm which has caused the greatest loss of property?—When it appeared among a herd of dairy cattle.

3952. Can you refer to the case in which the property of which you have charge has suffered the greatest loss?—In all my experience, I should say the property suffered the greatest loss in 1864-65. The loss was very great last year.

3953. Upon this farm, what would be the number of cattle which you would have?—The cattle amongst which the disease appeared were 32; it appeared in 25 of them.

3954. You take stock every year, I believe?—Yes, every year.

3955. Could you give the Committee the balance sheet of the year in which you made this loss. What I want to see, is your own statement of profit and loss for that year; the actual loss which has resulted from the foot and mouth disease?—I should be very happy to furnish you with the balance sheet of the farm, but that will not throw any light upon the subject.

0.38.

3956. Why not?—Because, before I could work out the balance sheet of last year to show that, I must get the valuation of the stock before the disease appeared, and when the disease left them.

3957. But surely, if the foot and mouth disease caused you a certain positive loss, you would be able, in your balance-sheet, to show how that loss has been incurred?—It is impossible to do so.

3958. You say that the actual loss from foot and mouth disease is 3,000,000 l. for last year to Ireland?—That is from all preventible diseases.

3959. How much of that would you attribute to foot and mouth disease?—I should certainly say that last year it amounted to 1,500,000 l.

3960. When you say 1,500,000 l. for last year owing to foot and mouth disease, do you mean that if there had been no foot and mouth disease there would have been 1,500,000 l. more money in the pockets of the Irish people?—There would have been 1,500,000 l. more property in their possession, but not more money.

3961. That is to say, their property would be worth 1,500,000 l. more?—I am very clear indeed upon that point; there would be the loss of condition, the loss of milk, and the loss of calves, and the loss of cattle. The loss of condition in sheep, and the loss of lambs, in consequence of the foot and mouth disease in sheep.

3962. Do you mean, we will say, that on the 1st of March, in 1873, the value of the cattle in Ireland was 1,500,000 l. less than it would have been if there had been no foot and mouth disease?—Not at all. The best way I can put it to you is this: that there has been a destruction of property of the landed gentry and tenant farmers, caused by the foot and mouth disease, to the extent of 1,500,000 l.

3963. Do you imagine that of this 1,500,000 l., part would be that the stock would be worth less at the time it was taken, and part would be that more food had been obliged to be put into the animals than would otherwise have been necessary?—It may happen that animals affected with the foot and mouth disease in the month of June would be more valuable in the month of January next than if no foot and mouth disease had appeared, and yet I would have lost. Supposing you are a manufacturer of linen, and your linen becomes damp, or that your property in linen is destroyed in that way, surely you suffer a loss.

3964. Undoubtedly I suffer a loss if I have to sell at a loss?—In either case, surely you lose. Supposing it was burnt.

3965. Supposing it is burnt, it is gone?—Part of my property in cattle is burnt up by foot and mouth disease.

3966. I want you to tell me the way in which you think this loss has been made up; 1,500,000 l., you say, has been lost by foot and mouth disease in a year, part of it would be represented by the stock being at the end of the year of less value than at the beginning?—Yes.

3967. How would the rest of the loss be represented?—It would be that, in consequence of this disease, this wildfire, as I may call it, consuming my property, I am unable to convert my hay and roots into so much meat, or milk, or butter, as I otherwise could.

3968. That is to say, that your sales have been interfered with?—Yes; and my expenses may have been increased.

v 4

3969. Then

Professor
T. Baileys.
—
24 April
1873.

3969. Then another component of the loss would be that you have made less sales?—No, for I do not think that the question of sales concerns it. I speak of the loss simply as a destruction of property. I have a sick of hay, and if I give it to healthy cattle it is worth so much more than if I give it to unhealthy cattle.

3970. Mr. Menzies.] Supposing the condition which had been put upon an animal by the 1st of May by feeding amounted to 30s., and the animal lost the whole of that 30s. worth of feeding by foot and mouth disease, you would have to put the whole of the 30s. upon it again; that is what you mean?—Yes, that is so.

3971. Chairmen.] And you have not been able to sell during the time?—Yes; and I do not get that profit from my crops.

3972. There is the fact that you have not sold during the time, and that you wished to sell?—Yes, and that my receipts are not so large.

3973. Now, I think with this description you could give us a balance-sheet which would work out the foot and mouth disease, and apply it to these three items?—I could make an estimate of it.

3974. Will you kindly do it in the form in which you have had the largest loss; we should be glad to see it?—I will do so.

3975. With regard to the passage from Ireland to England, you are clearly of opinion that the disease was not generated on board ship?—I am clearly of that opinion.

3976. But do you think that the disease is caught on board ship at all?—If you once get a diseased lot of cattle on board a ship, it is possible that the poison may get into the wood, and remain there a short time, and infect a clean lot coming afterwards.

3977. You have not experience enough to say with regard to that?—No; nobody has, I should say.

3978. Have you bred animals for the English markets much?—Not specially for the English market; they find their way to all places.

3979. Now, with regard to the experiments with pleuro-pneumonia, what number of animals did you experiment upon with cotton-wool saturated with the virus of pleuro-pneumonia?—I have operated on 23.

3980. At the same time you could give the number that took the disease?—Of those, 12 took the disease.

3981. And also the respective periods after which the disease appeared?—It raised from 17 to 44 days.

3982. And also a map of the farm, showing its various parts?—I have a map (now handed in).

3983. Were the experiments performed during one season?—During several seasons.

3984. Was there disease upon the farm at the time they were performed?—There was.

3985. In every case?—Yes.

3986. Mr. Clare Reed.] Have you had any special education as a veterinary surgeon?—No, never in respect of studying at a veterinary college.

3987. Where did you acquire your veterinary knowledge?—I suppose that I acquired it very much as you have acquired yourself a general knowledge of cattle diseases, by careful study. I do not profess to be a veterinary surgeon.

3988. But you have a certain scientific knowledge as well as a practical knowledge of the diseases of animals?—A little, but not very much.

I may say that having a large number of young men as students under my charge, I have been compelled, in justice to them, to pay a little more attention to this subject than I otherwise might; that is all I can say.

3989. But you have a certain knowledge of these diseases which you speak of, not only of the practical course which they take, but also of their pathology?—A little, just acquired in the way I speak of.

3990. You are quite positive of the fact that foot and mouth disease does not arise spontaneously in Ireland?—I am quite clear upon that point.

3991. And that it is of foreign importation?—I am also quite clear upon that point.

3992. Are you of opinion that the disease could be extended to other animals except cattle, sheep, pigs, and goats?—And rabbits and hares.

3993. Have you ever seen cases of that?—I have.

3994. And dogs?—I have not seen a case in dogs, but I have seen a case of it in hares and rabbits; that is to say, I have seen what would justify me in saying that it was the disease, but to pigs I have communicated the disease over and over again through milk.

3995. And fowls?—I have never seen a case in fowls.

3996. I understand you to say that some sewage water, which had flowed from a shed where some diseased cattle were, had percolated through some drains, and had been used for some other cattle, and you think that that communicated the disease?—I believe it did. It was not in a shed but in a field, to which liquid manure had been applied upon the principle advocated some time ago by Mr. Mechi; the ground from constant use lost its power of absorbing the fecal matter, and the sewage went from the land as it went upon it. When you pass the poison of foot and mouth disease through ordinary land, as you know better than I do, everybody admits that the power of the poison is likely to be destroyed, but in this case the poverty of the soil having been destroyed by constant use, it lost that power, and the poison passed through the soil into the place where the cattle drank.

3997. You think that very frequently the disease is communicated by means of streams?—I qualified that opinion by saying that I think it is not very often. I have no doubt of the disease being communicated by water, but I would not go so far as to say that it was communicated very often. I should say that when it gets to big streams that it is so diluted that it would not be conveyed by them.

3998. You said that it happens more frequently when it flows down than up a stream; is it ever carried up a stream?—I have not known it to travel up a stream.

3999. I think in the Veterinary Report of last year for Ireland, it is said that in the months of May and June 1871, foot and mouth disease was entirely absent from Ireland; have you any reason to believe that that is a correct statement?—I have no doubt they believe it, but I certainly do not believe it.

4000. You think that the disease might have existed and not been brought to the knowledge of the Veterinary Department?—Quite so.

4001. At the time of the cattle plague in Ireland, was the whole of the country under the cattle plague regulations that no stock should

move at all, or only a certain portion of it?—It was under regulations so far, that you could not import; and when once the cattle plague appeared, as it did appear, in county Meath and county Down, those spots were dealt with as vigorously as possible, and the disease stamped out at once.

4002. But the whole of the cattle plague regulations, such as we had in England, whereby no stock could move for a period, certainly, of more than three months, did not apply to the whole of Ireland?—No.

4003. Would you think it probable, that as we had these regulations in England for a period, certainly, of three months, and, I think, they extended to six months, we should have got rid of the disease in England during that time?—You got rid of it hugely, certainly.

4004. But as we have no record of it, at least for one year, do you think it possible that it might have been entirely got rid of by those means?—I think it is quite possible to have got rid of it by those means.

4005. Was the outbreak of 1872 in Ireland of foot and mouth disease an exceptional one in its nature or extent, or in what respect?—In regard to its prevalence.

4006. Do you know whether Spain is always or generally free from foot and mouth disease and pleuro-pneumonia?—It has been generally free, more especially from foot and mouth disease.

4007. How many animals, as a rule, would escape pleuro-pneumonia, and how many would escape foot and mouth disease if one animal only was affected in a herd?—That depends very much upon the herd. In the case of stock bred and reared upon the farm, and properly treated, as in the case of Glasgow, you are liable to have a very small percentage of the animals affected with pleuro-pneumonia; whereas you are liable in the case of animals bred by small farmers and purchased from them, or from jobbers in the fair, to have the disease more extensively. It may happen, as it is happening now at Glasgow, that every one of these cattle will get pleuro-pneumonia. With regard to foot and mouth disease, I find that your home-bred stock are not so likely to escape the disease. I find very little difference, practically speaking, even between your own home-bred stock and purchased stock.

4008. Do you believe that high-bred pedigree stock are more liable to disease than other cattle?—I believe less so.

4009. Then the opinion we have heard advanced here is not your opinion?—I am only giving my experience.

4010. Do you apply that answer to all diseases?—No; only to pleuro-pneumonia.

4011. Not to foot and mouth disease?—No, I made that distinction between the two. I made the remark that in pleuro-pneumonia the percentage affected of your own home-bred stock is much less than of your purchased cattle; whereas the percentage is about the same with regard to foot and mouth disease.

4012. But if your home-bred stock were taken a long journey, and sent across the Irish Channel in a badly-ventilated ship, and deprived of food and water for a very considerable time, I suppose they would be just as liable to take foot and mouth disease as other cattle?—They would not be so liable, I should say.

4013. Because of the superior strength of their
0.55.

constitutions?—I think there is more vital energy in them.

4014. But if there happened to be one animal affected with pleuro-pneumonia on board the ship, and the other animals had for a period of 12 hours to breathe the same air, there would be a very considerable number, I presume, of those animals affected with pleuro-pneumonia; whereas, on the other hand, if they happened to be in a field they might have a chance of escape?—Where animals are crowded together, and where the breath is so confined, the breath being to my belief the great source of infection, I believe that in the transit of animals across the Channel you are liable to have a very large proportion of animals affected with pleuro-pneumonia, if the poison be there.

4015. I am supposing that there was one and only one animal affected with pleuro-pneumonia in a lot of 200 or 300?—I have no doubt upon that point.

4016. Would you think that that was the reason why so many cattle coming to Norfolk are affected with pleuro-pneumonia?—I should say not the primary cause; it may be a cause. I admit frankly that there is a great deal of disease in Ireland. The fact that the Government returns show we had 15,000 centres of infection of foot and mouth disease last year is conclusive upon that point. I admit that Dublin is a hot-bed of pleuro-pneumonia.

4017. I am now speaking of pleuro-pneumonia, and this is a well-known fact, that the Irish cattle which comes to Norwich Hill are more liable to pleuro-pneumonia than the cattle that come by rail, we will say from Yorkshire or Westmoreland; do you think that the long voyage and the longer extent of journey has anything to do with increasing the number of cases of pleuro-pneumonia?—I should certainly say that it is an aggravating cause; it predisposes the animals (to speak more correctly) to take the disease.

4018. I suppose that remark would apply to all animals which had a long sea voyage?—Yes, it would.

4019. Your experiments in endeavouring to induce animals to take pleuro-pneumonia resulted in this, that you found, after you had experimented upon them, that from 17 to 44 days was the period of incubation?—Yes, it varied.

4020. Then, when our Act of Parliament says that a place shall be declared infected for pleuro-pneumonia only 28 days, it is quite possible that that may not be long enough?—Quite possible.

4021. And, however the local authority may try to carry out the Act, and may do it thoroughly well, and yet at the same time not stop the spread of pleuro-pneumonia?—That is so, in my judgment.

4022. I understood you to say that pleuro-pneumonia is communicated almost entirely by the breath; when a bullock is dead, is there any fear of that dead bullock conveying the disease?—I think not.

4023. Then why would you have the carcases buried and destroyed?—I expected that question, and I would answer it by saying that I should like to err upon the safe side; we are dealing with two diseases which involve a frightful loss, pleuro-pneumonia is so subtle a disease, and I desire respectfully to say to the Committee that any opinion I express upon the nature of the disease I put forward with very great diffidence; it is the most extraordinary disease that I have
X had

Professor
T. Balch.

24 April
1873.

Professor
T. Balch.
—
24 April
1875.

had any experience of; it baffles all your knowledge, and is a disease of that kind, which is so difficult to deal with and to understand, I say that it is far better to err upon the safe side.

4024. But if it be true that the moment an animal is dead the risk of contagion is almost entirely destroyed, would it not be possible to get rid of pleuro-pneumonia by simply slaughtering animals that were actually diseased, and not necessarily killing those with which they were herded?—No, I think not. I do not think that follows at all, because, as long as you are liable to have the disease communicated, the danger exists. The animal which had the disease before you slaughtered it might have done the mischief; it might have communicated the disease to others.

4025. But I suppose, during the time of incubation, they do not spread the disease; it is only when the disease has developed that the animals spread the disease?—If you could precisely gauge the point at which the disease does become poisonous that would be true, but you cannot do so.

4026. But when the animal is dead, if there is no fear of contagion, and you isolated the herd, say for a period of two months, killing all the animals as they fell down with the disease, do you think that it is absolutely necessary, in order to get rid of this disease, to kill all those which have been herded with the animals affected?—I can only repeat the opinion I express, and I give it with very great diffidence; I believe that the pleuro-pneumonia poison is in the breath, but I will not say with the same confidence that the poison ceases to be generated with the death of the animal; I believe it does.

4027. And you also strengthen that belief with this fact, that you have not been able to communicate the disease except by the breath?—That is very true; but in legislating you require more information than that. I think that one mistake of the Act, as it exists, is, that it is based upon impractical data and not really accurate data.

4028. If it were really once stamped out, and then if it were re-imported, you would kill all the rest of the animals?—Yes, I would just do as you propose to do, and I think very properly, with sheep-pox.

4029. You think that no inspection or quarantine of foreign animals would be a safeguard against introducing disease?—I think that quarantine would be ruinous to the Irish trade.

4030. I am supposing we have entirely got rid of pleuro-pneumonia and foot and mouth disease from Great Britain and Ireland, and I ask, would any amount of quarantine prevent the re-importing of disease?—No, certainly not.

4031. What would you do with regard to foreign stock; would you have all the fat stock killed at the ports at which they are landed?—I have considered the subject more as it concerns the interests of Ireland than as it concerns the interest of England.

4032. But do you not introduce foreign sheep into Ireland as well as Spanish cattle?—We have had some calves from Holland and some sheep from other countries, but our chief trade in importing is in cattle from the Peninsula.

4033. Are the calves that are sent to Ireland all killed?—They are all veal calves, as they are called.

4034. But, take the case of London, where

the foreign cattle come into the Metropolitan Market and are allowed to go all over the kingdom after a certain amount of inspection, except those coming from the scheduled counties; if that were to continue should we have any sort of guarantee against the re-introduction of those diseases from abroad?—As you are pressing me upon this point I should say, speaking as regards England, that this Committee and Parliament owe it to the agricultural interest of England to encourage the importation of dead meat. I think if you do that you will meet every end which can be desired.

4035. Do you mean by encouraging the importation of dead meat, killing the animals upon this or the other side?—I should prefer killing them upon the other side.

4036. Do you think that could be practically adopted?—I find two companies getting up already in London. I am not competent to form an opinion upon the subject, but still, while I have been in London I have been paying some attention to it, and I think the process which are likely to be introduced must succeed; I think they are sound in principle.

4037. *Chairman.* When you say the Committee ought to encourage the importation of dead meat, how would you encourage it?—A very strong measure of encouraging it could be to prohibit the importation of live fat stock from abroad.

4038. *Mr. Clerk Read.* You think that if it were possible to kill the stock upon the Continent and send the carcasses here, there would be hardly any danger of infection?—That would put an end to the whole thing, in my judgment.

4039. If it were possible to kill the cattle upon the other side of the water and import the dead meat, it would save a considerable amount of actual loss of food and also suffering to the cattle?—I believe, all things considered, it is the only enlightened system by which you can still supply the English market with beef and mutton, and at the same time protect yourselves from the fearful loss which the importation of foreign cattle plague is likely to entail upon you. I see no other practical solution of the difficulty.

4040. With regard to compensation, do you not think that in a case of pleuro-pneumonia, if the compensation was two-thirds of the value of the diseased animals, and the full value of those that were herded with them, that would be sufficient?—I should say it would be a great satisfaction. The Right Honourable Chairman must not misunderstand me; all I want is that you should carry with you the co-operation of the agricultural interest, and if by paying us a fair price you can effect a large object it is worth while doing it.

4041. The Right Honourable Chairman rather put it that your plan would be giving a small bribe to a farmer; would it be a matter of justice that he should be paid two-thirds of the value of diseased animals, and the full value of those that were herded with them?—I am quite sure that would meet the ends of the case. The farmer would be satisfied with reasonable justice in the case.

4042. *Chairman.* In what way do you consider that would be justice?—In the first place, it is no injustice to anybody. I think that the taxpayer is bound to come in to the rescue of the stockowner. As I said before, he is interested in having cheap and good meat.

4043. But

4043. But do you not admit that if he was to get two-thirds of the value of an animal that was affected with the disease, and the whole value of those that were barded with it, he would get from the State much more money than he would be able to get himself by either selling in the market or by taking the chance of the disease running out?—I think he would.

4044. Then how do you consider that his getting more money than he would otherwise have got is due to him in justice?—I think that if you come to me and ask me to slaughter a lot of beasts upon which, in my judgment, I could protect myself, you owe it to me to pay me every shilling of the value of the beasts that are only supposed to be within the range of infection.

4045. But does not justice require that you should only pay to the farmer what he would lose if you did not pay him?—That is so.

4046. Then, if you pay him more than he would lose, how would that be doing justice?—I should like to encourage every stockowner to become so enlightened as possible in dealing with his stock.

4047. But that is basing it upon expediency, not upon justice?—I cannot go further than that.

4048. Mr. *Clare Read*.] But a forced sale of cattle would be like dealing with a railway. When you take land for a railway you are forced to give more than it is worth?—Much more than it is worth.

4049. Do you think that unjust to the public?—I think not.

4050. Do you not think that in the case of pleuro-pneumonia the salvage of animals which you would slaughter would be at least one-fourth?—I will tell you what is done in some of the dairies. What happens there is this: when they have discovered the disease they have arrangements with the butcher, and they get more than 50 per cent. of the value of the beast; and if the property were my own, and I did as many a dairyman in Dublin does, I could get two-thirds of the value of every dairy cow affected, having them in good condition. I think justice requires that I should be adequately paid for those cattle.

4051. *Chairman*.] You think that the animals which are affected with the disease would really be able to fetch in the market two-thirds of their previous value?—Yes, I could get that, if I had the management of the stock under me for my own use.

4052. Mr. *Clare Read*.] Supposing I had a fat bullock which was affected with the disease, and I discovered it in the first instance, should I not get nine-tenths of the value of that bullock?—I should certainly say that you ought to get in that case the full value, because you can send it to London.

4053. I cannot send it to London, but I can kill it upon the farm?—I mean that you can kill it on the farm, and send it in a dead state.

4054. You think that the Veterinary Department of Ireland, as at present constituted, has not a sufficient staff?—I think it has quite an inadequate staff to carry out the object which it has before it, but I do not approve of that object.

4055. Have you any idea what it costs the country?—It would be quoting from memory.

4056. What are the expenses of the Veterinary?

4057. The Veterinary Department of Dublin?—The Parliamentary Papers ought to give it.

4058. In Ireland it is all done by the Imperial Government rather than by the local government, is it not?—Yes.

4059. Have you any faith at all in applying the system of local authority in Ireland; would the local authority be worse than in England, or better?—I should say, in dealing with a question of this kind, it is bad everywhere; I can give an instance of that; you contrasted the State gird in Dublin to a local body, and the result was that Mr. James Stephens, the Fenian Head Centre, disappeared from it; I should be very sorry to see that done with cattle diseases.

4060. How was the compensation for cattle plague paid in Ireland?—It was paid out of a public rate levied on the union; there was first of all a rate, called a rate-in-aid; a small sum of money was subscribed, but only a fraction of it was expended.

4061. You have stated that there was a vast difference in the amount of disease between the breeding and the feeding counties of Ireland; that would be the case, I suppose, everywhere?—It is the case in every country in which infectious diseases exist.

4062. And therefore you would not be surprised to hear that we in Norfolk, who buy almost all our stock, have a greater proportion of disease than any other county in England?—Not at all; I should be quite prepared to hear that.

4063. And you do not think that it is the fault of the local authorities in England that we have the disease, notwithstanding the operation of this Act?—I have seen the report, and it appears to me to be admitted upon all hands that the system has broken down.

4064. At the same time it must be much more difficult for the local authority to administer the Act in a thoroughly grazing county than in a breeding county, where no stock comes in?—It is much more so.

4065. And the regulations which might produce favourable results in a breeding county would have no effect in a grazing district?—That is so.

4066. I think you said your cows lost you, when attacked with foot and mouth disease, 8*l.* per cow?—I estimate the loss of my property from loss of condition, loss of milk, and loss of cows from abortion at that amount.

4067. Is it very frequently the case that abortion results from foot and mouth disease?—Yes.

4068. With sheep as well as with cattle?—Yes, with sheep as well as with cattle. In qualification of the answer I gave to a previous question which was put to me by you, I would say that I have never known foot and mouth disease to affect sheep so severely as last year.

4069. Did you observe the disease in the month?—I did.

4070. Did you ever observe it there before?—As a matter of fact I never did, but perhaps it was because I did not pay sufficient attention to it, but I saw it in hundreds of cases in 1872.

4071. Therefore, in that particular instance, you considered the disease more severe?—Yes, but not as it affected cattle.

4072. Have you had cases of a recurrence of the disease in the same beast?—I have had it three times in a beast successively in 1872.

4073. Have you known that more than once?—Yes,

Professor
T. B. B. B.
24 April
1873.

Professor
T. Balcham.

24 April
1878.

—Yes, I have had it recurring twice in the same beasts in 1868 or 1869.

4073. How much do you put down, as a rule, as the loss of milk?—More than one-half.

4074. It has been stated in evidence that the loss to the farmer who did not sell the milk was very trifling; would you be of that opinion?—Not at all; it is impossible that it could be trifling.

4075. Do you sell the milk?—A good deal of it.

4076. What do you make of it?—Sixteen pence a gallon.

4077. Upon the farm, or delivered in Dublin?—Delivered in Dublin.

4078. Mr. Peck.] What is the size of the gallon; is it a harn gallon, or what?—Four imperial quarts.

4079. Mr. Clare Head.] The Right Honourable Chairman wishes to know how you make out, at sixteen pence a gallon, a loss of 8 l.?—While the animal is diseased there is a complete loss of the milk; an animal will never come up to the full milking property again.

4080. Not until after she has calved again?—Not in the same season.

4081. Do they not frequently lose a quarter of the udder?—They do; sometimes one quarter is permanently lost.

4082. How much milk will your good cows give in a day?—The average of the Glasnevin dairy cows is about 820 gallons of milk in a year.

4083. It is the general opinion that, although this loss of milk and of meat falls first upon the farmer, in the end it falls upon the community?—I think it must; it falls first upon the farmer. It must fall upon the community ultimately, as far as I can judge.

4084. And although the agricultural community may reap some advantage from the increased prices, the individual farmer, who has had the loss is not the individual who gains all that compensation?—I should say the individual farmer must get a very small proportion of it indeed, and I should doubt very much whether the agricultural classes receive the increased prices; certainly not the increased prices of milk and butter equivalent to the loss which they sustain.

4085. Then there is the fear of this disease, which disarranges the farmer's plans, and must interfere with the management of a farm?—Yes. In illustration of that view I may state this, that my own district is surrounded by disease at Glasnevin, and we are so fearful of getting the disease that we do not make as much of the land as we should.

4086. Sometimes the whole of the grass is given away?—We go more into sheep. At Glasnevin the rent is 6 l. 15 s., and it is extremely difficult to make that out of sheep.

4087. You were at Ballinasloe fair in 1872, I believe?—Yes, I was.

4088. Did you observe any animals then affected with foot and mouth disease?—I saw several.

4089. What was the process of inspection there; were those animals taken out and detained?—No; there was only one Government inspector, and what was in one Government inspector in a great fair like Ballinasloe.

4090. What did he do?—I believe he discovered one or two animals, and they were isolated for a short time. I happened to be with Mr. Jenkins, of the Royal Agricultural Society,

and he tells the whole story in the journal of that society.

4091. I suppose the rest of the cattle which had been herded with those diseased animals went all over the country?—Yes, they went all over the country, but independently of the animals which were isolated by the veterinary inspector, I saw and examined several sheep and cattle which had the disease, and I may mention further that the disease among the sheep prevailed in the fair to such a frightful extent, that I had some sheep to buy, and I bought them upon a neighbouring farm, which I knew had a clean bill of health, rather than buy them at the fair.

4092. Did you upon removing them home catch the disease?—I am sorry to say I did from the trucks.

4093. You believe the trucks were not clean?—I think so.

4094. Is there not an order in Ireland for the disinfection of trucks?—There is an order of May 1871, I think, but it could not be carried out.

4095. Why not?—How could you disinfect the trucks at Ballinasloe; I stood there for hours looking on, and all that I could say was they could not do it, they came so rapidly to clear off the number of sheep and cattle that were there, that it would be simply impossible.

4096. Would it not be possible to have the disinfection done elsewhere, and have the trucks come up clean after the cattle had been delivered, instead of in the dirty state in which I have seen them?—In order to do that they would require such an enormously increased number of trucks, that the dividend of the company would suffer seriously.

4097. Are you acquainted with the landing places and lairs round Dublin?—Yes.

4098. What state are they in?—In a very indifferent state.

4099. Is there any attempt made to cleanse and disinfect them?—None.

4100. Is there any order to disinfect them?—I do not believe that it could be carried out any more than at Ballinasloe, and to speak candidly I do not believe in that sort of disinfection.

4101. I am trying to find out whether your central authority does its duty very much better than our local authorities?—Yes, I think it does its work a great better than your local authorities.

4102. But in these cases that you have mentioned, it does not seem to do so?—Unfortunately as in everything else, a strong pressure was brought upon the Government, and No. 14 of the orders was cancelled within a month after it was issued.

4103. What was the nature of that order?—It was an order with regard to the cleansing of trucks.

4104. Mr. Dawson.] Did I understand, that in order to extirpate foot and mouth disease, you would stop all movement of store stock without a license?—I would go further than that; I would stop them under all conditions. I should be afraid almost, that the license would not be sufficient. I would impose a very heavy fine upon anybody who moved them without a license.

4105. Would you allow them to be moved with a license, or not at all?—I would allow them to be moved with a license, but that is only with reference to fat stock.

4106. But

Professor
T. Balchais.
24 April
1873.

4105. But my question applied to store stock?—Unquestionably, I would stop the movement of store stock for six weeks or two months.

4107. You are speaking of Ireland?—Yes, I am speaking of Ireland.

4108. Would the public opinion of the farmers be so far favourable to that, that those restrictions could be enforced?—I believe the feeling of everybody would be favourable to it, except that of the class which is more numerous than I like to see it, the class of jobbers; very many small farmers in Ireland are becoming jobbers to the great neglect and injury of their farming and business, and if my proposal had no effect but to check this class of men, it would do some good.

4109. But if you had not the help of that class, would it be possible to do much good?—I should say that class represents a very small portion of the public opinion in Ireland; the great bulk of the farmers I think would support you; perhaps not in that particular measure, but in any measure which would rid them of the disease.

4110. *Chairman.* I understand you to say that a great proportion of the farmers, that is, the owners of cattle, are jobbers now?—More than I like to see; but not a very large number.

4111. *Mr. Dodson.* I understood you to say that a large number of small farmers were jobbers, and that they were increasing in number?—I said there was a greater number than I should like to see.

4112. Did you not say that there was a larger number of small farmers becoming jobbers?—I said that there was a larger number than I should like to see.

4113. You stated that you would allow fat stock to be moved with a license?—I should like the trade to be as free as possible. I should say the license would be no inconvenience, and I would not allow the cattle to be moved without a license.

4114. How do you propose that that license should be obtained?—From the nearest police station.

4115. Is it no inconvenience for a man who wants to move his cattle to have to obtain a license?—It is some inconvenience, but it is so small that I should say nobody would feel it.

4116. Have you had any practical experience of moving cattle under a system of licenses in Ireland?—I have; and I did not find it any inconvenience. I would apply to the nearest police station and get my license.

4117. How long has that system been in force?—It has been in force a long time; I cannot fix the date.

4118. *Chairman.* It has been in force in the case of foot and mouth disease being in a herd?—Yes.

4119. *Mr. Dodson.* But not generally throughout the country?—It does not come into force until your herd is affected.

4120. But under your proposition it would be general?—It would.

4121. *Mr. Cleve Read.* For a fixed period?—For a fixed period.

4122. *Mr. Dodson.* Can you distinguish sufficiently between store stock and fat stock to carry out those regulations?—The distinction between them would be very simple indeed. If a man said, I will sell my stock as fat stock, I would brand it, and it would be known to be fat stock.

. 0.58.

4123. And, therefore, he would have to apply for a license, and to have his animals branded?—Yes; and that the brand would receive favour in Ireland; I am happy to quote the authority of one of the most influential agricultural societies, the Royal Dublin Society. Amongst their papers you will find a recommendation to that effect; they are a very influential body, representing a large section of the agricultural interests in Ireland.

4124. You think that public opinion would be sufficiently favourable to this system of licensing and branding, to enable it to be carried out?—I do.

4125. This recommendation of the Royal Dublin Society is, that in order to distinguish store cattle from those destined for slaughter, the latter should be marked by the owner with a distinctive and authorised brand, then the authority which issued the license would have to see that the brand was affixed?—Somebody would have to see it done, and the Royal Dublin Society mean that otherwise it would be useless.

4126. With regard to the foreign trade, you said that you would, as far as possible, substitute a dead-meat trade for the trade in fat stock; what would you do in the case of foreign store stock?—Will you allow me to repeat, that not having studied the question as concerns the interests of England, I am very unwilling to express any opinion upon that point; but it does appear to me that it is only a question of time when you will insist upon the introduction into England of meat from the Continent as dead meat. I should say now, that most people would agree in that opinion. And going so far as this with regard to the store stock trade, I do not see any reason at all why you should not prohibit the importation of store stock altogether.

4127. You say that you do not import into Ireland foreign store stock?—As a rule, the cattle from the Peninsula are fat stock.

4128. Therefore you have not had occasion to consider that question?—But you asked me as regards England.

4129. You told the Committee that the poison of foot and mouth disease was carried, as you have found by your experience, down streams?—I expressed that opinion.

4130. Is it carried also by the wind?—I think not.

4131. You have not been able to trace that?—I stated one or two facts which appeared to me to negative that belief.

4132. I understood you to say, as regards the loss of milk and butter caused by foot and mouth disease, the agriculturist did not recoup himself for that loss by the increased price of milk and butter?—I think it is quite clear that he cannot recoup himself for the loss. Take the Glasnevin farm. I think I am quite within the bounds of the facts of the case when I say that on that farm, which is managed simply for the public account, the loss last year upon 178 statute acres of land, in consequence of the outbreak of foot and mouth disease, and being threatened with pleuro-pneumonia, amounted to fully 500 £; and I do not see any possible way by which the farm could recoup itself in the increased price. There was no increase in the price of milk to begin with.

4133. That is the point I wanted to come to. I can quite understand that the individual farmer or the individual farm does not recoup itself; but taking

Professor
T. Baldwin.

24 April
1873.

taking the agricultural interest as a class, does or does not the higher price of milk and butter make up to them for the loss?—I should certainly say not. I do not find any rise in the price of milk and butter, for instance, which would at all justify me in saying that the farmer is recompensed. There is an increase, of course, arising from other causes, and some small portion, no doubt, of the price of store stock will be due, and must be due, to the destruction of the property in the stock; and so far the agricultural classes will, in time, be recompensed, at all events, to some extent. But what I want to convey to the Committee is, that the loss caused by foot and mouth disease and pleuro-pneumonia is a loss for which the agricultural interest is recompensed only to a very small extent.

4134. Do you say the same with regard to meat?—I do say the same with regard to meat, but not to the same extent. I should say they are recompensed a great deal more in the case of meat than in the case of milk.

4135. Why is that?—The first instance in which I think the destruction of live stock caused by any of these plagues had a marked effect upon increasing the price of stock, was after the cattle plague; and I think that that taught the farmers of England, Scotland, and Ireland that the price of stock rose in consequence of the loss of property caused by infectious diseases. I believe that the cattle plague has educated the agricultural classes to some extent to get back, as it were, from the general public some portion of the loss; but I say that they do not get back the whole of the loss, and it is impossible from the nature of the case that they can; because, if the individual does not get it after all, how can the bulk of the agriculturists get it? The bulk of the community is made up of individual farmers. I cannot recompense myself; my neighbour cannot recompense himself; and when individuals cannot recompense themselves, I cannot understand how the agricultural body can recompense itself.

4136. If the agriculturists as a body do not recover by the correspondingly increased price of the remaining animals, or of the remaining milk and butter for the loss which has been sustained, how does the public lose?—I do not say the public lose in that respect; somebody must lose when property is destroyed; but the public loses in being supplied with bad meat, and being supplied with bad milk; for instance, several dairymen send the milk of their diseased cows into Dublin, and from the effects it produces in calves and pigs, I should be disposed to say that it certainly must produce injurious results in human beings.

4137. But I understood you to say that it was worth while for the public to pay full compensation for the animals which were slaughtered, because the public suffered so much from the loss by diseases in the increase of the price, particularly of meat?—It is, in my judgment, the interest of the public to give adequate compensation in the way suggested.

4138. Now I understand you to say that the agriculturists do not get that increased price?—I think there is a distinction there, which is this, that it is the interest of the consumer that the price of beef and mutton should be as low as possible; he owes it to himself therefore to adopt any and every means which will work out that end. Now, if property in live stock is decreased, as it is decreased by these destruc-

tive diseases, I have no doubt that in the course of time, when the agricultural classes become as sharp as the commercial classes are, they will ultimately recompense themselves for the whole of the loss they have sustained; and I am very sorry that they have not shown sufficient intelligence and readiness to take advantage of the situation to recompense themselves adequately.

4139. You think that up to the present time they have not recompensed themselves, and that therefore the public has not had to pay so much as they otherwise would?—I should say that so far up to the present, the public has been the gainer, except that they have been using bad milk, and eating bad meat.

4140. But the loss of animals does not make the remaining beef in the country worse?—But you get, as I have mentioned already, a very considerable quantity of bad beef under the present regulations; my proposition would put an end to the trade in bad meat as well as to the trade in diseased animals.

4141. Am I to understand you to mean this, that it would be worth while for the public to be at the expense of giving full compensation for animals slaughtered now in order to prevent a possible rise in price hereafter from which they would suffer?—And to protect themselves from the consumption of bad milk and bad meat now.

4142. Mr. Bailey.] You have referred to Mr. Jenkins's report to the Royal Agricultural Society; you are probably acquainted with the regulations which Mr. Jenkins says he would like to see imposed, with regard to the Irish trade especially?—Yes, I have read them.

4143. Do you generally agree with the recommendations which he makes?—I should prefer that you will ask me about any one in particular, because, taking them as a whole, I do not quite agree with them.

4144. Do you agree with the recommendation that all Irish cattle to be sent across the Channel should be inspected at the port of embarkation?—I think that proposition would not cure the evil.

4145. Why do you think so?—Because, if you get Professor Simonds or Professor Brown to examine the animals at the ports, they will tell you that they cannot discover the animals in which the seeds of disease exist, and which are just the animals which it is most necessary to deal with.

4146. After what time do you think that the seeds are developed?—In foot and mouth disease I have known them to be developed in 36 hours.

4147. Supposing the disease to be acquired at Ballinasloe fair, and the animals to be sent to Dublin for shipment, would not, in general, a sufficient time elapse to enable the disease to declare itself?—I have known it to take five days to develop itself. As a rule, it is only a small fraction of the diseased beasts which are sent to fairs and markets, but animals in contact with diseased animals are sent to fairs and markets, and it is in that way that the mischief is done.

4148. From Mr. Jenkins's description of Ballinasloe fair, to which you accompanied him, it appears most likely that all beasts at the fair were more or less exposed to the danger of infection?—I know there was a great deal of disease in the fair at Ballinasloe. I want to tell the Committee the whole story, as far as I know it.

4149. Do you agree with Mr. Jenkins that it would be possible to trace the spread of foot and mouth

Professor
T. Balchin.
—
24 April
1873.

mouth disease in Ireland as radiating from that fair in October last?—It would be possible, but it would be a Herculean labour, I should think.

4150. It was spread from that fair, you think?—Yes; a neighbour of mine lost 50 sheep from that fair. I have known many instances of sheep leaving the fair at Ballinasloe, and dying on the way home.

4151. But you think that it would not be worth while to inspect cattle in Ireland at the ports of embarkation?—I think it would be comparatively useless.

4152. What do you think of inspection upon arrival here?—I think that it, too, would be comparatively useless as a means of preventing the spread of disease.

4153. Would you take any steps whatever?—My proposition is this; I would kill out the disease to begin with, and having killed it out, I would keep it out.

4154. But supposing the agricultural interest not to be quite willing to stamp out the disease in this manner, do you not think that the graziers in Ireland and the dealers in England would prefer as an alternative scheme some sort of inspection, even if they paid a little for it, which would give them a security against the introduction of disease?—I should think the only scheme which would give them security would be this, and it is a scheme which you would be supported in by English as well as Irish stockowners. Give Ireland a clean bill of health; the English buyer would have no further uneasiness, and you would give the Irish stockowner the full market value of his beasts.

4155. Do you think that would be generally agreed to in Ireland. You say that foot and mouth disease exists in Ireland now?—I do.

4156. Would the Irish graziers generally agree to the entire stoppage of the trade for the stamping out of the disease, which would take two or three months?—I believe the great majority of them would.

4157. In preference to some sort of inspection, either at the ports of embarkation or disembarkation?—I do not think they place much faith in inspection, and I believe that very few of the inspectors themselves place much faith in it.

4158. Do you agree with Mr. Jenkins with regard to the importance of disinfecting railway trucks?—I agree with him. We agreed at Ballinasloe, that nobody could disinfect the trucks at Ballinasloe, but I say that it is desirable to disinfect the trucks when you can; it is a sound system as far as it goes.

4159. When you say the central authority in Ireland carries out the regulations better than the local authorities in England, you would probably agree with the Royal Agricultural Society that the authorities have entirely failed to compel the disinfection of trucks?—I think a pressure was put upon the Government which was too strong for them to resist, and the order was withdrawn.

4160. You were not aware that in England there are local authorities which do at their own expense, appoint an inspector to see that the proper disinfection of the railway trucks is carried out?—I have heard of it, and I believe it is a very proper thing to do. I believe it so thoroughly that more than once when I bought stock at fairs and markets I have taken with me some carbolic acid and disinfected my own trucks. I

believe it is the proper thing to do, and so far I am quite in unison with Mr. Jenkins.

4161. There is an order at present in Ireland compelling the railway companies to disinfect the trucks, is there not?—Yes, that is so; it was suspended up to a certain point, I think, at the end of last year. At the present moment it is not suspended, but it is not put into execution.

4162. That would not be a good instance to show that the central authorities in Ireland have carried out the regulations better than the local authorities in England?—I will explain to you that I do not approve of many of the things which are said and done by the central authority; for instance, they represented that foot and mouth disease did not prevail extensively at Ballinasloe; whereas I saw the disease myself, and therefore I take a contrary view of it; but what I do say, in justice to the central authority in Dublin, is that when a pressure is brought to bear by certain strong interests upon the Government, and the Government yields, the central authority is then relieved of the responsibility.

4163. Then you think they are not supported by public opinion?—I think not. I think you will find that in the last 12 months there has been a large amount of education given to the Irish public upon the question of infection.

4164. Do you not think that some of the orders having been originally too strict have been in some degree the cause of that; I refer especially to Clause 13, which is known as the Foot and Mouth Order of 1870, which is referred to in the Report?—I do not remember the number of the Order.

4165. Will you look at that (*Handing a copy of the Report to the Witness*); it is an order which compels the slaughter of all animals which have been in contact with animals which have been affected with foot and mouth disease?—Considering the want of education amongst the agricultural classes upon this question of infection, I would say that this order was in advance of its time; but I hold that it is not a bit too far advanced for the necessities of the case, but quite beyond the appreciation of the Irish agricultural classes, of the necessity of dealing with infectious diseases in a rigid manner.

4166. As a matter of fact it has been a complete dead letter?—Yes, and in so far it is unfortunate.

4167. Is it not to the detriment of the carrying out of other regulations?—I do not see that. I think you can never suffer from the promulgation of an order or a rule which is really sound in principle. You may not be able to realise it for the time being; it is, of course, in advance of the time. The two regulations in this passage of the report appear to me to amount to this, that to be consistent they ought to have closed Ballinasloe fair, and consequently, taking these two orders as they stand, I do not approve of them.

4168. Although you would approve of them in the abstract?—I think it amounts to this, that the orders which would render it necessary to close Ballinasloe fair were, like many clauses in an Act of Parliament, loosely drawn. I think that is as much as you can say against that clause.

4169. Can you give me any idea of what is the proportion of fat stock which comes from Ireland?—I think it supplies, as far as I recollect, about 27 per cent. of the total meat supply of

Professor
T. Baileys.
—
24 April
1873.

of England, according to the return of the Veterinary Department.

4170. I wanted to know the proportion which the fat stock from Ireland bears to the store stock?—I could not answer that question from memory.

4171. Mr. J. Bright.] I think, in the beginning of your examination, you assumed that those diseases about which you have been questioned were of foreign origin?—Yes, I assumed that.

4172. You believe that that is so?—Yes, I do.

4173. What makes you believe that?—There are several reasons which force that opinion upon me. I think it is a matter of historical certainty that one of them was imported into the county of Waterford by Dutch cattle.

4174. Which two diseases are you referring to?—I have been almost confining myself to pleuro-pneumonia and foot and mouth disease. In the next place both have been imported, I believe; they did not appear before a certain period, and they are capable of being stamped out or dealt with. The regulations imposed in England at the time of the cattle plague immediately reduced the amount of the disease in England, and they were gradually reducing it, and they would ultimately have killed it out.

4175. But would not the same means kill the disease out in every country?—Yes; but there is this difficulty, that each of those great plagues has its own home or centre.

4176. But I thought you were arguing that as it could be stamped out, that was a proof that it was of foreign origin?—That was one of the reasons.

4177. Could not you stamp it out in every country by the same means?—Not in its native home.

4178. How is that?—Reasoning from analogy, I should say, with reference to cattle plague, there is no doubt that that has a home; it comes by certain well-marked lines to England, as does Asiatic cholera. We know pretty well with regard to small-pox in sheep, that that is an imported disease; we can trace pretty well the lines in which foot and mouth disease and pleuro-pneumonia spread.

4179. Did you say that it was historically known that one of those diseases was imported into Waterford?—Yes.

4180. From what record do you gather that?—Perhaps I had better say to you that it is not a matter which you can prove like the great truths in history, but we know this much, that that disease did prevail in the Low Countries at the time that an enterprising citizen of Waterford imported some Dutch cattle, and we know also that immediately after the introduction of those animals in 1839 the disease did appear.

4181. And what have you to say with regard to the other disease?—With regard to the other disease, the case is not so clear, possibly, but I would submit to the Committee that after all it is strong evidence upon a point of that kind when you get all able men who devote their lives to the study of that disease agreeing in one opinion that it is a disease of foreign origin.

4182. Are the Irish cattle subject to any disease which is not of foreign origin?—Yes, they are liable to a great variety of local diseases. They get diseases the same as human beings get diseases.

4183. So that there are some diseases which are not of foreign origin?—There are several.

4184. If the diseases are of foreign origin, as all events, Ireland seems to be very favourable to their ascendance; I think you told the Committee that there were 30,000 centres of one of those diseases?—I should say that it was inevitable in a country like Ireland which has, say, 4,000,000 cattle distributed amongst, say, 400,000 farmers who send their cattle to small fairs and markets. They have a great many more of those fairs and markets than the interest of the country requires; you have in that way a peculiar trade in cattle. A country so circumstanced must be liable to a very large proportion of disease.

4185. Do not you think that it would be worth while sometimes to look at the causes of disease as well as at the disease itself?—I quite agree with that.

4186. You speak of Asiatic cholera, and I think you said that those diseases should be treated like Asiatic cholera, and be regarded as diseases which we might get rid of; how did we get rid of Asiatic cholera?—We are liable at any time to an importation of Asiatic cholera, and we adopt precautions, not as good as they ought to be, for the purpose of dealing with it when it comes.

4187. What kind of precautions do you refer to?—Sanitary precautions.

4188. When you propose to shut up every fair and market in Ireland, and to prevent every kind of locomotion in Ireland, do you touch a single cause which may originate or prolong those diseases?—I certainly touch the disease itself.

4189. But do you touch a single cause of it?—There are no causes in Ireland to generate foot and mouth disease.

4190. You assume that; but at least you will admit that there are causes which keep it alive when it gets there?—May I respectfully submit to you this consideration: it is not proof, but, perhaps, it would have some influence with you, that I could take you to some parts of Ireland where the cattle are worse treated than any where else in Ireland, and yet there has never been a case of foot and mouth disease there.

4191. Mr. (Clerk Read.) Where the animals are exposed to the greatest hardships?—When they are exposed to the greatest hardships, and to the worst treatment in every possible form. I do not say that is proof, but it is a consideration which may influence the Committee.

4192. Mr. J. Bright.] Still, do you not think it is a good thing that we should look to the causes of the disease instead of to this peculiar, and I think very unsatisfactory, mode of dealing with the disease itself?—I would say that it would be a most desirable thing for a great body like the Royal Agricultural Society, or the Agricultural Society of Scotland, possibly, to set on foot an elaborate system of investigations to search this matter out.

4193. Is not one of the first and best means of getting rid of the disease to give the farmers a strong interest in repressing it?—It is desirable to give the farmers a strong interest in getting rid of it; but in dealing with a disease like foot and mouth disease, the course of which we can trace almost so plainly as we can trace the course of rivers and roads, and which does not arise in those parts of Ireland where it ought to arise, were it capable of arising spontaneously at all, we should kill it out effectually.

4194. But if you were to make it more profitable for the farmer when he has disease amongst

his stock than when he has not, that would not make the farmer particularly interested in getting rid of the disease; you would put the farmer in the position in which Mr. Plimsoll says some of the shipowners are, namely, that he would rather have the disease and lose his stock, and get a profit, just as the shipowner would make a profit by sinking his ship?—But my proposition during the two months would be to see that no man did get more than the proper value for his animals; that could not possibly arise.

4195. You would wish to kill the cattle affected with pleuro-pneumonia as you would the cattle affected with rinderpest?—I believe that ought to be done.

4196. Would you also kill those in contact with them, or only those attacked?—Those in contact with them.

4197. You would kill both?—I would.

4198. But not in the case of animals affected with foot and mouth disease?—No.

4199. With regard to foot and mouth disease in animals, I think I understood you to say that in your experience in 1872, it was extremely bad?—It prevailed more in 1872 than I have ever known it.

4200. How is it now?—It is not so bad as it has been, but it is, I am afraid, bad enough.

4201. A few years ago, did you not say, that the disease had almost disappeared?—The number of reported cases or centres was very small indeed. I did not say that it had disappeared; I believe it had not disappeared.

4202. We have had periods when it has been extremely bad, and periods when it almost disappeared, and then a period when it has been extremely bad again?—Yes.

4203. I think you will agree with me that that shows that there are some very powerful causes operating upon those diseases which an Act of Parliament could not touch at all?—Yes, there is no doubt that there are modifying causes which an Act of Parliament could touch.

4204. And most powerful causes?—Yes, powerful climatic causes.

4205. You have stated to the Committee that you thought we ought to encourage the trade in dead meat?—I stated that with regard to England I was extremely diffident in offering an opinion, but it appears to me that you could meet the wants of the English consumers by the importation of meat in a dead state, and thus relieve the stockowner of the loss from disease.

4206. Perhaps I was mistaken; I thought you said that most people would come round to that opinion?—What I stated was, that most people are of opinion, that taking the two interests into account, ultimately the trade would take that direction. I am glad to say it is already commencing in Ireland voluntarily.

4207. You are aware that there are a good many people who live in Lancashire and Yorkshire?—I am aware of that.

4208. Do you think that that opinion would make much progress there, that it would be better not to have live meat introduced from foreign countries?—Yes, I think the people in Lancashire and Yorkshire would be very glad to have the meat introduced if they could get sound meat.

4209. How is that to be done in the summer time?—I have been in some of the very large breweries this week, and they appear to me to have wonderful control over the temperature by 0.58.

refrigerators, and I presume that in ships something of the same kind could be adopted; I do not say what could be done, but I am sanguine in saying, that what has been done elsewhere, would be equally successful by and bye when applied to the cattle trade.

4210. You mean that by some invention of science it would some day be practicable for us to do this?—That is what I mean to convey.

4211. But you do not mean to say now that it would be practicable to do it?—I do not mean to say that we could now bring in meat in the summer time in a perfectly sound state.

4212. You spoke of the number of Irish farmers who were jobbers, and you stated that you did not like there being so many of them, as I understood. I do not know really what that means; what is the Irish farmer who is a jobber?—An Irish small farmer who is a jobber is a man who rents from five to 30 acres of ground, and he goes to every small fair and buys a beast here and a beast there, and sells at a profit to larger jobbers; and I have no doubt he would be much better employed at home, in the great majesty of cases, industriously upon his farm, avoiding the drink and the loss of time which now occurs.

4213. If he were here, do you not think he would ask you if he did not understand his own interests better than you could?—So would a highway robber. There are in many parts of Ireland too many of this class. They are not producers of wealth, but are mere distributors of it, and they are not necessary to Ireland.

4214. But you do not make a general attack upon distributors, do you?—Not when they are necessary.

4215. Who is to say when they are necessary or otherwise?—I think that if Parliament were to legislate upon the subject, they would be the best judges of it.

4216. Do you think that Parliament should say whether there should be jobbers, and how many there should be?—No, I do not say so.

4217. Do you think it would be worth while to put a license on them?—Mr. Jenkins made that suggestion, and it is a suggestion which I think ought to be at once adopted.

4218. My opinion would be that the more freedom there was in Ireland the better, but you do not appear to think so?—I have not said a word about free trade, but what I would wish to do would be to adopt some means to prevent the frightful loss arising from those two diseases.

4219. With regard to the possibility of introducing dead meat only into England, that is, chipping it as dead meat instead of live cattle; do you think it would be possible to try the experiment with Ireland?—I think that if you insisted upon receiving dead meat from Scotland, or Liverpool, or Peterborough, you ought to insist upon its coming from Ireland.

4220. Would you insist upon its coming dead from anywhere?—I did not say it was desirable to do it; and Ireland is the last country in the world that I should like to see you try an experiment upon which was not sure of succeeding.

4221. Mr. O'Connor.] Is it not the fact, that almost every small farmer in the west of Ireland is more or less of a jobber?—Both in the west and in the north.

4222. Therefore the proposition which you make, and which you say would interfere very seriously with the jobbers, would interfere with nearly every farmer in Ireland?—They are not all

Professor
T. Balcan.
—
24 April
1873.

Professor
T. Balcham.
24 April
1873.

all jobbers; not half of them; nor a quarter of them.

4223. But they would all more or less come under the description you would give of a jobber, namely, a man who buys at a fair and sells shortly afterwards at a profit?—There is a larger number of them in Ireland than is necessary, but that they form the bulk of the small farmers I am not at all prepared to admit.

4224. But supposing that they do form a very considerable proportion of the population, would that alter your opinion with regard to the propriety of making these regulations?—No; I believe at the end of the year their balance sheet would be quite as good if they remained at home working at their farms.

4225. Your proposition is that all fairs and markets, and the movement of store cattle, are to be prohibited for six weeks?—All movement of store cattle.

4226. At the end of that time you would expect to have stamped out foot and mouth disease?—I should hope so.

4227. Supposing it were found out that a considerably larger time were required, would that make any alteration in your ideas?—Not provided the stock owner could get sufficient notice.

4228. You would continue the restriction until you had stamped out the disease?—If I found that I was reducing the disease rapidly, you would support me in saying that the restrictions ought to be continued.

4229. What would you consider sufficient?—Simply the total disappearance of the disease from the country.

4230. Are you aware that sometimes within the last few years it has been stated that the disease has totally disappeared?—I have heard it stated, but it has not been the fact; because I had it myself at the time that it was stated that it had disappeared from the country.

4231. Supposing it was stated by scientific men to have disappeared, although there were a few cases in the country; if the restrictions were taken off, would you not then be in the same position as you were in some years ago?—The second part of my remedy would then apply.

4232. Assuming that the disease had reappeared, you would at once slaughter any animal that had it?—I would.

4233. Do you think that such a proposition as that would be tolerated by the farmers in Ireland?—I should say that the loss sustained in Ireland in 1872 was so great that it is a proposition that would receive very general favour, if you give adequate compensation.

4234. As a general rule, I believe that cattle and sheep affected with foot and mouth disease recover?—Yes; but still the destruction of property which I have mentioned remains.

4235. Your opinion now is that, although previously to 1872 such a restriction would not have been acceptable, it would now be acceptable after the outbreak of last year?—Yes, I think so.

4236. Supposing the suffering and the loss were to become considerably less, do you think that that feeling would continue?—I think it would grow, because it would be proof positive.

4237. Supposing that your plan has not been put into operation, and that not having done anything at all, foot and mouth disease dies out, as it died out some years ago, and there is very

little of it remaining in Ireland, and that then your plans were brought before the farmers, do you think they would be as ready to accept it as they are at the present moment?—It appears to me that my scheme, if it were put into practice, would not cause the loss of a shilling to any of the landed gentry or to any of the *bevd ghr* farmers; it would only interfere with the jobbing class.

4238. Do you think that the closing of fairs and markets for six weeks would not cause an injury to any one except the jobbers?—I do not think it would cause a loss to any man's balance sheet.

4239. I presume the whole of your calculations are founded upon the supposition that you would find the feeling of the country sufficient to enable you to carry out those regulations?—Any scheme which does not receive the cordial co-operation of the people must fail.

4240. If you found that the great bulk of the farmers, and the small farmers who do not come under the *con rete* term of jobbers, were greatly opposed to you, would you reconsider your proposition?—Yes, I should; but I think you would find that the jobbing class to which I refer do not influence public opinion to a considerable extent. One advantage of my scheme would be that it would serve the interest, to a great extent, of the great bulk of the stock owners.

4241. You do not consider that anything short of destroying the cattle after your first measures had been carried out would be of any use?—I am quite clear upon that point.

4242. I think you stated that you are aware of hares and rabbits being affected with foot and mouth disease?—I have seen hares and rabbits affected, I believe, with the disease, but that is a point upon which I should defer to the judgment of professional men.

4243. Supposing that hares and rabbits were affected with foot and mouth disease, would they not spread the disease amongst cattle?—No, because the poison would be as short lived in the one as in the other.

4244. You would kill the cattle, but you would not kill the hares and rabbits in the same way?—But I am assuming that you stamped out the disease.

4245. That supposing that you did not quite stamp it out, then you say, if I meet with a case I would kill the animal; but if you met with hares or rabbits you could not keep out the infection?—I think that you would find that the amount of infection caused by hares and rabbits is so small, that you may leave it out of the calculation.

4246. Is there any other country in the world which has been successful in stamping out the foot and mouth disease?—At the present moment I cannot answer that question satisfactorily, but I can say one thing, that my plan at all events has not been tried anywhere.

4247. You stated that Dublin was what you called a hotbed of disease; do you think it is worse than most large towns?—It is much worse.

4248. It was stated that the London dairies were hotbeds of disease?—Yes; I have found it so.

4249. Do you consider that the Dublin dairies are worse than the London dairies?—They are much about the same.

4250. I presume

Professor
F. Balboia.
—
24 April
1873.

4250. I presume it may be taken as a fact, that there is a great deal of disease in the dairies in all large towns?—I would not have you take it as a fact that pleuro-pneumonia prevails in very large towns in Ireland; there are some which are free from it.

4251. Mr. PeL] Did you ever try the experiment of communicating foot and mouth disease to hares and rabbits by artificial means?—Never.

4252. How did you come to the knowledge of it?—Professor Ferguson mentioned it to me, and on a point of that kind I should defer to his opinion.

4253. Do you know whether the experiment has been tried to convey the infection from cattle or sheep to hares or rabbits?—No, I do not know that.

4254. You told the Committee that the Spanish vessels brought cattle to Ireland?—I did.

4255. You have been on board those vessels?—Yes.

4256. We have heard that they have been fitted up specially for the purpose, with barriers to pen the cattle up in?—Yes, but I have not seen any cattle better brought over than on board the steamer I came over in the other day, for the purpose to see how it was managed.

4257. Where was that?—From Dublin to Holyhead. I looked at the ship simply as it affected what I will call the propagation of the disease.

4258. But confining yourself to the comfort of the cattle on board, do you still think that the arrangements upon the Irish boats are as favourable to the comfort of the animals as they are on board the Spanish boats?—I should say, so far as influencing the spread of the disease goes, they are equally comfortable.

4259. But I mean with regard to the discomfort and pain the cattle might meet with on board?—It is not so large a trade, to begin with; it is done by a private firm, and I must say that they do conduct the Spanish trade very carefully.

4260. Do you think the Dublin people keep their lairs in good condition at the North Wall?—No, it is not so good as it should be.

4261. In fact, there are places called lairs which are so only in name, the animals being kept in by barrels, and so on?—That is true.

4262. There is a very large amount of animals which pass through those so-called lairs at the North Wall weekly?—Yes, that is so; but it is necessary to bear in mind that that cannot generate disease.

4263. I am dealing only with the comfort of the cattle?—But the object of the Committee is to see how the disease comes into England.

4264. If you submit animals to a great deal of discomfort it is not unlikely to extend the disease, is it?—I have never in all my life seen cattle so badly treated as they are in the parts of Ireland which are free from disease.

4265. You admit that the arrangements for receiving the cattle on the North Wall are not good?—They might be better.

4266. Is there any system of artificial ventilation beyond just a wind sail, or any substitute for it, on board those vessels?—The ventilation is very bad indeed.

4267. You have got no fans or anything of that sort?—I have not seen any.

4268. Have you seen any tried?—I have gone

repeatedly into the boats, more particularly after what I heard from Mr. Jenkins, and I came over by a cattle boat the other day, and the cattle did not seem to suffer very much upon that journey, certainly.

4269. What was the temperature?—It was not so bad as it would be in the summer.

4270. Have you heard of any attempt to try an artificial ventilator?—There has been such an experiment made.

4271. How long have you been at Glanerin?—About 20 years.

4272. In that 20 years there has been a great variation in the intensity of foot and mouth disease in Ireland, has there not?—A great deal.

4273. Sometimes falling to very small dimensions, and at other times rising?—It has varied a great deal.

4274. I suppose 15 years ago there was no legislation at all upon the subject applicable to it?—I should be deceiving the Committee if I were not to tell them that there was disease in 1858.

4275. But was there any restriction in the movement of cattle in 1858?—Not that I am aware of.

4276. Now, at all events in 1873, a great deal of attention has been given to the matter, and an attempt has been made in Parliament to check it?—An attempt has been made.

4277. In Ireland through the instrumentality of the central authority, and in England through the local authority?—Yes.

4278. I believe it has entirely failed in Ireland in its object?—What I wish to convey to you is, that it has done rather better there than in England; in England it has failed, in Ireland it has broken down.

4279. The results to the community are the same; there has been as much loss in the one country as in the other. I think we may admit, may we not, that the two systems have practically broken down?—They have practically broken down.

4280. Chas. W. PeL] Do you consider that the regulations with regard to foot and mouth disease in Ireland have had any perceptible effect in checking the disease?—I think they have had, and must have had a perceptible effect.

4281. You say that, notwithstanding that in spite of those regulations, there were 15,000 centres of disease?—So I see from the returns.

4282. Mr. PeL] And you also said that if there was any decline in 1871, it was not owing so much to the legislative provisions as to the character of the animal?—No; what I said was, that in the rearing districts we had not so much of the disease. If I had understood that I would be examined with regard to the Veterinary Department I would have looked into it more carefully. I came before the Committee simply to state my own experience. I do not want to defend the Veterinary Department in Ireland at all. I have had very little to do with it. I know very little about it.

4283. I thought you said that the disease was never so bad during the last 30 years as it was in 1872?—I never knew it to prevail to the extent that it did in 1872. I never knew sheep to suffer so severely.

4284. At the same time, there were never such complete legislative provisions as in 1873?—I consider they are not adequate; they did not go to the root of the evil.

4285. But

Y 2

Professor
T. Bellhouse.
—
24 April
1873.

4285. But such as they were, there were more of them?—Yes, certainly.

4286. Now, with regard to your loss by foot and mouth disease, you say that you make about 620 gallons of milk a year at the Glasnevin dairy?—Yes, per cow.

4287. Do you use the milk if it is notropy?—What I do now with it is what you would do yourself, I sell it and give it to the pigs. I found that until I did that it gave the disease to the pigs.

4288. But what do you suppose is the loss upon the amount of milk from a cow affected with the disease when the animal was at her best?—Taking a diseased animal, and looking at the yield in that season, and what is the ordinary yield, I find there is, on the average, 4 l. per cow difference in the yield.

4289. Then, in addition to that, her leg is very much injured, is it not?—Yes, until the next calf, and if she is forward in calf she would very likely abort.

4290. The Right Honourable Chairman asked you how you arrived at the loss, and you told the Committee; but would it be possible to produce the figures unless you keep a double entry account?—To give that I must know the amount of stock before and after the outbreak.

4291. Chairman.] But you could show the amount of food that you have had to give to the cattle in addition to what you would otherwise have had to give to bring them back to condition?—That I could do for you; but it would be upon the understanding that it is an estimate only.

4292. Mr. Pell.] You do not keep an account debiting the total of the horned stock with what comes out of the hay yard, and crediting them with what they produce, do you?—I do, for the year; but if I were to give you a *dead fide* balance sheet for the foot and mouth disease I must begin when it begins.

4293. Your alternative recommendation I believe to be this, to reduce the foot and mouth disease to some small limit by keeping the cattle at home?—That is my view.

Mr. GEORGE PHILCOX, called in; and Examined.

Mr.
G. Philcox.

4303. Chairman.] How long have you been clerk to the Deptford Market, since its formation?—Yes.

4304. Mr. Clive Read.] Do you consider your Deptford Market to be in all respects well regulated?—Yes.

4305. How many cattle can you accommodate there?—Of oxen about 5,000.

4306. And how many sheep?—About 14,000.

4307. What is the greatest amount of stock that you have ever had in any one week?—I can scarcely tell, about 8,000 beasts I should think, and about 7,000 or 8,000 sheep.

4308. What is the amount that you now receive?—About 350 beasts, that is bullocks; there are no sheep.

4309. Where do they come from?—All from Germany.

4310. None from any other place?—No.

4311. Do you believe that there is any great loss to the importer from sending them to that market?—I cannot say.

4312. Do they very much dislike coming there,

4294. Do you agree with the recommendation of the central Chamber of Agriculture, that the removal of all animals should be prohibited during the months of June and July?—I do.

4295. Do you fix the months?—Yes.

4296. When?—During June and July.

4297. Then having, as you would expect, reduced the number of cases, after these two months had expired you would kill in all the cases that hereafter arose?—Yes, I would.

4298. And you would compensate the farmers fully?—Yes, that would be matter of detail. I should hope that you would carry the agricultural interest with you.

4299. Now, what do you mean by giving the full value in the case of pleuro-pneumonia; let me put it in this way: suppose I have a hundred animals, and I put 50 in one park and 50 in another, and pleuro-pneumonia breaks out among one-fifty and not among the other, leaving the others perfectly free, do you imagine that, if I brought dealers there to purchase the animals, the attacked lot would be of the same value as those where there was no disease; would you, yourself, supposing the animals to be of equal quality, give as much for the 50 animals where the disease had broken out as for the 50 where the disease had not broken out?—I should not, as a matter of prudence. If the Right Honourable Chairman will allow me, I should like to qualify my answer by saying that I took the value in your sense, which I think is the correct sense.

4300. Chairman.] By the full value, you mean the value of the animal after the disease has got to the head?—I quite agree with the Honourable Member, that every herd of cattle in which the infection appears is lessened in value thereby.

4301. Therefore, by the full value, you mean the value of the herd after the disease has broken out?—Yes, I quite accept that view.

4302. Mr. Pell.] The value being also affected by the legislative restrictions which we put upon movement?—Quite so.

4313. You stated that no improvement was necessary in your market; do you not think it very desirable to have railway communication to the market, so that the manufacturing districts might be supplied with meat direct from the market?—Yes, I think so.

4314. How far is it to the railway?—It is seven minutes' walk to the Deptford Station, upon the Greenwich line.

4315. Can they load at the Deptford Station?—No, it is a passenger station.

4316. Where do they go to load?—They take them up in vans from the market.

4317. How far is that?—It is about three and a half miles to Smithfield Market.

4318. So that, of course, if any butcher from Manchester wanted a lot of dead meat, he would have to convey it in vans, if he came to your market to buy it?—He would.

4319. Chairman.] With regard to the cattle which are slaughtered at your market, does the

most generally go to the dead-meat market?—It does.

4330. It does not go to the purchasers in the immediate neighbourhood, does it?—No; generally to London.

4331. Do you think that if there was railway communication direct to the market, you would have buyers direct from the manufacturing districts coming to you, as they did when the market was temporarily at Mr. Odam's wharf?—Yes, I think so.

4332. Are you of opinion that the market at Deptford is in every respect good and complete, with that one exception?—Yes.

4333. Did you find much practical inconvenience in working the division of the slaughter place for the animals which were diseased, and those which were not?—No.

4334. Mr. Lusk.] It is only three miles and a half to the market?—Yes.

4335. Do you know the docks?—Yes.

4336. Do you know that there is an immense quantity of sugar and tea there?—Yes.

4337. Does that go to market by vans?—Yes.

4338. And that is much more than all your meat put together?—Yes, in weight.

4339. *Chairman.*] Do you think there is any difference in the price at which your meat is sold, from what it would be sold at the dead meat market?—I hear there is not much difference.

4340. Mr. *Clare Reed.*] Do the dead meat buyers come down to your market and buy, or is the meat all taken to Smithfield before it is sold?

—It is nearly all taken to Smithfield, but not quite; sometimes it goes direct by rail to Aldershot and various places.

4331. Mr. *Pell.*] Are there any salesmen in Deptford whose business it is to sell the dead meat there, or do the salesmen do their business in Smithfield?—In Smithfield.

4332. The absolute selling, as a rule, is in Smithfield?—Yes.

4333. Mr. *Clare Reed.*] When you had your 3,000 cattle in a week there, there was a very considerable amount of cartage incurred?—Yes.

4334. What becomes of the offal at Deptford?—It is carted away.

4335. Have you heard any complaints that the offal is hurt in the carriage?—No.

4336. Not in hot weather?—No, I have not heard so.

4337. Mr. *Pell.*] How far is the nearest railway station from the market gate at which you could load meat?—That would be the Brighton Railway, I suppose; about a mile.

4338. Mr. *Lusk.*] How far are you from the Greenwich Railway?—About seven minutes' walk; a quarter of a mile.

4339. Mr. *Clare Reed.*] How long would the tramway be that would be necessary to connect Deptford Market with the railway?—I suppose about a mile, or a mile and a half, perhaps.

4340. Have you heard traders complain of the want of railway accommodation?—No.

4341. You have no distant buyers?—No, not from the country.

Mr.
G. Phillips.
24 April
1875.

Monday, 28th April 1873.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mr. Clay.
Mr. William Edward Forster.
Mr. Dodson.
Mr. William Johnston.
Mr. Kavanagh.

Mr. Moncell.
Mr. O'Connor.
Mr. Clara Read.
Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson.
Mr. Tipping.

THE RIGHT HONOURABLE WILLIAM EDWARD FORSTER, IN THE CHAIR.

PROFESSOR THOMAS BALDWIN, called in; and further Examined.

Professor
T. Baldwin.
—
28 April
1873.

4342. Mr. Kavanagh.] YOU said, on the last day of your examination, that you were in charge of, or superintended, 200 model farms scattered over the whole of Ireland?—I said Agricultural schools.

4343. Are they not very nearly the same?—It does not follow that an agricultural school is attached to a farm which deserves to be called a model farm; they are schools to which a small number of acres, varying from two to close on 200, as at Glusnevin, are attached.

4344. Are those schools equally scattered throughout the four provinces?—Not equally.

4345. Could you say how they are scattered? I could give you a copy of my report for last year, which gives the figures, or put in an abstract before the Committee. I may mention that there is no county in Ireland without an agricultural school of some kind, except the county of Wexford.

4346. There is an agricultural school which you superintend in every county in Ireland, except Wexford?—Yes.

4347. How often in the year do you visit each of those schools?—It varies very much; the principal ones I visit very frequently indeed; there are two gentlemen acting with me, one having the north and one the south; and, with a view to a division of labour, they confine themselves more to the small ones, while my time and attention are rather centred upon the schools and farms managed for the public account.

4348. Do you personally visit each school once a year?—No.

4349. Do you ever, when visiting those schools, attend the local fairs and markets in the districts in which they are situated?—I make it a rule, even without business, to go to the fairs and markets to see how they get on. Sometimes I have business there, sometimes I have not; but I do attend fairs and markets very much indeed.

4350. Is your knowledge of the fairs and markets in Ireland a very general one; that is to say, not limited to one province or one county?—I have been in fairs and markets in every one of the counties.

4351. I presume, from your superintendence of those schools, you are brought very much in contact with the farming class?—I am necessarily brought very much in contact with the farming class.

4352. It gives you an intimate acquaintance with their habits and opinions, and the manner in which they carry out their business?—It does.

4353. Will you tell the Committee if there is any movement of cattle, independently of fairs and markets, in the country?—There is, but not very much so. All private dealings in cattle, of course, independently of fairs and markets, such as the movement, to begin with, of shorthorned cattle by private purchasers.

4354. Is there not a good deal of movement of cattle in respect to what are termed grazing cattle?—From farm to farm, and from district to district, there is. Some men have farms in different parts of the country. I know men, for instance, who have rearing farms in the west of Ireland, and who have finishing lands in Leinster; that, I presume, is what you refer to. There are several districts in Ireland where men have rearing farms, and then finish off upon the finishing lands.

4355. But independently of that, are there not numbers of, we will say, the brothers and younger sons of farmers, and the class of people that are called farmers' boys, although they may be grown men, who have had by some of them considerable sums of money which they invest in cattle, and who take grazing grounds?—Yes, that is so.

4356. Must there not be a good deal of movement of cattle in such cases as that from farm to farm, according as the owner can find grass for them?—There is such a movement, but what I should be disposed to say is, that it forms a very small per-centage of the whole movement of cattle in Ireland.

4357. But there is such a movement?—Then is such a movement.

4358. You stated, as I understood, that the number of cattle jobbers was not very large?—On the contrary, I said the number is large.

4359. You stated first, that they were more than you liked to see them, and then that the number was not so very great compared to the number of farmers in the country?—I understood the honourable Member for Sligo to ask me whether they did not form a very large proportion, and whether the majority of the small farmers were not jobbers; and then I stated it as my opinion that they did not amount to 50 or even 25 per cent. I put it in that way.

4360. You suggested that the jobbers should be

Professor
T. Baldwin,
28 April
1873.

be licensed?—I should be very glad to see them licensed. I should be very glad to see a number of them stamped out altogether.

4361. Let me refer you to Question 4312: what I wanted to ask was this; how could you manage to license all these men, these brothers and younger sons of farmers, and servant boys: how could you propose to carry out such a thing as that?—I do not see any practical difficulty in managing a scheme of granting licenses to them, but it is no part of my own scheme, or I think of my scheme for repressing, or certainly stamping out foot and mouth disease; I was merely asked incidentally about them. I do not see any more difficulty about granting licenses to them than to anybody else.

4362. But with these diverse movements of stock belonging to these different persons, which you propose to repress in the months of June and July, it would be necessary to know who they belonged to, to carry out your scheme perfectly?—Possibly the object which you have in view now would be better met, if I suggest what has often occurred to me with regard to the trade in cattle, which is perfectly independent of my own proposition. I hold, and I think I can prove to the Committee, that the great evil in Ireland, as far as regards the propagation of infectious diseases, is done by jobbers. I have known many instances in which they have found it their interest to deal in diseased cattle, simply because they had bought them at a low price. They ran them in with a large lot of healthy stock and sent them over to England. But it appears to me, as a practical means of putting an end to that, that you could make an order prohibiting any man from selling stock who had not them in his own bona fide possession for a certain time. I may mention to the Committee that I believe that would be a more effectual check upon it than any system of licensing, although I think the licensing would be useful.

4363. Do not you think that that would be a very arbitrary restriction upon trade and private enterprise?—But when you come to deal with a great evil like that of infectious diseases, which I maintain entail an enormous loss upon Ireland, England, and Scotland, you must deal with it, as I said before, with a high hand, and I do not think it would be too arbitrary to meet the wants of the case.

4364. I think you said that you had communicated with a number of farmers, cattle dealers, and sales masters, upon the subject of the proposed plan, and that your opinion was that they would rather support it?—I said I had spoken to a number of men whom I know very well, and upon whose judgment I could place reliance; but I did not say I consulted a large number, because I think it is plain, if you want to have an independent opinion upon a question of that kind, that you must not consult the jobbers or the dealers. You cannot deal with a great evil like this without interfering with somebody. My scheme is simply directed to preserving the national wealth of the country, and at the same time doing as little personal injury as possible.

4365. But with respect to those who did approve of your plan, was their approval unqualified, or was it conditional on your plan being successful? Did they express any opinion with reference to the probability of the success of the plan you propose?—No person to whom I have spoken upon the subject has expressed an adverse

opinion as to the success of the scheme, provided the period was sufficiently long.

4366. Would you be surprised to learn that a very large number of the principal graziers and sales masters engaged in the Irish cattle trade advocate the omission of foot and mouth disease from the Act altogether?—I have heard that opinion expressed by one of the largest salesmen in Dublin, a man who farms 2,000 or 3,000 acres himself, and a man who, I may say, insures a good deal of the agitation on the question; his decided opinion is that there ought to be no restriction at all; that he ought to be permitted to do what he likes with his own; but I said to him, "Would you go so far as to insist upon being allowed to do what you pleased with a mad dog, which was your own?" And he said, "Yes." After that opinion, I am prepared for anything which I may hear upon the subject. I may add that I have seen in the papers that Professor Brown stated it, as his opinion, that the farmers of England are very indifferent upon the subject.

4367. My question was whether you would be surprised to know that this indifference did exist?—I am quite as sure as that it does exist.

4368. And that the tendency of those interested in the cattle trade is more to loosen the restrictions than to increase them?—Yes; but then I think I may be allowed to add, in reference to that point, and I am sure that you will find it is the case, that the men who advocate that course have found that the present regulations are vexatious, without being efficacious, and they have no hope of any scheme being put into practice by which they would get what I call adequate compensation for animals which it may be necessary to slaughter.

4369. Your plan is shortly this: In the month of June to close all fairs and markets, and to stop the movement of all store stock for six weeks or two months, and after that you would slaughter every case of foot and mouth disease which appeared in the country?—What I did say, or at all events what I wanted to convey, and what I desire now to state most explicitly is, that I believe these diseases are produced by infection, and by infection only, and that the only way of stamping or killing out the disease is to have a knowledge of that leading fact before you, and that as a matter of principle you must impose restrictions for a time sufficiently long to stamp out the disease. I should be very sorry to commit myself so expressly as you have put it, that a period of six weeks would be sufficient to kill out the disease; I said that I would begin with six weeks or two months.

4370. You were asked as Question 3908:—"How long is an animal generally ill which is affected with foot and mouth disease. I refer to attacks which would leave the animal still contagious," and your answer was, "About a week." Q. "Not more? A. Not more in ordinary cases. Q. Your notion would be that these six weeks would give time for all the diseased animals to be cured or to die, and that the steps that you would take would prevent any movement. A. I should hope so?"—I did not mean to say that the disease would in every case be killed out within a period of six weeks.

4371. At Question 3913 you were asked: "And you feel confidence, from your experience, that six weeks of that kind of regulation would be sufficient?"—What I meant to convey was, that I would begin with a period of six weeks or

Professor
T. Balch.
28 April
1873.

two months; and I added this, that I was quite sure that the result of the scheme during a period of six weeks or two months would be so striking that I believe as firmly as I believe in my own existence, that you would have the landed gentry and tenant farmers coming to you and begging you to continue the restrictions.

4372. But otherwise, what I read about your proposals is correctly expressed, that you would close the markets and fairs?—Yes; I would close all markets and fairs for store stock.

4373. And you would slaughter every animal affected after a certain period, say two months or three months?—I will go so far as to say that, while it would be inconvenient, I admit, to many people, but it would not lessen the property in live stock in Ireland, to close the markets between the great May fairs and the great autumn fairs. The great May fairs are fairs for supplying animals to consume the grass, and the autumn fairs are for supplying animals for stall feeding. And although it would be an inconvenience, it would be such an inconvenience as I think the landed interest ought to bear for the purpose of ridding the country of so great an evil; and the inconvenience and loss could be prevented to a great extent.

4374. After this closing you would slaughter every animal, which appeared affected, in the country?—I would.

4375. I did not quite understand whether you meant that the stoppage of fairs and markets for store stock in the summer should be an annual institution, or only done once for all?—If you were to close all fairs and markets between the great May fairs and the autumn fairs, I have no doubt at all you would kill out the disease.

4376. But do you propose that this enactment should be put in force every summer?—I do not.

4377. But only once?—Only once.

4378. After that you would depend upon the slaughter to keep the disease in check?—I would; just as I would depend upon slaughter for cattle plague.

4379. You stated that you believed the disease to be of the most highly infectious character, and that it could be communicated by infection and infection only?—I do believe that.

4380. And you say also that you believe the disease can be communicated by inoculation, by the milk of infected animals, by water, by feeding vessels, by the clothes of the owners and the herdsmen, by streams, and by sewers?—I do.

4381. And in the case of the sewers you instanced, what was the distance which the stream ran which infected the three head of cattle from the field where the diseased herd were?—It was about the eighth of a mile; it crossed three fields.

4382. How do you suppose this infection was conveyed; was it from the urine or the dung, or the saliva of diseased animals?—In answer to that question I feel it right to say that, upon what might be called the medical aspect of the question, I do not presume to state an opinion. I come to deal with it more as a practical man, and, therefore, any opinion which I may give you upon the subject is one which certainly should be subject to a very wide qualification; and having given that qualification, I shall simply say that I suppose it was conveyed both in the fecal discharges as well as in the saliva which drops upon the grass, for instance.

4383. Do you think that this poison, from

whatever source it came, filtered through the ground, or how did it get into the sewers?—The ground had been so saturated with the use of the liquid manure some time after time, that the soil lost its power of retaining the deleterious matter, and when I went to examine the sewage I found it came out as it went upon the land.

4384. It came out as dirty as it went upon the land; it was not filtered?—It was not filtered.

4385. And you think the poisonous matter from these animals was carried in an intact state through the soil, and so into the pond?—I believe it was. I stated to the Committee that it passed right over or through the 25-acre farm, the animals being upon grass, and not affecting one of them, and went into the little place that the four cattle of the 5½-acre farm were supplied with water from.

4386. How long do you suppose the virus would remain alive in the sewer?—There, upon speaking as a man without a medical education, I do not wish to express an opinion upon a matter of that kind further than this, that so far as my observation as a practical man goes, I think the virus is capable of living a considerable time in water, but certainly not in the air, and I will add the reason which induces me to think so. I have known animals in a field suffering from foot and mouth disease, and I have known the herd to be cleared after an interval of about three weeks. I could not fix the precise date without my note-books, which are, unfortunately, locked up in my office at home. I have had periods of about three weeks to elapse. I am quite clear as to that in round numbers. Then I have seen healthy animals put upon the same land without taking the disease.

4387. After a period of three weeks?—A period of about three weeks. So far as I can judge, it is a mere matter of opinion, and not being a medical man, I speak with great diffidence upon the subject; but I have observed that upon wet land, or land where you have surface water, the poison may remain longer than where you have well-drained land.

4388. Was this land wet land?—No, it was drained land, but surcharged with sewage.

4389. Mr. *Chas. Reay*.] How deep were the drains?—The parallel drains were cut from 4 to 4½ feet.

4390. Mr. *Kassonagh*.] There was evidence given before this Committee that infection was conveyed from this country to Australia by an animal sent there in a ship; do you believe that such a thing is possible in a voyage occupying three months?—I have heard that, but I was not aware that the evidence was before the Committee, but the difficulty has been stated; I have been asked about it by many persons; I think Professor Ferguson once asked me the question, how I could account for the outbreak of foot and mouth disease, or pleuro-pneumonia in Victoria, or in those colonies; and my answer to him was the answer which I should like now to give, that in dealing with a question of the kind having such strong proofs to satisfy me that these diseases are infectious, and produced by infection only, I should really wipe aside, as unworthy of consideration, an isolated case of that kind. Independently of this, I would say, subject only to this qualification, that I really do not want to express any medical opinions at all, or touch upon the domains of what may be called the medical part

of the question. I see no reason why the poison of the disease might not be locked up in water on board ship in such a way as to have its vitality preserved; but if you preserve the vitality on board ship for the time specified, that is a totally different thing from doing it on ordinary land.

4391. I asked you whether you thought it possible to convey the disease, after a voyage of three months, on board ship?—I believe it is possible to have the disease carried in water on board ship during that period, and I see no difficulty in accounting for the outbreak of the disease in Australia in another way. I knew an animal last year that took the disease three times over, and the poison would be preserved on board ship in that way. I submit that it could be preserved in either of two ways; first, in the water; and secondly, in the animals themselves, taking it from one another over and over again.

4392. Further evidence was given before this Committee, that it was possible to convey infection by means of merchandise sales of goods, hides, hoofs, and horns, and such things as that, and any sort of merchandise which had been in contact with infected animals; do you think that that is the case?—I am quite clear upon this point, that porous material will absorb and retain the poison. I am not quite so clear with reference to its power of doing so for a length of time.

4393. But still you are of opinion that these different kinds of merchandise would import infection?—I am.

4394. You stated in your evidence on the last occasion that no diseases had been imported into Ireland from Spain or Portugal; have you yourself inspected each cargo upon its arrival in this country?—Not each cargo.

4395. Then you cannot speak from having inspected each cargo?—I can speak from having examined a very large number of the animals, and you will get it from Professor Ferguson, who is the authority who I suppose inspects these. I stated upon the authority of respectable men engaged in the business, and I have never heard of a case. I am very often in the Dublin market, and have an opportunity of speaking to persons acquainted with the facts.

4396. Mr. Jenkins, in his report to the Royal Agricultural Society of England, at page 218, says that from Spain and Portugal a considerable number of animals affected with foot and mouth disease are imported into Liverpool, and in 1871 he gives the number of those cases as 493; if these are the facts as to the importations into the port of Liverpool alone, how can Ireland get off free?—I have seen that statement in Mr. Jenkins's paper. But I would certainly beg the Committee to allow me to put in this observation, that in legislating upon a great question of this kind you must not allow yourselves, if you will forgive me for saying so, to be led away by a small fact of that kind, in the face of the big facts which you have before you.

4397. Mr. Dodder. The big fact being that cattle from the Peninsula are exempt from the disease?—The big fact is that we know that the disease is highly infectious.

4398. Mr. Keaney. Your evidence is that the imports from Spain and Portugal are free from the disease, so far as you know?—So far as Ireland is concerned; and so far as my knowledge goes.

Q.38.

4399. But you have not inspected every cargo?—It is impossible that I could have done so.

4400. I only want to know if there is open any door of danger?—I do not believe there is. I am quite sure that if there was the slightest danger Professor Ferguson would long since have taken some notice of it, or some action to prevent it.

4401. You further stated in your evidence that you did not believe in the efficacy of inspection, and that it was impossible to discover the disease in a latent state?—I expressed that opinion.

4402. And that you are also opposed to quarantine?—Yes, I am totally opposed to quarantine.

4403. Are you aware that there is any importation of calves or cattle, goats or sheep, or pigs, from England into Ireland?—I have not seen myself a case of importation. We do import a few well-bred stock, and occasionally have imported some calves, from time to time.

4404. You do not think that it is a general trade?—No, I think I am justified in saying that it is not a general trade.

4405. I was informed that there were a good many calves imported from England into Ireland to be reared?—From time to time there have been.

4406. You yourself referred to some calves which had been imported from Lancashire?—That was a good while ago; the fact was just before a Committee of this House, as far back as 1864, and proved, as far as I can remember. That bore upon the introduction of the disease into Ireland at that particular time, but I am not aware of any trade at the present moment. Professor Ferguson will be able to put before you the actual numbers, if there is any such trade.

4407. From some sources I have heard that there is a considerable trade, but from others that there is not. I moved for returns, but the Government were not able to give them, therefore, I wanted to get your opinion. Your opinion is, that there is no trade of any importance?—My opinion is that there is not at present any importation of calves from England to Ireland which deserves the name of trade.

4408. I did not gather from you whether you proposed to extend your suggestion for stopping the disease to England?—No; as I stated to the Committee before, my duties bring me into contact with the wants of the Irish people. I think I know the arrangements for fairs and markets as regards Ireland, and I propose to confine myself very much to the consideration of the question as it affects Ireland.

4409. But you think, I presume, that what would be good for Ireland, by stopping the trade, would be good for England too?—I should certainly say so.

4410. Are you aware that the general nature of the evidence which we have received from the veterinary profession is that it would be impossible to stamp out foot and mouth disease, and equally impossible to guard ourselves against its introduction?—I am quite aware that that opinion has been expressed, and expressed by men for whom I may say I have the greatest possible admiration. I read in the Chamber of Agriculture Journal that Professor Brown had expressed that opinion. Professor Brown is a professional man, and it is for you to consider what value to attach to it. I have spoken of this disease, as I have said before, as a practical man; but

Professor
T. Balch.
—
28 April
1873.

Professor
T. Balcham.

28 April
1875.

but I would say such an opinion as that can only be maintained, I think, after all upon one hypothesis, that in this case the disease is produced by living organisms. If it be produced by a poison, I should certainly say that there is not the slightest shadow of ground in maintaining such an opinion. If it be produced by living organisms, then the case assumes an entirely different aspect. These living organisms may be capable of propagating themselves; but it appears to me that it would be very unwise indeed, in the face of the fact that you have a destructive disease raging in the country, burning out the property of the people, so to speak, to devise any system of legislation upon purely hypothetical data. You must take the great fact that the disease is in the country, and that it moves by infection; and proceed upon well-known and well-ascertained facts. If you put my scheme into operation, if it succeeds you will save the country, and if it fails you will see whether Professor Brown and those who are with him are right, and you will, at all events, obtain one piece of information which will enable you to legislate afterwards.

4411. If we succeed, we should save the nation, but if we fail, we should have slaughtered all the cattle in it?—No; in stamping out the disease in the first, foot and mouth disease in the first instance there is to be no slaughter. And afterwards you would cause no destruction of national property worth speaking of.

4412. Looking to the other hypothesis, after the evidence which has been given by very eminent men of great experience, and after your own evidence with regard to the highly and insidiously infectious nature of the disease after its being admitted to be conveyed by clothes, by water, and by hares and rabbits, do you think the Committee would be wise in recommending such a measure as the compulsory slaughter of any animal which would become hereafter infected with the disease; that is the other side of the hypothesis?—The other side of the hypothesis is based upon negative evidence.

4413. It is based upon your own evidence?—No; pardon me, my evidence does not go that far. I do not want to come into collision with the medical gentlemen at all. I wish to speak of the question as a practical man; but I find one of those gentlemen, whom I consider to be a man of great natural ability, professing to have stamped pleuro-pneumonia out of Dublin practically. Now, if that disease has got a home in these countries, how can that be the case? He is therefore inconsistent. And again, I find another gentleman maintaining that we have been free from foot and mouth disease. Now, if this disease has a home in this country, how can that have occurred? I say he is inconsistent. I submit to the Committee that the great balance of evidence is against any such hypothesis. The opinion is hypothetical and speculative, and in the face of the fact that the disease is highly infectious, and lives only for a short time, you will excuse me if I say that you ought to legislate upon the question in accordance with practical experience.

4414. With reference to its being short-lived, you admit that the disease can be kept alive in water for three months?—I do not admit that, but I cannot say it is not so.

4415. I thought you admitted it?—No; but I put in two explanations of the difficulty you put to me, with reference to its appearance in the colonies.

4416. But you admitted the possibility that the virus might be kept alive for three months in water?—I do not say that is impossible; but if you will allow me to come back to the statement I made upon the last day, which was this: that while I admit that the disease is propagated by water, by hares and rabbits (as I am informed; I have no evidence of that from personal knowledge), by clothes, as I have proved in my own case; yet I believe that the percentage of disease which is propagated in all these ways is so infinitesimally small, that for practical purposes you may leave it out; I hold that the cattle themselves are the great carriers of infection. Experience tells me that this is so. We had ample evidence of that in the case of the cattle plague; no restrictions were of any use as regarded that disease until you stopped the movement of animals, and as soon as you stopped the movement of animals you began to kill out the disease, and ultimately did kill it out; and I say that the same thing is possible with respect to foot and mouth disease.

4417. At the time of the cattle plague there was very little foot and mouth disease prevalent in Ireland, was there?—There was some.

4418. But very little?—I would not feel justified in saying that it was very little, but it was not anything like what it has been since.

4419. To return to the question of slaughter; the disease is admitted to be only fatal to a very small extent; do you think that the majority of the farmers and stockowners would consent to have their stock slaughtered for a disease which would not kill them?—I should say that the landed gentry of Ireland, and the farmers at the present moment, are an extremely intelligent class, and very keenly alive to their own interest, and they would see that it was for their own interest, not only to submit to, but to approve of this course of action.

4420. Speaking from your own knowledge, would they approve of this course of action?—I believe they would.

4421. Have you asked the opinion of many? I have not; I am simply asking for information?—I propounded this view to a Government official in Ireland more than three years ago; it was forced upon me by the difficulties which I experienced myself in dealing with those diseases. I suggested this course then, and from that day to this I have never lost an opportunity of speaking to the landed gentry, and to those farmers to whose opinion I attached any value, upon the subject. I have talked quietly over the question with them, and I never yet met a man of intelligence who took time to inquire into it, carefully and calmly, who did not approve of it.

4422. My reason for pressing you so much upon that point is, that the information I have received is rather the other way, that the majority of the farmers would like, as I have said before, the foot and mouth disease to be wiped out of the Act; therefore, I wanted to know upon what grounds you based your opinion that they would agree to this very great increase of stringency?—I am quite sure you will find that the grazing interest are very strongly opposed to any restrictions upon their trade; they are fearful of the imposition of any restrictions, and more particularly so, in view of the fact that the existing restrictions which are vexatious have failed, and that they have no belief that you will ever deal liberally with them in the way of compensation; if they can only start with the impression that you will

will introduce an effective scheme, and give them fair and reasonable compensation, I believe that the great bulk of them will turn in favour of your views.

4423. Allowing, for argument's sake, that your plan of entirely restricting the movement of cattle for two months, or whatever time you name, was successful in putting an end to the disease; but supposing through some of the various means which we have had recapitulated before; that is to say, owing to the importation of merchandise, or anything else, the infection should again appear in the country, would it not be necessary, for the sake of the success of your plan, immediately to discover every fresh outbreak?—It would, as in the case of cattle plague.

4424. In order to act with promptitude before the disease spreads?—Quite so.

4425. How would you propose to carry out such a general surveillance so as to insure its immediate discovery?—That question is one which I scarcely expected to be asked, but if the Committee approved of my views they could easily devise a scheme for putting it into practical operation; if the Committee wish to know in a rough and ready way what I should do, I shall state it.

4426. I should be glad to know, for I confess that that appeared to me to be the main difficulty of the case. Allowing, for argument's sake, that the disease was stopped by your plan, how could you keep up such entire surveillance over every place where a head of stock might be, to be sure of discovering, with sufficient promptitude, any fresh outbreak, the prompt discovery of which I assume to be essentially necessary to the success of your plan?—In other words, it is necessary that I should state my plan for carrying it into operation.

4427. We should be very glad to hear it?—You have in Ireland a body of constabulary of very great intelligence, and as you have found, in times of very great difficulty, of very great fidelity. I would make them, as they are now, the basis of operations, and would appoint their own chief officer a Commissioner. I would associate with him, possibly, one of the Commissioners of the Dublin Metropolitan Police, and a man of character who would inspire the confidence of the people like (if he will allow me to say so), my, the Honourable Member for Norfolk. I would entrust the execution of the law to these three gentlemen. In the first place, I say any failure which has arisen in the Irish system has been largely owing to the external, and what I cannot but regard as improper, pressure, which has been exercised, and to the circumstances that the Constabulary have not been directed and controlled by their own principal officers. I would pass a law declaring that every stock owner in Ireland, from his Grace the Duke of Leinster down to the smallest farmer, should be compelled to notify to the nearest police station the first appearance of disease, and I should impose a large fine upon any man who broke or evaded the law. I should give a premium to every policeman who discovered a man breaking or attempting to evade the law.

4428. Are you at all aware of the extent of the districts which the police would have to watch thus closely?—Yes; but you must bear in mind that there is a very large force, and when once you stamp out the disease the difficulty would not be so great afterwards. There

is no great difficulty now with cattle plague; it was, after some delay, stamped out, and foot and mouth disease is certainly not so infectious as that was.

4429. You have also stated that failure in a single instance would frustrate the success of your suggestion?—I have not stated that.

4430. You have stated that if the disease was not discovered on its immediate outbreak your plan would fail?—If you give the encouragement to the constabulary of Ireland, which I now suggest to you, I will take it upon myself to say they would soon discover the disease for you, if it existed.

4431. Allowing, for the sake of argument, that this surveillance has been successful, and that the fresh outbreak has been discovered and the affected animals slaughtered, unless it be a solitary and isolated animal, is it not more than probable that the same cause which affected these animals would also have infected other cattle in the same herd with them, or that they would themselves have communicated the infection to the other cattle?—I think that each introduction of the poison (I use the words poison, germ, and virus in the same sense, as we do not know what it is), but each time you import poison I do not think that it hops about from place to place. I think it drops down and does its work in each particular centre; that was clearly proved to be the case in regard to the cattle plague. I saw it in Enfield, in the County Meath, and I can say that it was stamped out there without any trouble. I was in Belfast upon my ordinary duty, and I came up to see it in County Down, close to Lisburn. There the same thing was done and it did not spread.

4432. You stated that it was impossible to discover the disease in a latent state?—That is true of all diseases, including cattle plague.

4433. Is not it poisonous in a latent state?—I think not. I think that the medical men, to whose judgment I defer in the matter, will tell you that.

4434. There is no poison eliminated from the system during the stage of incubation?—No, I think not.

4435. Once the disease is developed it must necessitate the immediate slaughter or isolation of the animal to prevent its communicating it to others?—That is so.

4436. In fact, really to secure the success of your scheme, would it not be necessary to slaughter, not only the affected animal but every animal which had been in contact with it?—Yes; that is part of my scheme.

4437. That, in fact, is to put foot and mouth disease upon exactly the same basis as the cattle plague?—Quite so.

4438. Mr. Mowell.] After you had exterminated it?—Yes, after we had exterminated it.

4439. Mr. Kinnear.] Now, with regard to the restrictions upon the movements of store cattle in the months of June and July, the stopping of fairs and markets is a very simple matter; it is done by Order; but do you believe it would be possible to stop all the movement of stock throughout the entire country, including private sales and the taking of cattle to grass, by the constabulary alone, without the willing co-operation of the farmers; of course, their professed co-operation would not do; it must be the hearty co-operation of the farmers; do you think that the constabulary would be able to stop the movement

Professor
T. Baldwin.
28 April
1873

Professor
T. Balchin.
28 April
1873.

movement of all the cattle in the country for the time you speak of?—I do.

4440. In your answer to Question 3074 you say, that it would be very difficult to interfere with private sales?—It would.

4441. If you stop the fairs and markets you give a fresh incentive to private sales?—But I would stop all private sales.

4442. How would you stop all private sales; do you think the constabulary could stop them?—I do. The marvel is that the constabulary of Ireland have done so much good, in what may be called extraneous labour, considering that they have not been paid for their work, which I know from practical observation has often been very arduous; they have done a great deal of work without any remuneration. I would propose to pay them.

4443. Even allowing that that was done, are there not many upland farms in Ireland on which cattle require in the summer to be driven night and morning to water?—That is so.

4444. And, according to your own admission, the streams and rivers would become media of conveying infection?—Yes, streams and rivers are so; but I repeat what I consider to be very material, if the Committee will excuse me for repeating it so often, that the extent to which the disease is propagated by those means is practically insignificant as compared with the mischief done by the movement of the cattle themselves in getting round from fairs and markets. The amount of mischief which was done, for instance, consequent upon the fair of Ballinasloe, is something of which I really could not adequately give the Committee an idea. I have that broad fact before me, and I see it everywhere. I see that it is the cattle themselves in the fairs and markets which do the mischief; and although it has been said to me that hares and rabbits do it, I do not suppose, in the whole country, that there would be 10 cases of disease propagated in a year by hares and rabbits; the number of cases in which it is conveyed by water might be something larger, but taking into consideration all those collateral modes of conveying the disease, I would say that the total of diseases produced in that way is so insignificant in amount, compared with what is caused by the movement of the cattle themselves, that you may really overlook it.

4445. But, with regard to the question of stoppage for two months, if the disease is so easily kept alive, do not you think it is a question whether it might not be kept alive altogether through those two months?—I do not. I believe, first of all, it is washed down into the ground; in those two months you would have considerable rainfalls, which would wash it into the soil, to begin with, just as the sewage got rid of it in the Glasnevin drains.

4446. The sewage did not cure those that were affected?—No, but still it removed it from the land; and that is the only farm in Ireland where that could occur, after all, so that that is a very small matter. I mentioned it merely as an interesting fact bearing upon the way in which the disease might be propagated, but that is the only farm on which that system is adopted in Ireland.

4447. You do not recommend any slaughter within those two months?—None at all. I understand you are confining yourself to foot and mouth disease. I would not slaughter any beast during that period.

4448. You recommend the months of June and

July as the best months for imposing this restriction; perhaps you have not seen the Tables in Mr. Jenkins's Report, at page 188, Nos. 1 and 2; from those Tables it appears that the disease has been most prevalent in England in the autumn months, from August to December; do you think it would be the same in Ireland?—In 1872 it was the case. I ascribe that to the extreme wetness of the season.

4449. But those Tables of Mr. Jenkins go from 1869 to 1872; in 1870 it was at its height on the 3rd of September, and went on until November. In 1871, in September, it began to increase, and on the 7th October it was at its height; there were then 12,458 cases in 1872; on 8th of July it began to increase, reaching its highest number of outbreaks in September of that year; so that for the years 1869, 1870, 1871, and 1872, it is in the autumn months, according to Mr. Jenkins's Tables, that the disease was prevalent in England; I want to know is it according to your experience the same in Ireland?—I should certainly say so; and that appears to me to be rather an argument in support of my proposition; it is at that time that the great movement of cattle commences for the winter supply for stall feeding; and I think it bears me out fully in saying that the mischief is done by the cattle themselves.

4450. You still adhere to recommending the months of June and July, notwithstanding that the disease is most prevalent in the autumn months?—Yes; but what has happened in the case that Mr. Jenkins puts, would not in my judgment necessarily follow, if my plan of operation came into use; the poison of the disease was in England and in Ireland in the autumn of 1871 and of 1872, and therefore it was liable to be caught by cattle, but if you could kill out the poison, as I propose to do, then those results which Mr. Jenkins describes would not follow.

4451. You say you believe that foot and mouth disease is amenable to medical treatment?—I make a distinction between pleuro-pneumonia and foot and mouth disease. I do very little for instance as a practical man with it, except with old cows, which require nursing. If it is in store stock I let it run through them. In pleuro-pneumonia, as far as my experience goes, the best thing is to put them under lock and key, put a muzzle upon them, and give them plenty of water to drink.

4452. You mean to leave them alone?—Yes.

4453. You agree, then, with the veterinary professors; I was under the impression that you thought it better to put them under a course of treatment?—No.

4454. Now, with regard to Ballinasloe fair, you say that you do not believe that any number of inspectors would have been of any avail; you are speaking of the time when you were there with Mr. Jenkins?—I did not wish to convey that impression exactly; I said that they would discover a few cases here and there, but the great evil of Ballinasloe is this, that you have the germs of the disease in the cattle, and no inspection could discover it, and that they communicated the disease to others as they went along the road afterwards.

4455. Have you read Mr. Jenkins's Report upon that subject?—I have.

4456. Do you agree in what he states regarding it?—I do generally; I think it is a cleverly and elaborately drawn Report.

4457. Do

4457. Do you recollect the instance where he quotes in his Report a paragraph of the Irish Farmer's Gazette, of cattle belonging to Mr. Russell dying to the number of 50 on one farm, 30 of them on one night?—I have heard it stated over and over again as being true.

4458. You do not know anything about the cases themselves?—I do not, but I do know cases in which animals have died of foot and mouth disease very shortly after leaving the fair.

4459. Mr. *Clare Read*.] You mentioned a loss of sheep from Ballinasloe fair?—A neighbour of mine; a tenant of Lord Clifton who lives not many miles from the model farm, lost a great number of sheep from Ballinasloe fair, and I have known that a neighbour of the Right Honourable Member for Limerick lost a large number. I know several cases in which sheep have died in very considerable numbers from foot and mouth disease.

4460. Mr. *Kearney*.] I was in hopes that you knew something of the district, because about a week ago an affidavit was sent to me, taken before a magistrate, that this statement was utterly false?—I do not know anything of it personally.

4461. Do you consider the present system of the Veterinary Department in Ireland efficient; I must draw a difference between the style of system and the manner in which it is carried out, because the system may be perfect while there may not be the means at the disposal of the head of the department to carry it out properly; do you think that the plan upon which the Veterinary Department in Ireland act, is a sound plan for checking disease?—Upon that point I am most unwilling to speak. I do not wish to touch upon anybody, but I think it is a very unwise thing for the Government, for instance, not to pay Professor Ferguson properly, so that he should cease from all private practice and give his whole time to it. I do not know what his pay is, but he is an able man, and he ought to be well paid. I do not think he ought to be in private practice at all.

4462. But that does not apply to the country; there must necessarily be some sort of inspection to carry out the orders about foot and mouth disease; do you think that the system of inspection is sufficient?—I do not think that there is any real system of inspection in Ireland at all.

4463. There is a rule, is there not, that every outbreak must be reported to the constabulary?—There is.

4464. And if it is not reported the man is subject to a fine, is he not?—Yes, but the fine is optional; it is optional with the magistrate to impose a fine of sixpence if he chooses.

4465. But how is it discovered that those cases are not reported; must not there be inspection for that?—You must begin at the beginning, put the organisation of the thing upon a new footing, and make it a central authority, and make the persons at the head of it responsible to Parliament, and to the Executive. I think it is desirable that they should have more control over the constabulary. It appears to me that Professor Ferguson has done wonders, considering the organisation of the system. I stated before, and I repeat it, that I do not believe myself, in inspection.

4466. Mr. *W. Johnston*.] You stated, on the last day of your examination, that you did not approve of the object of the Veterinary Department?—They go on the principle of inspection; they profess to do it, but they do not do it.

038.

Professor Ferguson can speak much better for himself than I can do.

4467. Mr. *Kearney*.] Do you believe that all the cases of disease in Ireland are reported?—Not all of them; I know cases which have not been reported.

4468. Do you believe that nearly all are?—I should say at present, from my practical experience, that from 10 to 20 per cent. are not reported.

4469. You stated in your evidence that there are 15,000 centres of infection?—Yes.

4470. And do you think that there would be 10 per cent. more than that?—I think there would be 20 per cent. more than that of cases of disease which were not reported last year.

4471. Sir *H. Sturt*.] I wish to ask you one question with regard to an answer which you gave to the Honourable Member for Manchester, relating to the Dead Meat Market; are you at all aware of the supply of dead meat that was furnished at the time of the Manchester Exhibition to the large towns?—I have no knowledge of that subject; I am really not an authority upon the dead meat question.

4472. The Honourable Member seemed to imply that the large towns in Lancashire could not be supplied by the Dead Meat Market; do you think that there would be any insuperable difficulty in that, supposing the slaughter of foreign cattle took place abroad?—So far as my judgment goes (it is not worth much), I do not think that there would be any difficulty in supplying it, from the experience that we have had of the Aberdeenshire trade.

4473. You are not aware that, during the time of the Manchester Exhibition, and the congregating together of large bodies at that time, the whole supply was actually a dead meat supply?—I was not aware of that.

4474. Mr. *O'Connor*.] You were, I believe, at Enfield at the time of the cattle plague?—I was.

4475. You have no doubt there was real cattle plague in Enfield?—Not the slightest degree.

4476. How many cases did you see?—Only one animal diseased; a policeman destroyed it, and I was present at its destruction and burial.

4477. Mr. *Clare Read*.] In your cross-examination on Thursday it was suggested that, as a manufacturer does not lose when he is compelled to hold over his goods, so a farmer is not likely to lose when he is delayed in sending his cattle to market from foot and mouth disease; can you state the difference between those cases?—There is this difference, which I did not state then, that in the one case the goods do not require to be fed, while the cattle do.

4478. Is there not also this, that it naturally deranges farming operations, if a man is obliged to hold over a lot of beasts for two months before they can be sent to the butcher?—Quite so.

4479. You are clearly of opinion that farmers ought to receive adequate compensation when their stock is sacrificed for the public good?—I think that any legislation that does not proceed upon that basis will fail.

4480. You would do this, not only because it was just, but also because if it were not adopted the law would be evaded?—I am quite clear that, unless that principle is adopted, the law will not be carried out.

4481. In the case of the central authority, as distinguished from the local authority, would you interfere

Professor
T. Baileys.
—
23 April
1873.

Professor
T. Baldwin.
—
28 April
1873

interfere at all with the magistrates in the performance of their duties?—No. I am very glad you have asked me that question, as I might have been misunderstood. My view is this, that local magistrates or bodies are not necessarily competent to deal with a subject of this kind. You must entrust the execution of the law in a case of this kind to men who are really experts, so to speak, and who understand the matter thoroughly.

4482. You stated that the jobbers were in the habit of buying diseased stock, and sending them to England; did you mean in the case of foot and mouth disease or pleuro-pneumonia?—I think that the jobbers are not very scrupulous; they buy all sorts of things; they buy both cattle suffering from foot and mouth disease and pleuro-pneumonia.

4483. But with regard to foot and mouth disease, would not the development of the disease be so very rapid that they would be subject to the chance of being detected before the cattle arrived at the fairs or markets in England?—They take their chance for that; sometimes they get cured upon the journey, and do mischief as they go along.

4484. But there would be much greater risk in sending animals affected with pleuro-pneumonia to England, on account of the greater length of the incubation of the disease?—Yes, that is so.

4485. Mr. Mowell.] With regard to the accuracy of the reports as to the number of cases in which disease has broken out in Ireland, have you seen the report of the number of cases in which pleuro-pneumonia has broken out in the Dublin district in the last year?—Yes, it was sent to me.

4486. Will you state what the number of cases there mentioned is?—Here is an abstract of a very elaborate return drawn up by Professor Ferguson, in which it appears that in 542 dairies in Dublin the total number of animals upon the premises was 8,874, and the number which died on account of pleuro-pneumonia was 214, while the number which were slaughtered on account of pleuro-pneumonia is professionally only 10.

4487. Those are the facts stated in that return; do you believe that that fully represents the number of cases of pleuro-pneumonia in that district, and the number of cattle that were slaughtered?—I am quite satisfied that the number of animals said to be slaughtered on account of pleuro-pneumonia is quite inadequate, and is only a fraction of the real number.

4488. How do you know that?—From practical observation. I know and visit frequently several of the large dairies in Dublin. I think Professor Ferguson has deceived himself unintentionally, and I am sure this Return will deceive anybody else, and it is my duty to state so.

4489. Mr. Dodson.] Does Professor Ferguson's Return profess to apply to animals slaughtered compulsorily under order, or to those which are slaughtered in order to avoid spreading the disease?—It does not make any distinction.

4490. But in your evidence you include animals slaughtered by their owners, as well as those slaughtered compulsorily?—Yes, animals slaughtered in the way I have mentioned, in order to make the most of them.

4491. Mr. Mowell.] There are no animals slaughtered compulsorily for pleuro-pneumonia, are there?—No, there are not.

4492. You were asked some questions about the probable attitude of the farmers towards your plan, supposing it was to be tried. You said that the farmers wished to abolish the present restrictions?—I did.

4493. Do they wish to abolish them because they believe them to be ineffectual?—They do.

4494. Does it follow that because they wish to abolish the present restrictions, they would not co-operate in carrying out those which they believed would be effectual?—I believe their losses have been so fearful that they would be willing to support and co-operate with any plan which would give them a fair chance of success. When they are in the midst of 15,000 centres of infection, they cannot fail to see that the system is a failure, and they have lost confidence in it.

4495. With regard to the possibility of stamping out the foot and mouth disease in six weeks or two months, you are aware that very stringent measures were adopted in England at the time of the cattle plague which interdicted the movement of cattle, but I do not think they killed out the foot and mouth disease, did they?—Those restrictions were not adequate. I was sent over by the Government with a number of other people to study this question, and I was really alarmed at what is called the action of the local authorities.

4496. Will you express more fully what you mean?—It really appeared to me at that time that there was no effectual method of dealing with the cattle plague at all, and it was only when you lost live stock to the value of millions, that the nation became aroused to a sense of the danger, and then stringent measures were introduced, and I submit to the Committee that what occurred under those restrictions, so far as it goes, is, I would say, convincing proof that you would hope to succeed by adopting my plan; that is to say, that as the cattle plague was raging before those stringent measures were introduced, as soon as you adopted those stringent measures, fresh with the disease began to abate. What I say is, adopt the stringent measures which I suggest to you with regard to foot and mouth disease, and I venture to hope that corresponding results will follow. The restrictions imposed on the movement of late, then checked foot and mouth disease very much.

4497. You are very decidedly of opinion that the disease never appears except as the result of infection; how do you account for its appearance in Lambay Island?—In your absence I was asked about the introduction of the disease into the colonies; of the case of Lambay Island I would say the same thing. I would wipe it out from consideration. I see no difficulty about the case. I went to Malahide, intending to go across to Lambay Island; it is a long passage, and it was very stormy weather, so that I was unable to go across, but on making inquiry, I was informed that dead carcases had been washed upon the island; but assuming that that had not been so it might have been conveyed by the disease being washed upon the island by any porous material. Will you allow me to refer you to another case which is as strange as the case of Lambay Island. A gentleman has a house and 18 acres close to me. I was buying some cattle for the Commissioners of National Education, and he asked me to buy him a milk cow, and I did. The animal was for three or four months on the land. The 18 acres are surrounded by a wall, and it is the most isolated

closed place of any gentleman's residence in the whole of Ireland that I know of. In the middle of those 18 acres is a hollow in which this animal grazed, containing a couple of acres, and though she had been there for three months and a-half she became infected with foot and mouth disease, which would appear to be quite as puzzling a case as Lambay Island. I was interested in that case very much. It so happened that there was a little stream crossing the public road, and flowing into this inclosure. I went up the stream and into the lands adjoining, and found an old cow lying dead across the stream.

If I had not discovered that, anybody might have said, here is a case not produced by infection; and if I had not made the discovery of the conveyance of the poison in the sewage in the Glasnevin farm, they would have said, here is a clear case which is not the result of infection or contagion. I say, that if we possessed all the facts, we should be able to make it clear that every single case is produced by infection, and by infection only.

4498. Mr. Deane.] In this case was the dead cow lying further up the stream?—Higher up the stream.

Mr. WILLIAM STRATTON, called in; and Examined.

4499. Mr. Deane.] Will you inform the Committee what is your calling?—I am a farmer in Wiltshire.

4500. What is the nature of your farm?—I have about 1,500 sheep and 150 beasts, and about 1,000 acres of arable land.

4501. Have you had experience among your own animals of the different cattle diseases?—Yes; I have had at least 500 beasts affected at different times, and as many as 1,000 sheep.

4502. Will you inform the Committee what the beasts were affected with?—With foot and mouth disease.

4503. Have you had the cattle plague?—No.

4504. Or pleuro-pneumonia?—No.

4505. What were the sheep affected with?—With foot and mouth disease.

4506. You have not had any sheep pox?—I have never had sheep pox.

4507. Mr. Clive Read.] You farm over 2,000 acres of land yourself, do you not?—Yes.

4508. Your family are also extensively engaged in farming, are they not?—Yes; myself and brothers pay 10,000 l. a year rent in four counties.

4509. Do you keep much dairy stock?—Yes, I myself keep 70 dairy cows.

4510. Have you had them affected with foot and mouth disease?—Yes, upon several occasions.

4511. Lately?—This last summer I had it; it continued for three months gradually spreading from one part of my herd to another, until they all ultimately got it; only one escaped.

4512. What was the effect upon them as milking animals?—I lost three-fourths of the milk for about a fortnight during the heat of the fever, and I consider that the loss upon the dairy cows, as they took the disease during the months of June and July when they were in full milk, averaged from 3 l. to 4 l. each.

4513. Have you had any after effects, such as abortion?—I have had nearly half my dairy out of season in that respect. I have sold nearly 40 out of my dairy cows for grazing, because they would not breed. I attribute a considerable proportion of their barrenness to foot and mouth disease. We always find a considerable quantity of abortion after foot and mouth disease.

4514. Do you consider the foot and mouth disease a very great loss to the agricultural community?—I think the losses direct and indirect from foot and mouth disease in the death of the animals, the loss of flesh, abortion, and various causes infinitely exceed those from all other contagious diseases put together.

4515. Not because of its extreme virulence, .058.

but because it is so very general?—Because of its extremely infectious nature.

4516. And its being so very general?—And its being so very general in consequence of that, and the want of proper measures.

4517. Would you explain to the Committee what you would suggest as proper measures for stopping the spread of the disease?—I consider the present Orders of the Privy Council utterly inadequate to deal with it. I would like to see it treated with the same stringency as cattle plague, ultimately. I would begin with mild measures, such as are suggested by the Council of the Central Chamber, and having reduced it by these measures to a low point, I would then treat it with the same stringency with which we now treat cattle plague.

4518. We have just had Professor Baldwin from Ireland, who has been suggesting the stoppage of fairs and markets for six weeks or two months in one year; would you just look at the recommendations relating to the stoppage of fairs and markets, and tell the Committee if you agree with them?—The recommendation of the Central Chamber was that in any county in which, in the months of June and July, foot and mouth disease existed, the moving of animals should be prohibited during those months, except by license, as was the case during the prevalence of cattle plague; and that during those months no animals should be brought into any county without such license. I think that would be a most important regulation to make; the foot and mouth disease always declines during the winter months, when animals are confined in separate buildings, and are not allowed to range the country, it always declines to a minimum at the end of the winter, and then rises until winter comes again, and they are again confined to the stalls. I think the best months to take would be the months of June and July, when there is the least necessity for moving cattle. I think if it was then taken in hand, and no animal allowed to move except with a license, an immense deal would be done to keep down the disease if this were ordered to be done in each county for two or three years running. I think that one or two years would be sufficient; the disease would be reduced to a very low point, and I would then adopt more stringent measures, and treat it as cattle plague. You would then soon get rid of it.

4519. That is to say, you would slaughter all cattle affected with it?—Yes, I would, when we had reduced it to such a low point.

4520. You fancy that restrictions similar to those would have that effect?—I think that if the restrictions were adopted as drawn up by the

Professor
T. Baldwin.
—
18 April
1873.

Mr.
W. Stratton.
—

Mr.
W. Stratton.
28 April
1873.

the Central Chamber of Agriculture, the disease would be reduced to a minimum. During the cattle plague, the adoption of such restrictions had the effect of destroying the disease, and an immense blessing it was to us.

4521. I see this paper begins by saying that, "Provided the fresh importation of disease were prevented by the adoption of the system of slaughter or quarantine, the Council would recommend additional regulations," and the first is, that there should be uniform action in counties and boroughs throughout Great Britain; do you agree with that?—Certainly.

4522. Have you any doubt that the sub-division of the local authorities is one cause why the Act is not properly and efficiently carried out?—I have no doubt that that is the great cause of it.

4523. That whereas the interest of the counties is to preserve the health of the animals, the interest of some of the boroughs is to get a good market, and not to attend to the health of the animals?—I believe the interest of boroughs is to get as good a market as possible, and they have power to carry on markets independently of the county, whereas they ought to be stopped from doing so.

4524. The report goes on to say, "That unless Ireland be subjected to safeguards against disease, similar to those which may be adopted in this country, it will be necessary to impose restrictions on the importation of Irish stock?"—Quite so.

4525. Do you think that if it were, that would not be necessary?—I think that if measures such as I have indicated were adopted there as here, they would be in as healthy a state as we are, and that ultimately the disease would be got rid of. I believe now that the seeds of the disease are picked up in the steamboats to a great extent. I believe there is a chance there with regard to double disinfection, which I think is very important. I believe the present system of disinfection is a complete failure.

4526. You would have the vessels, bins, and trucks disinfected twice to the satisfaction of the local authorities?—Yes.

4527. The third recommendation is, "That in cases of cattle plague or sheep-pox, the veterinary inspectors of the Privy Council should be empowered to order the slaughter of animals in adjacent places as well as those in contact with diseased animals;" do you agree with that?—I think that in many cases that would be very desirable. The inspectors of the Privy Council should have a discretionary power to slaughter in case they thought it desirable.

4528. You would not give the power to every veterinary inspector throughout the country?—No, only to those of the Privy Council.

4529. Who should be sent down upon the outbreak of any disease?—Just so, as in the case of sheep-pox or cattle plague.

4530. Are you aware that the slaughter of animals that are herded with those which are the subjects of cattle plague is now optional with the local authorities?—I think that ought to be imperative.

4531. You think there ought to be no doubt about this, that all animals actually herded with diseased animals should be killed at once?—Certainly.

4532. You stated just now with regard to subsequent outbreaks of foot and mouth disease, after

these stringent measures of restricting the movement of cattle in the months of June and July were adopted, that you would have the cattle slaughtered?—Yes.

4533. That I believe is your own opinion, and is not the recommendation of the Council?—No, that is my private opinion; I am quite sure that the farmers of England are prepared to submit to any loss in that way and any sacrifice of stock, provided they have a reasonable hope of annihilating the disease. There is a very strong feeling amongst the agriculturists that the disease might be and ought to be got rid of.

4534. You are of opinion that a great deal of the disease is now propagated by transit?—Yes.

4535. Are you prepared to adopt this recommendation of the Central Chamber of Agriculture with regard to transit: "That no store animals should be brought by sea into this country except on deck, unless an efficient system of ventilation is carried out in the holds of vessels"?—Yes, I think that is a very valid proposition and perhaps hardly goes far enough.

4536. You think that the ventilation might be better?—I have no doubt that the ventilation of the holds might be made very perfect by a proper mechanical system; I see no difficulty in ventilating the holds of a vessel.

4537. And "That two pieces of landing should be provided at every port into which cattle are imported;" do you agree with that?—I do not think that is of very great importance.

4538. "That with regard to store animals, there should be required a veterinary certificate of health from the port of embarkation, and that when such animals are landed, such certificate should be endorsed by a duly qualified inspector, after careful examination of the animals by daylight;" do you agree with that?—Possibly I have very little belief in inspection at all. I know very well that the seeds of this disease will so lie in an animal, that they cannot be detected by the most careful inspection. We had a very good instance of that at the Smithfield Club Show last December 12 months. There was a most elaborate system of inspection carried out then. Professor Simonds had two men of his own staff at the door of the hall, who made a personal inspection of the animals as they came to the hall; and the result was, that they shut out 30 animals which they thought were infected, and allowed the rest to pass in. Before they had been there three days, I myself saw animals suffering from foot and mouth disease. Now the inspection was carried out under the most favourable conditions; it was done under the direct management of Professor Simonds, and if that was not perfect, I do not know what inspection can be perfect. I maintain that inspection is altogether a delusion, and is the great fault of the system as it stands.

4539. You mean that those animals had the seeds of the disease incubating in their system when they were examined?—Yes.

4540. And as no one can detect the disease in a state of incubation, you do not place much reliance upon inspection?—I want to do away with inspection; I do not believe in it at all.

4541. The last recommendation is, "That there should be a detention of six hours for animals coming from Ireland, for the purpose of perfecting the inspection, and giving food and water." Although you do not place much reliance upon inspection, I suppose you would say that

that for the purpose of humanity, the animals ought to be allowed to rest six hours?—Quite so; I think the state of animals coming even from Ireland, and landing at Bristol, is most disgusting. I have seen them myself when they have been evidently suffering most tremendous agony from want of water and food, and from pressing together, and from filth and want of ventilation.

4542. You think that has arisen from overcrowding in the vessel?—From overcrowding and from want of food and water, and other hardships.

4543. Have you seen many animals unloaded at Bristol?—I have seen them in the market after being unloaded. I have not been on the boats, but their state in the market was sufficient to show that they must have undergone terrible sufferings.

4544. Where are the animals coming to Bristol mostly shipped from?—From Cork, I believe.

4545. That would be a voyage of considerable duration, would it not?—It would be a voyage of about 36 or 40 hours, I believe. I cannot speak with authority upon that point.

4546. If the holds of these ships are only ventilated by windfalls, the ventilation when coming up a narrow channel like the Avon, would be, no doubt, worse than it would be at sea?—I have no doubt that it would be worse than at sea.

4547. We have been told that the farmers of England care nothing about foot and mouth disease; do you agree with that statement?—I believe that statement to be very untrue; they all look upon it as the greatest scourge which they suffer from, and the worst of infectious diseases.

4548. If the farmers thought that any measures of restriction could get rid of it, do you think that they would be willing to try them?—I am quite sure that they would submit to very strong measures, if they thought that they would be effectual. Our county unanimously passed resolutions even stronger than those which the Central Chamber have adopted, and I, as representing the local chamber at the Central Chamber, was asked to use my utmost influence to get the Central Chamber to back up and adopt such measures as these.

4549. I suppose some years ago the farmers thought less of the disease, because they imagined that if the cattle once had it, they would not have it again?—That certainly was the character of the disease until within the last few years. It was quite the exception to get a second attack, but now it seems to have become much more virulent, and the first attack does not prevent them from a second; this year I had about 35 cattle which suffered from it, which had last year.

4550. Out of what number?—I had about 40 last year attacked by the disease, 35 of those had it this year; the rest were gone. I had but one which escaped.

4551. How long have you been engaged in farming?—I have been farming 15 years.

4552. Had you ever had any cattle suffer from a second attack before last year?—Yes, but only in rare instances. I had had 10 or 15 in my whole experience which had it twice before this year.

4553. And now the whole of them have had it twice?—Yes; the whole of them have had it twice, with the exception of one.

4554. Was the second attack more or less
0.58.

violent than the first?—It was quite as virulent as the first. One animal died upon the third day after showing symptoms of disease which had had it the year before.

4555. Do you ever remember it being so fatal and general amongst sheep as it was last year?—No, I formerly held the opinion that sheep were not liable to take it; but I have quite altered that within the last year or two. It has inflicted great loss in Hampshire upon the large flocks there, and in Wiltshire it has been very prevalent this last year. All my lambs suffered from it from first to last; but, upon the whole, I do not think I lost more than 3s. a head by them; but my brother lost 150 lambs when they were sucking their mothers; the disease has the effect of rendering the milk poisonous to young animals; he lost 150 of them and injured many of the others, and he says that he lost more than 500*l.* upon a flock of 500 ewes.

4556. Does the disease manifest itself in the mouth?—It does not manifest itself very plainly. Sometimes there is a small scab upon the roof of the mouth, and sometimes on the tip of the tongue; but you may look without seeing it, unless you examine it upon the right day.

4557. I believe, in consequence of the failure of the restrictions upon an outbreak of foot and mouth disease among cattle, the farmers thought that it was no use to interfere with it?—I believe that until the cattle plague broke out we had no means of dealing at all with it; it was looked upon then as the whooping cough or measles may be; as something which we could not avoid; but as soon as we found that the measures adopted for the repression of the cattle plague effectually got rid of foot and mouth disease, the farmers made up their minds that those measures ought to be extended, and the diseases thoroughly dealt with.

4558. Is it your opinion that the restrictions imposed upon the movement of cattle at the time of the cattle plague had the effect of considerably reducing pleuro-pneumonia, and getting rid entirely of foot and mouth disease?—So much so that, practically, we had none. I did not know of any at all; we were free from it. I believe for two years, almost absolutely for three or four years, there was scarcely any disease existing.

4559. Does that remark apply to pleuro-pneumonia as well as to foot and mouth disease?—I cannot speak positively with reference to pleuro-pneumonia, because I have had no experience of it; there is none in our district. I believe that it did reduce pleuro-pneumonia, but I have the impression that many lung diseases are mistaken for pleuro-pneumonia, and are called pleuro-pneumonia, which are not absolutely infectious pleuro-pneumonia, but are merely, as it were, bad colds.

4560. Was the importation from Ireland stopped by those cattle plague restrictions?—I am not aware that it was.

4561. I understand you to say that you do not know of any cases of foot and mouth disease for a year or two after the cattle plague?—No, I believe there were none in our county, and I heard of none elsewhere.

4562. You go about to farmers' clubs, and go about the kingdom a good deal, do you not?—Yes, I attend nearly all the great shows; my father has been an exhibitor of cattle for a long period, and we certainly were free from the disease for years.

A. A.

4563. There

Mr.
W. Stratton.
—
28 April
1873.

Mr. W. Stratton. 4563. There have been objections raised here and elsewhere against the development of the dead meat trade, because it is said that the offal would be entirely lost if cattle were slaughtered at the waterside, and the dead meat forwarded to the inland towns?—That is the most extraordinary statement I ever met with. It is an organised system in our country now, when pigs are killed upon a farm, which is often insisted upon by the farmer in order that he may see the weight, to send the offal immediately it comes from the pig to London.

4564. How far are you from London?—A 100 miles by rail and six miles by road from a station; that is on one side. Then when the Bath butchers buy an animal they take it to Bath, and put the offal into hampers, and cart it by road to Bath. Last July twelvemonths was the last time I had any slaughtered at home. I had about 25 fat pigs slaughtered by a Bath butcher; the people came out from the village to buy the offal, as they always used to do on such occasions. The butcher refused to sell it, saying he had customers in Bath when it was reserved for. The offal was taken by road to Bath in the hottest possible weather in July; and my neighbour, about three miles from me, says that when his pigs are slaughtered, the offal is put into hampers and carted to Gillingham station, and then carried from Gillingham station to London upon the South-Western Railway, which is over 100 miles.

4565. Was there any particular pains taken to cleanse or cure the offal?—Not at all; it was thrown into hampers at once.

4566. Would there have been any loss upon it?—Not at all; if there had been they would have sold it to people on the spot.

4567. If they could send it in July they could do so at any other time?—Certainly; that is the most difficult time for preserving meat.

4568. Did I understand you that previously it was the custom to sell the offal to the villagers round about?—Yes; this trade for offal in London seems to have been only newly developed in our neighbourhood. At one of our local meetings I met Mr. Evelyn Ashley, who stated at the public dinner that the subject was a very difficult one; that he had been employed by the promoters of the waterside markets as counsel before the Parliamentary Committee; and he there found such a mass of evidence to show that the offal would be wasted, in the case of waterside slaughter, that they were utterly unable to maintain their ground. I then told him what was the practice in that neighbourhood, and was supported right and left.

4569. You imagine that the objection which is raised about the transport of offal is illusory?—Quite illusory.

4570. And that if you can take offal in this careless and unprepared state, there could be but little doubt that the meat itself could be transported?—There would be no difficulty whatever. There is a regular trade in dead meat from Exeter to London by the South Western line; they have vans for the purpose. It is the regular practice to slaughter lambs, sheep, beef, and everything else in Exeter, and send the carcasses by rail to London, instead of sending them alive.

4571. Do they hang them up in the vans, or are they packed in cloth?—They hang them up in the vans.

4572. Do they kill lamb in the spring of the year and send it up?—Yes, there is a great deal of that done in Exeter.

4573. Which is the most delicate of all meats?—It is the most delicate of all meats. They say that they can send it in that way when they could not keep it the same length of time in their own slaughter-houses; that the current of air is such that it is beneficial to the meat; and it is only reasonable to suppose so; in open vans there is a great circulation of air round the meat.

4574. I suppose, recurring to the subject of foot and mouth disease, the disease is so guarded that farmers think they must have it, and that it is of no use taking any particular precautions about it?—The measures are so inadequate that a great many of them are careless, and despite the rules in consequence of their known inadequacy.

4575. But you still adhere to your opinion that farmers do regard the disease with a great deal of dread, and that the losses are almost incalculable?—Yes; I am sure that farmers in our county, and in the west of England, are unanimous, and most urgent in demanding stronger measures for the suppression of foot and mouth disease.

4576. Do you consider yours a dairy or a feeding district, or what?—A dairy district, mostly.

4577. You do not buy much, do you?—Yes, we do; we buy them in the spring, for the purpose of stocking the dairies. My brother has a 300-cow dairy; and this spring he went into Oxfordshire and bought 63 heifers in one deal. He put them into trucks, and upon the fourth day after their reaching home they had the foot and mouth disease; he lost time out of the 62, and nearly all the calves. The nine beasts died absolutely, I believe, owing to their having the disease when they were fat in very full milk; it affected their system, and they died mostly within 10 days of being seized.

4578. Mr. Mansell.] Did the animals catch the disease in the trucks?—Yes, undoubtedly. As they became diseased on the fourth day after reaching home, whereas the animals which were herded with them were perfectly well throughout, which shows that the disease was picked up in the trucks.

4579. You have not a large winter grazing district, have you?—No; there is an exodus of the country in the winter and an influx in the spring.

4580. Do you get many cattle from the Bristol market?—Yes; that is where we get the disease generally.

4581. Mr. Dodson.] You recommend, in addition to the resolution of the Central Chamber, that after foot and mouth disease has been stamped out, as far as may be, then any animal which is found to have the disease should be slaughtered, by order?—I expressed the opinion that those measures would reduce the disease to a low point, and then it would be advisable to adopt even more stringent measures to get rid of the few remaining centres of infection.

4582. You would then slaughter compulsorily every animal found to be affected?—It would be a question as to how many animals were affected in a certain locality; I think it is hardly fair to put it quite in that way.

4583. I only want to understand your proposition?—I act as one of the committee for the county of Wiltshire, we do not delegate our power to

any subordinate body, but act through the police. I apprehend that when the disease reached a point at which it might be more stringently dealt with, we ought to have the power to slaughter any animals affected in our county, and to prevent the ingress of any other animals from any other county, except by license.

4584. You would have a discretionary power of slaughter?—Yes; vested in the county authorities, not in any smaller authority than that.

4585. How do you propose to insure that the existence of disease could be discovered?—We have a system of reporting by the police, through the clerk of the peace; the chief constable issues weekly reports as to the number of infected animals in each police district, so that we are kept thoroughly informed weekly as to the state of disease.

4586. Do you consider that that information is complete and reliable?—I think it is as complete as we can get it.

4587. Therefore, that would still be your source of information?—Yes.

4588. The source of information is the owner of the diseased animal?—Yes, and his neighbours; if the policeman in the parish sees a case of disease, and unfortunately, all know it too well, it would be at once reported, and I, as a stockowner, would report the case if my neighbour did not. I do not think that there are any means of hiding disease in Wiltshire. I think it is all reported in our county.

4589. In your county the feeling upon the subject is so strong, that if a man did not voluntarily give the information, his neighbours would give it for him?—Yes; in the parish adjoining me there are 600 cows, which were free from disease up to June last year, and some little farmer bought three beasts, which became affected with foot and mouth disease, and those beasts remained in one field affected for about a week without spreading the disease beyond themselves, and if we had had the power of slaughtering those beasts we should have saved a great deal of money. The beasts were worth about 30*l.* each, and the money that was afterwards lost by foot and mouth disease, spread by those animals, in the way of cheese and butter, casualties, &c., would amount to, it was calculated, about 800*l.*

4590. If you slaughtered the animals, what proportion of compensation would you propose to give to the owner?—Being slaughtered for the benefit of the community, I think he ought to be paid all.

4591. When you say "all," you mean the value of the animal when it is diseased?—Yes, the value of the animal at the time.

4592. Would you take any steps with regard to the animals which had been herded with the diseased animals?—Yes; supposing the disease were reduced to the proportions I am assuming, I do not say that it should be slaughtered in every case, but where the animal is not slaughtered there should be a more stringent separation and isolation of it.

4593. You would propose to vest in the county authorities a discretionary power also to slaughter animals which had been herded with the diseased animal, or to prescribe isolation?—Quite so.

4594. You have had no experience of cattle plague in your county?—No, I have not.

4595. Was there no cattle plague in Wiltshire at all?—There was a reported case, but I believe

it was never thoroughly authenticated. I do not believe we had a single case.

4596. Have you had any sheep-pox?—We had sheep-pox before the institution of the Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act.

4597. You recommend that in the case of cattle plague the animals herded with the diseased animals should be killed by compulsory order?—Yes.

4598. What would you do in the case of animals which had not actually been herded with diseased animals, but in a diseased neighbourhood?—I would leave the power in the hands of the inspectors of the Privy Council to slaughter the animals to which they believed the disease had been communicated.

4599. You would increase their power to that extent?—Yes.

4600. You say that your Chamber of Agriculture had adopted resolutions somewhat stronger than those of the Central Chamber of Agriculture?—Yes.

4601. In what respect were they stronger; in the same respect as those you have been recommending yourself?—Very much so.

4602. There would be no material difference between them?—No.

4603. Could you hand in a copy of those resolutions that you came to?—I could send it to the Committee, but I drew up those recommendations of the Central Chamber upon the basis of what we had agreed upon, and they are so much the same that I think it would not be necessary.

4604. I understand that your recommendations are more stringent than those of the Central Chamber of Agriculture?—They are so in one or two points.

4605. We should like to see them; you have had no experience of sheep-pox yourself, I think?—I have not.

4606. Do you know when sheep-pox was in the county in what way it was got rid of?—It was got rid of by the separation I believe of the infected animals and constantly turning them for examination; vaccination was tried and found ineffectual, and incision was resorted to to a great extent, and I believe the slaughter of them in some cases was carried out; but I must tell you that the feeling of the farmers was clearly indicated in this way, that after the disease had almost died out on two or three of the principal farms on which it had raged, a small flock of sheep was brought into the county in a suspicious state, it was believed that they were infected with the sheep-pox, and a subscription was got up amongst the farmers at Marlborough market; they bought this little flock of sheep and the hurdles within which they had been enclosed; they slaughtered the sheep and buried them, and burnt the hurdles.

4607. With regard to the alleged failure of inspection at the Smithfield show which you adduced as an argument that inspection at the ports must fail, are you aware that if at the port one animal in a cargo is found diseased the whole cargo is slaughtered?—That would not affect my argument. I maintain that all the animals of that cargo might pass the inspector, and might, within 24 hours afterwards, break down with foot and mouth disease. The period of incubation is four days, and those beasts would not necessarily be four days coming from Hamburg to London; they would probably have picked up the disease in the hold of the ship; no inspector in England could detect it until after three or four days.

Mr.
W. Stratton.
—
28 April
1873.

4608. At the Smithfield show no animal which had not actually got the disease was stopped?—I do not suppose so; it was an inspection carried out under the direction of Professor Simonds, and under the orders of the Privy Council. I presume they would have stopped anything which had come in the same horse-box with an affected animal. My brother's animal was examined and rejected, and left out of the yard from the Saturday until the Monday, when he was brought in perfectly sound, never having had the disease at all.

4609. On what occasion was it that the inspection at the Smithfield show failed in the manner you describe?—The Christmas show of 1871; the last show but one.

4610. There was no failure last year, was there?—They adopted different measures altogether last year; they did the very same thing which I say ought to be done; they would not allow anything to come into the yard without a certificate that the animal had not been previously exhibited within a certain time; that it had not been in contact with any diseased animal; and that it had been sent to the show in a horse box; they adopted practically the system of licences which I say ought to be adopted; that is, the very point we contend for, namely, that inspection is no use; you must go by results, and that where a place is proved to be an infected or dangerous place, everything which comes from that place shall be treated as infected.

4611. You told the Committee that you lost 3*l.* or 4*l.* per head on milch cows through the foot and mouth disease?—Yes.

4612. How much upon the average do you say you lost by fat stock that were attacked?—It depends so very much upon the period at which they get the disease; during the summer months it is much more injurious than during the winter months, and at the season when herbage is scarce there is much greater loss than when there is plenty of soft succulent grass. I should estimate the loss upon grazing beasts in a forward state to be 2*l.*; upon store beasts just brought in, it would not average more than 1*l.*; and upon young beasts it would very often not average more than 10*s.* each.

4613. *Chairman.* You had the foot and mouth disease very badly last year in Wiltshire, I believe?—Very badly.

4614. Had you it badly in 1869?—It was not nearly so prevalent as it has been since; it has gradually increased since the cattle-plague restrictions were removed.

4615. But there was a great deal of foot and mouth disease in 1869, was there not, in Wiltshire?—I am not quite clear as to when it began. The cattle-plague restrictions were removed in 1867; there was very little disease until 1870. It has been gradually increasing from 1869 down to the present time; increasing from the spring to the autumn, and dying away from the autumn to the spring again.

4616. Do you take an active part in Wiltshire in putting in force the Orders of the Privy Council?—I am one of six farmers who are upon the executive committee for the county.

4617. In Wiltshire have they made use of the power given by the Privy Council to make orders with regard to foot and mouth disease?—We adopted, at my suggestion, about the year 1869, the power given us by the Privy Council, of treating foot and mouth disease in the same way as pleuro-pneumonia.

4618. And you have done so ever since?—We have done so ever since.

4619. The farms in Wiltshire are generally rather large, are they not?—Yes.

4620. Do the large sheep-owners own also large numbers of cattle?—The greater part of North Wilt is a dairy district. There is an immense number of cattle kept in North Wilt, and in South Wilt also there is a large district where cattle prevail.

4621. Have you had the disease prevalent amongst sheep as well as cattle?—It has been very prevalent amongst sheep.

4622. What is it exactly that you recommend with regard to foot and mouth disease?—I recommend those measures which the Central Council have sent to you as being their suggestions.

4623. The chief recommendation here with regard to home cattle is, that in the months of June and July, if foot and mouth disease exists in any county, all movement should be prohibited, except with a license?—Yes; I think that is a very important condition.

4624. That means that you would not have that prohibition at any other time in the year?—No.

4625. Nor in any county in which there was not foot and mouth disease?—Not until the disease was reduced by those measures to the very low point I have suggested; it would then be desirable to increase the stringency of those measures; but I now think it extends so universally that more oppressive measures than those would be found to be unbearable.

4626. Then I understand that you would stop all movement; if at the end of two or three months you still find that you have foot and mouth disease, what would you do then?—I should not expect during the first year to extinguish it during those two months, but I do not think it would be possible to prevent the movement of cattle much longer than during those two months.

4627. Supposing you diminished the June during the two months by this action, in what way would you prevent its reviving in its full force during the ten months that would elapse till the next June and July?—Practically the period in which it would be inclined to spread would be August, September, and October, because we find that after October the holding of cattle commences, as they are shut up from the fields into the yards. We propose to take the months when it reaches its lowest point.

4628. But experience seems to show that August, September, and October are the first months in which it is very likely to spread?—Quite so, because during the months of May and June and July the disease has been spreading; the seeds have really been sowing broadcast.

4629. Then you would hope that those regulations for those two months would give it such a blow the first year that it would not reach anything like the same height before the next June and July, as it had done during the first year?—Quite so; those measures being taken with the others which have gone before and which follow it. The preamble is a very important point, I think, also for consideration.

4630. The other measures with regard to foot and mouth disease are chiefly disinfection of the lairs and yards, and the holds of vessels?—It is very important, in our opinion, that that should be done in a different manner from the present.

4631. The

4631. The first of your recommendations is that there should be uniform action in boroughs and in counties; but that is in contradiction, is it not, of the 6th recommendation, which says that there should be only restrictions of movement in those counties in which you have found the existence of disease; I should have read that 1st recommendation as meaning that there should be a restriction throughout the kingdom?—It means so to some extent; it means that the delegation of power to minor committees is objectionable, and that the boroughs not being amenable to the local authorities is a very objectionable thing.

4632. Then uniform action in counties and boroughs throughout Great Britain means uniform within each county in Great Britain?—I think we say as far as possible.

4633. Now, with regard to the Preamble, what do you ask for there, exactly?—We ask for the slaughter or quarantine of all foreign imported animals.

4634. In foreign animals you do not include Irish animals, I presume?—We do not include Irish animals.

4635. But supposing that you still apprehended danger from Ireland, what would you do?—We believe that if the same measures which we recommend in that set of resolutions were applied in Ireland as in England, they would have the same effect in Ireland as in England.

4636. Supposing that they were not applied, what would you do?—Then we would treat them as foreign beasts.

4637. What would you do with foreign animals?—Either slaughter or quarantine the whole of them.

4638. How long would you quarantine them?—For foot and mouth disease, I imagine a week would be sufficient. I am not a sufficient veterinary authority to give an opinion about pleuropneumonia.

4639. With regard to foot and mouth disease, you do not propose at first to slaughter any animals?—Not at first.

4640. What is the most severe proposition that you make with regard to slaughter in the case of home animals?—If you mean, ultimately, when we have reduced the disease to a low point, I would give the county authorities power to slaughter, or use additional precautions with regard to isolation beyond what they now have. I would give them a discretionary power to slaughter if they thought proper.

4641. To slaughter what animals?—Animals affected, and those in contact with them.

4642. You are aware that in case of any cargo arriving from abroad in which one animal is found to have foot and mouth disease the whole are slaughtered?—Yes, that is so.

4643. You are aware also that that has been put in force in many cases?—Yes.

4644. Are you also aware that it is believed that the fact that there is that order has caused very great care to be taken by the importers of cattle from the unscheduled countries; that is to say, countries from which the cattle would not be compelled to be slaughtered at the port of landing unless disease was found in them?—I believe the order would be ineffectual, because the germs of the disease might be picked up in the hold of a ship upon the voyage from Hamburg to London.

4645. Have you any knowledge of any case
0.58.

which you can trace of the disease having been introduced in that way?—As I live in the western part of the kingdom I know more of the cattle coming from the west.

4646. You know that the restriction upon foreign importation is much more severe than upon the movement of any home cattle?—Yes.

4647. Have you full confidence that the stringent regulations you propose would be carried out generally by the farmers in Wiltshire?—Yes; I have full confidence that they would be hailed with acclamation.

4648. Were these regulations in force during the cattle plague?—Yes.

4649. Was there no difficulty in carrying them out?—I know that the benefit was far greater than the difficulty. We authorised the corporals and sergeants of police to sign licences, and we had no difficulty at all in carrying them out.

4650. If the authorities who were employed by the Privy Council stated that they found it was very difficult to carry out these orders, either that difficulty did not exist in Wiltshire, or they must have been mistaken in their assertion?—I do not know what difficulty you allude to.

4651. It has been frequently stated that, notwithstanding the great loss from cattle plague, it was found very difficult to carry out the restrictions with regard to movement during the cattle plague?—Practically we had no difficulty in Wiltshire. I can speak to that, because I was in constant communication with the authorities and with head quarters.

4652. Mr. Dodson.] You had no cattle plague in Wiltshire?—No, we had not, and no foot and mouth disease, I believe; we got rid of it entirely.

4653. Chairman.] Does your local authority in Wiltshire chiefly employ the police to carry the regulations out?—Yes.

4654. Do they employ any veterinary surgeons also?—No, only in a case of doubt, when they are empowered to call in a veterinary inspector.

4655. None of your inspectors are veterinary inspectors?—No.

4656. There is no right of entry at present upon a farmer's premises in respect to foot and mouth disease?—There is not.

4657. Would you give such power of entry?—Yes.

4658. Do you think such powers would be necessary?—Yes.

4659. To whom would you give such power of entry?—To the inspectors of the local authority.

4660. To the police?—Yes.

4661. Supposing that there were farmers who did not wish to report the fact of foot and mouth disease being upon their premises, what steps would you take?—Their neighbours would report it for them very quickly.

4662. But suppose their neighbours did not know of it?—It would surely be discovered.

4663. What steps would you then take to discover whether they do or do not conceal the existence of disease?—You cannot do more than that, I think.

4664. You think that giving the police the power to enter the premises, and each man watching his neighbour, would be sufficient?—Yes, I think so.

4665. Is it one of your recommendations here that there should be power of entry in the case of foot and mouth disease?—I do not think it is included in that report. I was not aware until quite recently that we had not that power.

Mr.
W. Stratton.
28 April
1873.

4666. Just to turn to another question: take your third recommendation with regard to compensation for cattle plague or sheep-pox, you say that you think that the owners of the animals which are slaughtered should be reimbursed the full value thereof at the public cost?—I would have the compensation estimated by valuation.

4667. Do you mean the full value after the animal has caught the plague, or before?—Afterwards.

4668. And the full value of the animal which has been exposed to infection after such exposure?—The full value at the time that the animal is slaughtered.

4669. What do you think would be the value of an animal which has caught the cattle plague, supposing he was a beast worth 20*l.* originally?—At the time he was infected I should not think he would be worth half the money; less than half the money, probably.

4670. Then, as regards cattle plague, your recommendation is similar to that contained in the Act; it is precisely the same thing, because the Act says, "Where an animal affected with cattle plague, or affected with disease suspected to be cattle plague, is slaughtered in pursuance of this Act, the local authority (except as otherwise provided in this Act) shall, by way of compensation for the animal, pay to the owner thereof such sum, not exceeding 20*l.*, and not exceeding one-half of the value of the animal immediately before it was affected with cattle plague, as to the local authority seems fit." Consequently, if the fact of an animal catching the cattle plague diminished its value by one-half, which is your opinion, I should think it would do more; and the Act agree together?—Yes.

4671. Have you any estimate of the amount of depreciation which the fact of being herded with animals which had the cattle plague would cause?—I do not think they would lose any less value if they were fat.

4672. They could be killed before they would develop the disease?—Yes.

4673. You would have to look rather sharp about that, would you not?—Yes; but I apprehend that if these measures were properly carried out, there would be very few suffer on account of them, as the evil would be cured immediately.

4674. You have heard evidence of the exceeding rapidity with which the disease spreads?—I have.

4675. Are you aware what compensation is given now for animals herded with diseased animals?—£30 I think is the maximum.

4676. It is not exceeding 30*l.*, or three-fourths of the value of the animal?—But we contemplate that those in adjacent places, as well as those herded with diseased animals, should be paid for at their full value.

4677. Would you apply the same rules, with regard to slaughter and compensation immediately, to pleuro-pneumonia at the present time?—No; I would treat pleuro-pneumonia as we now treat it. I am not practically conversant with it.

4678. Have you much pleuro-pneumonia in Wiltshire?—No, we have not.

4679. Have you never had it?—No; I never have had it on my farm.

4680. Mr. Noswell.] Do you believe that if the circulation of cattle were prevented, and that the fairs and markets were stopped for two

months, you would entirely get rid of the foot and mouth disease in the district?—No.

4681. Chairman.] Your sixth recommendation does not, in its wording, ask for the stoppage of fairs and markets?—No; but I think that would be a necessary consequence of the adoption of the measures we propose.

4682. Mr. Noswell.] Why do you believe that it would not get rid of the foot and mouth disease?—On account of the vast number of cases which at present exist. Supposing the proposed system were put in force next June and July, there are so many sources of infection; in fact, the disease extends over so great an area that in the first year it would not be absolutely successful in eradicating it; it would reduce it to a lower point, but I believe some would escape.

4683. Take the case of a herd of cattle, the disease would not have run through the herd before the two months had expired?—It would, if they were in direct contact, but not if there was a break; there might be a pause in the communication of the disease from one lot of animals to another.

4684. Could you form any opinion as to the length of time during which it would really be necessary to take these restrictive measures, with a fair chance of getting rid of the disease altogether?—I think the adoption of these measures for a whole summer would be effectual.

4685. That would be impossible, would it not? No, we did it in the time of the cattle plague, and I should be glad to do it again; but there are many weak brethren amongst us, and we drew these recommendations up to meet their views, but I should like it as I say.

4686. Do you suppose that if these strong measures were adopted they would be sufficient to limit the disease to the particular counties in which the disease existed; would it not be more effectual, in order to carry out these restrictive measures, to let the whole country suffer for a certain time, with the view of absolutely eradicating the disease?—I think very likely it would be desirable to do so. For myself, I should like to see that restriction absolute through the whole summer.

4687. Supposing there were a general belief amongst farmers that the disease would be eradicated, do you think that they would not be prepared to submit these resolutions?—I think they would, if they understood that.

4688. The reason, as I gathered, why the farmers object to the present orders is that they find them rather onerous, and they do not do any good?—That is so.

4689. Chairman.] You yourself would prefer that there should be a stoppage of movement during the summer; you mean from June to November?—Yes.

4690. You think that it would be better that that should be done all through the kingdom?—Yes.

4691. I suppose you simply say you would prefer that, because you think you would be more likely to ensure success?—Yes.

4692. Mr. Dodson.] Do you think that public opinion would go sufficiently with such a measure to ensure its being carried out?—I doubt if it would.

4693. Unless public opinion were to a great extent in its favour, it could not be tried?—I do not think it could be carried through Parliament otherwise.

4694. But could it be carried out in the country

ties unless public opinion went with it?—I do not think there would be any hostility on the part of agriculturists to the measures.

4695. Would there not be in the counties which were free from the disease?—In those counties I daresay there might be some objection; but, practically, it would be inoperative there, because they would have no disease there. I have no doubt it would be shirked in those counties where no disease existed.

4696. Mr. Mansell.] Do you think that you have in England sufficient local machinery for the purpose of detecting the springing-up of the disease itself, supposing it were once eradicated?—Yes; I think the principle of self-preservation would be the means of finding it out; the neighbouring farmers would take care that any case of disease was reported.

4697. You think that if you could once get rid of foot and mouth disease, the local authorities would have sufficient power to detect at once any case of its reappearance?—I have no doubt whatever upon that point.

4698. Mr. Kinsman.] After you have stopped the foot and mouth disease by stopping the movement of cattle, would you propose any regulations with regard to the cleansing of trucks, and so on, for fear the disease should be left dormant in them?—That set of resolutions to which I called your attention, as presented by the Central Chamber of Agriculture, points out that the disinfection of trucks is very inefficiently done, and requires further measures to be adopted.

4699. Do you recommend putting cattle in quarantine upon arriving from Ireland?—No.

4700. You do not agree with the veterinary professors who regard quarantine as being likely to form a hotbed of infection?—We have never recommended quarantine for animals coming from Ireland.

4701. In the case of Ireland not being subjected to the same safeguards as England, you would treat them as foreign beasts?—Yes.

4702. Do you look upon quarantine as a protection?—Yes, protection to our herds.

4703. Suppose disease breaks out during quarantine, what is to be done?—The animals must stay there until they either die or recover.

4704. Then it would become a hotbed of infection?—But an isolated hotbed of infection, I imagine.

4705. Mr. W. Johnston.] Do you find that a great number of Irish cattle are brought to Bristol?—Yes.

4706. Have you found much disease in them?—I believe there is never a cargo comes in that has not disease on board; but I do not blame the Irish for it; it is on board the boat that they pick it up. The period of incubation is exactly long enough for the animals to stand the market before showing the disease.

4707. Professor Brown mentions that, in the markets at Bristol, cleansing and disinfection is carried out to a considerable extent?—Yes, that is so; but I do not think that the contagion is picked up in the market, but in the boat; it is latent in the animal at the time it is in the market.

4708. It was from some calves sent from Bristol to Ireland in 1871 that the foot and mouth disease was conveyed to Ireland, was it not?—That is very likely, I think.

058.

4709. Do you know what quantity of cattle come to this market from Ireland?—About 1,000 a week.

4710. Are they fat or store cattle, principally?—Principally store cattle.

4711. Mr. Clay.] Did I understand you to say that those gentlemen who act upon this Committee would recommend commencing with less stringent restrictions than have been proposed, and for a shorter time, say from July to the end of October?—I think that the recommendations of the Central Chamber would be preferred by the community generally.

4712. That is, I suppose, chiefly from the belief that the inconveniences would be so great that it would be practically impossible to carry out the system further, and that the price to be paid for it would be so great?—Yes.

4713. But you believe that by more stringent regulations, and maintaining them for a shorter time, more good might be done?—Yes.

4714. And that that would go a good way towards diminishing the prevalence of foot and mouth disease?—Quite so.

4715. When you had succeeded in considerably diminishing the disease, then your proposal would be to increase as much as possible the stringency of the different restrictions, with the idea of stamping out the disease altogether?—Quite so.

4716. Is it your opinion that when the farmers, who are the parties generally interested, had found that a good deal of good had been done by the earlier restrictions, they would then make no objection to the carrying out of the more stringent regulations, and for a longer time than you have spoken of?—That is my opinion.

4717. Sir H. Sturt-Delecton.] It really seems itself up into two points, namely, that if you could get united local action in the counties, and the restrictions for a certain period, you believe you might practically stamp out the disease?—I believe that the adoption of these recommendations of the Central Council would reduce the disease to a very low point and to such a low point that it would be then practically desirable to adopt more stringent regulations.

4718. The farmers in your county are large holders of land generally, are they not?—Yes.

4719. Do you think that counties where small farms exist in a large proportion would equally sanction the proposals you suggest?—Decidedly they would; the small farmers are those who occupy the dairy lands, and it is those who suffer principally; and it is they who are most anxious for the regulations. In our county the dairymen are most anxious for them; they are by far the greatest sufferers from the disease.

4720. They do not require to change their stock, do they?—Yes; but they have no difficulty in getting licenses; they used to come to me for them. I had the granting of the licenses in my district, and afterwards the police had the power.

4721. But practically you think that the agricultural body would agree to restrictions of that kind with a view to the ultimate stamping out of the disease?—Yes.

4722. Mr. Cresswell.] Do you think that, in giving notice of the disease to the police, it would be necessary, if we amend the Act, to insist upon the owner of stock giving notice to his neighbour as well?—I think it is very desirable that it should be so, or that the police should be instructed to publish it.

A A 4

4723. You

Mr.
W. Stratton.
28 April
1873.

Mr. W. Stratton. 4723. You would make the police the medium of information?—Yes.

58 April 1873. 4724. And do you think, taking the average of loss upon fat stock, store stock, and young cattle, that 2*l*. a head would be an excessive estimate of the loss?—I think it would be a fair estimate for the western counties.

4725. On account of the large proportion of cows?—On account of the large proportion of dairy cows.

4726-7. *Chairman.*] When you speak of the loss upon an animal which is not a milch cow, how much do you estimate that at?—It depends altogether upon the degree of fatness in which she is; if she is a fat heavy cow she would lose 2*l*. in value, I think.

4728. Does that mean that it would require 2*l*. more keep to bring her back to the condition in which she was before taking the disease?—Taking a herd of 20 animals, it would require 40*l*. worth of food to bring them back to their previous condition.

4729. And supposing they are brought round again, they are as saleable then as they were before?—Yes, if they are put into the same condition.

4730. I believe you were asked about the working of the local authorities in counties and boroughs; your local authority goes over the whole county of Wiltshire, of course?—Yes, it does.

4731. What number of boroughs have you within the county?—I cannot tell you the number of boroughs which have individual privileges.

4732. Are there any of them with a large agricultural area around the town?—No, they are all confined, I believe, to the town itself.

4733. In what way do you find the fact of there being a borough authority as well as a town authority an inconvenience?—In the case of Bristol, the authorities of Somersetshire and Gloucestershire have no power of interfering at all.

4734. Your remark applies rather to what you hear about Bristol than to anything in your own county, does it not?—Yes, from what I know about Bristol.

4735. In what way?—Cattle come from Bristol to our markets every week, and we find that the local authorities of Somersetshire and Gloucestershire whose interest it is to prevent the spread of disease, have no power of going to the boats and of inspecting the cattle.

4736. The large fair at Weyhill goes on, does it not?—Yes.

4737. It is not so large a fair, is it, as it used to be?—It is as large a sheep fair, but not so large a cattle fair.

4738. When is it held?—In October.

4739. Was there much foot and mouth disease when it was last held?—I do not think there was any active foot and mouth disease in the sheep; a great many of them were lame from the effects of it.

4740. Was not that rather surprising, considering there were so many cases of foot and mouth disease in sheep in Wiltshire?—It is very difficult to identify; it is very difficult to say whether the lameness arises from foot and mouth disease, or from foot rot.

4741. When are the cattle fairs?—In the spring and in the autumn.

4742. You have none in June or July, of importance?—None.

4743. Are they generally held in towns, or are any of them held in large villages?—In towns.

4744. Then would your proposition be that the local authority of the county should treat the boroughs as part of the county?—Quite so.

4745. That is your proposition, rather than that the boroughs and counties should together form one local authority?—I think the boroughs ought to be under the control of the county authorities; they have no interest in the cattle, nor in watching, nor in reporting the disease.

4746. Their only interest is the interest which may be connected with the market, and their interest as consumers?—The market interest is rather antagonistic to the agricultural interest.

4747. And being antagonistic, do you think that it would be quite fair to put them under the county without any share in the composition of the local authority?—Yes, I do; it is for their ultimate benefit, although not for their immediate benefit.

4748. You mean that it would be for their ultimate benefit, because you think the amount of disease would be diminished?—Yes, and the price of meat reduced.

4749. *Mr. Clere Read.*] I suppose the borough authorities could sit with the county committees?—I see no practical difficulty in that at all.

4750. And if the two came together at all, the probability is that they would agree upon some reasonable course being pursued?—There is no doubt about that, I think.

4751. Are you a large breeder of cattle yourself?—Yes, I breed a good deal. I have 70 dairy cows, and their produce is washed altogether. I wash about from 50 to 30 myself, and in cases such as those where I had more than half my dairy barren, in consequence of foot and mouth disease, I am obliged to buy to fill up my dairy. I breed upon the average from 25 to 30, and I am obliged to buy besides that to fill up vacancies.

4752. *Chairman.*] What part of Wiltshire do you live in?—Near Warrminster, in South Wilts.

Mr. WILLIAM HUNTING, called in; and Examined.

Mr. W. Hunting. 4753. *Mr. Clere Read.*] You are a veterinary surgeon, residing in Derby Street, May Fair?—I am.

4754. Have you had much experience in glanders?—Yes, comparatively speaking.

4755. Is glanders upon the increase in the metropolis?—It is, according to my experience, and according to the experience of other veterinary surgeons in London, whom I have asked about it purposely.

4756. How long has that disease been upon the increase?—I have been somewhere about four years in London, and my experience is that it increases every year; but I find that the last report of the Veterinary Council shows that during last year, 1872, there were a great many more cases than in 1871; but that 1870 showed nearly as many cases as 1873.

4757. Are you of opinion that the Act is sufficiently stringent to deal with glanders?—As far

Mr.
W. Hastings.
28 April
1873.

as glanders itself goes, it may be; but there is a disease known as farcy, which is really one and the same with glanders. This disease, farcy, is not mentioned in the Act at all, and the result is, that horses can work in the public streets affected with farcy, in a state capable of communicating glanders to other horses; horses affected with farcy are regularly worked, although they can communicate glanders to any other horse.

4758. Does farcy become glanders eventually?—Farcy horses die of glanders, as a rule.

4759. What are the symptoms of farcy as compared with glanders?—The symptoms of farcy are confined almost entirely to the superficial parts of the body; to that which we call the lymphatic system; underneath the skin. You have little swellings in the course of these lymphatics, sometimes thick legs and sometimes a discharge from the nose.

4760. In those stages is farcy infectious?—Certainly.

4761. And you say will produce glanders?—Yes.

4762. Then, in any amendment of the Act, you consider that farcy should be considered a contagious disease?—That the term "glanders" should include farcy, and that a difference between the two should not be made, simply because the one affects those particular parts more than the whole general system, for in both cases the blood and the body contain a virulent poison.

4763. Whether developed in the shape of farcy or in the shape of glanders?—Yes.

4764. What would you do with those animals which were the subjects of disease?—I think that all cases of farcy and glanders should be killed as soon as they are discovered.

4765. Do not you think that there is any cure for farcy?—Doubtless the majority of cases of farcy in young, strong animals are curable; but, at the same time, the length of time taken to bring about a cure, and their being centres of contagion during the whole time that they are suffering from the disease, and its virulence, render it a disease, I think, not fit to be allowed to exist; and besides that, by doing as I suggest, you would thoroughly stamp out the disease, and, having stamped it out, I believe we should be perfectly free from it.

4766. You would order all horses affected with farcy or glanders to be killed?—To be destroyed.

4767. Are you aware that under the Act there is no power to kill a horse affected with glanders, unless he should happen to be in some public place, and be there seized by the authorities?—Yes.

4768. Would you extend that power so that a horse might be killed in the stable of the owner without being exposed?—I think it should not be allowed to exist even in the stable of the owner.

4769. Are you aware that the inspector, under this Act, has no power whatever to enter premises for the purpose of discovering glanders?—Yes.

4770. Do you think he ought to have that power?—Certainly.

4771. Have you any idea whether the drinking troughs in the metropolis have been the means of spreading farcy or glanders?—Some months since I drew attention in a newspaper called the "Animal World," to the increase of glanders in London, and in it I drew attention to the increase of drinking fountains in London. I

could not say positively that there is any connection between the increase of the two; but certainly one has a right to conclude that horses might get glanders from those drinking troughs, for a horse affected with farcy or glanders might leave matter from his nose upon those troughs, and in that way it might be communicated to other horses. Then, again, there is the increased use made of public auctions of horses in London; there are now a great number of them, and it is certainly the case sometimes that horses suffering from farcy, if not glanders, are sent into those establishments for sale. It is a common thing, when glanders breaks out in a stable, for the owner to kill the animal affected, and it quietly away to the knacker's yard, say nothing about it, and send the rest into the sale-yard.

4772. With the chance of spreading the disease?—With the chance of spreading the disease into every stable that each of those horses goes into; the owner sends perhaps half-a-dozen horses into the sale-yard, and it is just as probable as not that each of those horses is then affected.

4773. How long do you suppose a horse would be affected before he would be capable of communicating the disease to another horse?—It would be difficult to say; direct inoculation would produce it in two or three days; but, generally speaking, a horse might go two or three months without showing symptoms of glanders after he had got the poison into his system.

4774. Then it is a very insidious disease, and one which has a very long period of incubation?—The difficulty is to know when the horse took the germs of the disease. I knew a case of glanders in a horse down a coal mine, and the question was, whether he took it from a new horse, or from the disease existing in an old stable which had been shut up two or three years before.

4775. Does the infectious matter retain its property for a considerable length of time?—It does. If it has dried up, so that it does not become decomposed, it will retain the infection for a considerable length of time.

4776. Then it would be thoroughly necessary to cleanse and disinfect any stable which had been used by glandered horses?—Yes, that is another point; I should add that glanders and farcy are more prevalent among the horses of cabmen, small contractors, and such persons, than amongst any other class. Some men have stables which they take by the week, and if they get glanders among their horses they can sell the horse affected, or send it to the knackers, leave the stable, and go into another stable, giving no reason why they left. That stable may be left as it is, containing enough virulent matter to give glanders to any other horses which may come into it.

4777. You are quite of opinion that horses affected with farcy or glanders, ought to be killed at once?—I certainly think that that is the way to put a stop to the disease, and I have no doubt that that is the only way to get rid of it.

4778. Now, an owner can keep a glandered horse as long as he lives, so long as he does not remove it; and he can remove it if he is not caught doing so?—Yes, that is so; and with farcy he can work the horse in the streets. I believe that in the case of farcy and glanders, they should be made contagious diseases under the Act as much on account of their contagion as on account of their fatality.

B B

4779. Have

Mr.
W. Hawking.
28 April
1873

4778. Have you had any experience of the inspection of cattle and sheep from foreign countries?—Not as an inspector, myself; but last November I was employed by the Great Eastern Railway Company to supervise the inspection of cattle that were brought into Brown's Wharf. I was asked to be present at the inspection, which lasted for about a month.

4779. Were there any foreign horses brought in during the time that you were there?—Yes, there were three or four cargoes; one cargo of about 40 or 50 animals.

4781. What inspection do horses undergo?—None at all.

4782. Do you say that horses never undergo inspection on landing?—I cannot say that they never do; but the cargo I saw landed on Sunday morning certainly underwent no inspection. I was told that it was not the custom to inspect horses.

4783. Have you any reason to suspect that glanders prevails upon the Continent?—It prevails upon the Continent as it does here, but they have stricter regulations than we have.

4784. You have no knowledge of a diseased horse coming over, have you?—I have no direct knowledge of that, but another veterinary surgeon told me that he had a case in a Belgian horse which had only been in this country three or four weeks.

4785. That horse might have caught the disease here, might he not?—He might have done so.

4786. With regard to the inspection of sheep, for instance, how many sheep would an inspector inspect in an hour?—It would depend somewhat upon the circumstances. I should think an inspector, provided that he had good arrangements for his inspection, and plenty of men to help him by turning the sheep and so on, could inspect something short of 1,000 sheep in an hour; 800 or 900 in an hour.

4787. He does inspect that number?—Yes; I should think he could inspect that number, or that he does do so. I should say that inspection is as well carried on at Brown's Wharf as at any other landing-place, and I should say the rate at which inspection is carried on there is about 800 or 900 in an hour.

4788. You think that a well-qualified practitioner could inspect about 800 or 900 an hour, if he had sufficient help?—It depends upon what you call inspection. I should doubt very much its guaranteeing your detecting every diseased animal.

4789. Would it guarantee your detecting foot and mouth disease in an animal?—I should think an animal might escape.

4790. What number of cattle could you inspect?—I could not say; certainly not that number. In inspecting sheep, every sheep is turned, and your eyes run along a row of them; but with cattle it is different; you make a general examination with your eye, and then you make an examination of the mouth; the head is held, and the upper lip is turned up.

4791. With sheep you must have eight or nine men to turn eight or nine sheep?—In the case of foreign sheep, they are let out of the pen between a row of men and a row of hurdles. The inspector stands behind the hurdles, the number of men in front being equivalent to the number of sheep to be stopped. The sheep are then seized and turned, and examined in the under

parts by the eye of the inspector. Those exhibiting any suspicious symptoms are kept back, in order to make a more particular examination of them. Then they are let into another pen, and driven slowly past the inspector again, to pick out any lame ones, and to examine their feet. The examination for foot and mouth disease consisted in picking those out which were lame, and if the sheep had foot and mouth disease, and were not lame, there is very little probability of the disease being detected.

4792. An animal might have foot and mouth disease and not be lame, and then it would go off undetected?—It might be so.

4793. A sheep might be lame from other causes than foot and mouth disease?—There are few cargoes, I should think, in which half the sheep are not lame from some cause or other. In some few cargoes 80 per cent. of the sheep are lame from the horn of the foot being worn through.

4794. From travelling?—Yes. I forget which port it was, but from one port they seemed to have a considerable distance to travel, and in every case of a vessel arriving from that port, about 70 to 80 per cent. were lame. From some of the other ports we hardly had any lame animals.

4795. Do you think that a sufficient time is given after landing by a 12-hours' detention for the detection of disease?—We might as well examine them at once. I think a detention of 12 hours is nearly useless for all practical purposes. I believe that the inspection, as conducted at present, is nearly useless for stopping the importation of disease.

4796. Do you believe that any longer period would be of any benefit?—Yes; if you detain the animals a sufficient length of time to allow the symptoms to develop, then, of course, an inspector would detect every case, and no cargo could come through without disease, if existing in it, being detected.

4797. You are speaking with special reference to foot and mouth disease?—The same would apply to any disease, if you could detain the animals over the period of incubation.

4798-9. What period of incubation would you allow in the case of foot and mouth disease?—Three or four days.

4800. And in the case of pleuro-pneumonia, a month?—Six weeks, perhaps; we could not do anything with that disease. Whatever good might accrue from a quarantine of three days in the case of foot and mouth disease, would be of no use for pleuro-pneumonia; you might have it break out six weeks after their landing, or perhaps more than that.

4801. Fat stock attacked with foot and mouth disease being killed at once would be, perhaps, no great matter to the country?—No.

4802. What would you do in the case of store stock?—I would submit store stock to a period of quarantine sufficient to include all the diseases marked by a short period of incubation.

4803. Which are those?—Foot and mouth disease, cattle plague, and sheep-pox.

4804. Do you think that a quarantine of eight days for foreign store stock would be sufficient to prove those three diseases?—I feel certain that it would, because the voyage would add another day or two to the time, which would involve the full period of incubation of those diseases.

4805. We have no guarantee against pleuro-pneumonia from inspection?—I think not.

4806. Would

Mr.
W. Hoating.
28 April
1874

4806. Would you advise slaughter in all cases of pleuro-pneumonia?—Certainly, in all cases of pleuro-pneumonia.

4807. And the slaughter of animals herded with them as well?—Yes.

4808. Of course you would give compensation in that case to the owner?—Certainly.

4809. *Chairman.* Were you inspecting yourself at Brown's Wharf, or did you only see the inspection carried out?—I inspected as though I were an inspector. I examined every animal myself as a check upon the inspector.

4810. What number of sheep generally come in a cargo?—Various numbers; I should say from a couple of thousand down to thirty.

4811. Averaging, I suppose, over 100?—Over 100, certainly.

4812. Do not you think that if there were foot and mouth disease in a cargo it would be a most exceptional case that some of them would not be lame?—It would be a most exceptional case if foot and mouth disease were developed in the cargo.

4813. I understand you to describe that inspection as being conducted in such a way that the lame animals are detected?—Yes.

4814. They are subjected to a second examination?—Yes.

4815. In which case it would be found out whether the lameness proceeded from foot and mouth disease or otherwise?—Yes.

4816. Then why do you say that inspection is useless?—Because a cargo of animals usually consists of two or three lots; we will say, for example, that it consists of four lots, three lots of those sheep might be healthy, and the fourth lot might have been in contact with animals suffering from foot and mouth disease the day before they were put on board, and in that case only one lot of the sheep would have the disease at all forward, and they would not show the disease until after they were examined at Brown's Wharf.

4817. The word "useless" means that it is of no good; that it would never find out any disease?—I did not mean useless in that sense.

4818. What did you mean?—I meant that the inspection was not sufficient to prevent the importation of disease.

4819. That it is not a certain positive protection against all disease?—No.

4820. That it is possible that in exceptional cases the disease might escape detection?—Yes;

that inspection after 12 hours' quarantine may admit disease.

4821. That is your definition of the term "useless"?—Yes.

4822. Did you not some time ago go down to superintend the inspection at Brown's Wharf?—Yes.

4823. Did you make any report upon that inspection?—I did.

4824. Have you got it here?—I have not.

4825. Would you kindly send it in?—I will apply for it.

4826. With regard to *farcy*, many veterinary surgeons consider it glanders, do they not?—I suppose all of them do.

4827. Then, legally speaking, it certainly is included within the definition of "glanders"?—Practically it never is; nor do I think its inclusion could now be legally sustained.

4828. Why is it not?—I do not know, except from the fact of the two forms of the disease having separate names.

4829. Is it a much less virulent form?—Yes; as far as fatality to the animal goes it is much less virulent.

4830. Does it ever develop itself into the virulent form of glanders?—Yes.

4831. Is it, in fact, glanders in a mild form?—Not in a mild form but in a peculiar form, affecting different tissues of the body from those which glanders does. You might inoculate an animal with glanders and produce symptoms of *farcy*, and you might inoculate another animal with *farcy* and produce glanders.

4832. Could you give the Committee any illustration of two diseases of the human subject which are similarly akin?—I could not at the moment.

4833. But although it is generally acknowledged by the veterinary profession to be the same disease, do you think it would be necessary to include it as an additional disease in the definition?—I think it would on account of its curability.

4834. Would you treat it in any different way from that in which you would glanders?—No; I think it would, perhaps, be fair if a man had a horse suffering from *farcy* destroyed to compensate him for it.

4835. There is no compensation in the case of glanders, I believe?—No, a glandered horse is worth little or nothing.

4836. *Farcy* being curable and glanders not so?—Yes.

Thursday, 1st May 1873.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mr. James Barclay.
Mr. Cawley.
Mr. Clay.
Mr. Dodson.
Mr. William Edward Forster.
Mr. William Johnston.
Mr. Kavanagh.

Mr. Lusk.
Mr. Monsell.
Mr. O'Connor.
Mr. Clara Read.
Mr. Ridley.
Sir Henry Selwin Ebbeson.
Mr. Tipping.

THE RIGHT HONOURABLE WILLIAM EDWARD FORSTER, IN THE CHAIR.

Professor HUGH FERGUSON, called in; and Examined.

Professor
H. Ferguson.
1 May 1873.

4837. Mr. Monsell.] WHAT position do you occupy with respect to the Government?—I am Director General of the Veterinary Department in Ireland.

4838. How long have you filled that office?—I have conducted the Veterinary Department from its first institution in March 1866.

4839. It was constituted in consequence of the apprehended arrival of the cattle plague, was it not?—There was an office from which sprung the Veterinary Department which had been constituted a year previously, in the year 1865, which office was constituted in consequence of the apprehension of cattle plague being imported from Great Britain into Ireland.

4840. Had you anything to do with that first office?—I was the person who had charge of it.

4841. What is the staff of your office?—The staff at present authorised by the Treasury consists of first myself, three clerks, an office cleaner, and a boy messenger; I have, however, more employed, pending an application to the Treasury for a larger staff; but those persons who have been so employed without authorisation, up to the present time, are at my own risk.

4842. Are you employing them without any authority?—I am employing them upon my own authority; I was ordered to discontinue them; there were five clerks employed in the office, and I was ordered to discontinue three of them upon the last day of March; but I found that that could not be done without the business of the office coming to a dead lock. I made application to the Government, through the medium of the Under-Secretary for Ireland, for permission to retain those two or three additional clerks, and also to retain the man messenger, but the Treasury refused the application.

4843. Can you describe to the Committee the character and amount of work which is done in your office?—I can. As far as regards the dealing with papers, the number which we received during the year 1872, which required at least to be registered, and the majority of them to be noted as well as registered, was 55,785. Those sent out, of importance, were 23,457; but, were circulars included, they would amount to upward of 69,000.

4844. Do you produce a return showing those papers in detail?—I do (*producing the same*).

4845. Will you just state the substance of that return?—It is a summary of the papers dealt with in the Irish Veterinary Department during the year 1872.

4846. Will you put in that return?—Yes, I will. (*The same was handed in, vide Appendix*).

4847. Have you prepared any other returns for this Committee?—I have.

4848. Will you put them in also, if you please?—(*The same were handed in, vide Appendix*).

4849. Did you not make a Report to the Government in 1872?—I did.

4850. Has that been printed?—No.

4851. Will you put that in also?—I will; I made two Reports, one in 1871 and the other in 1872, which relate to each other; perhaps I had better hand in the two. (*The same were handed in, vide Appendix*).

4852. Will you now describe shortly, what the duties of your office are; what is it that you profess to do, and how do you do it?—The principal duty undertaken by the office is for the purpose of ascertaining when an outbreak of contagious or infectious disease occurs at any part in Ireland, and then to take the action required by the Council Order relating to that disease.

4853. Then how is that object accomplished?—In the first instance we have got the Council Order posted in all parts of Ireland; then if an outbreak of disease is ascertained, either by the owner of the animal reporting the occurrence of the disease, in pursuance of one of the provisions of the Council Order, or else from private information given to the constabulary. If the disease be not reported by the owner, and if the constabulary, after visiting the farm, lands, place, or premises, consider or suspect that there is disease, they make an application to a magistrate for an order to stop the movement of all cattle from the place for three days, or as long as is required to ascertain the nature of the disease to the satisfaction of the Lord Lieutenant, or whatever person be deputed to act for him.

4854. Is it the duty of the constabulary, in their respective districts, to find out the outbreaks

Professor
H. Ferguson.
1 May 1879.

breaks of the disease?—It is their duty to try and do so.

4855. Have you got the instructions which have been issued to the constabulary upon that subject?—I have not; there are no particular instructions issued; the instruction issued to the constabulary is included in each Council Order.

4856. Are the constabulary, generally speaking, competent to decide with reference to whether disease exists or not?—No, decidedly not; at least relative to the nature of the disease.

4857. But with reference to the existence of a diseased animal?—As to the fact of an animal being unwell or indisposed, they are generally able to decide that.

4858. Do they upon the whole, discharge their duty efficiently?—More so than I had expected.

4859. Do you take any steps to instruct them, with reference to the performance of their duties?—The course which is generally pursued is, in the first instance, getting a magistrate's order; that is where the people do not report the case themselves; then they call on the owner of the animal or his agent, and obtain all the information they possibly can, bringing with them a form and a number of questions, 14 or 15 questions, which are here, relative to the particulars respecting the farm and the animals thereon, and the symptoms of the affection; they fill that up, and it is sent to the Veterinary Department immediately.

4860. And from their answers, are you generally able to detect what the character of the disease is?—In the great majority of instances I am; but the reason why I have been obliged to have recourse to such a method was in consequence of not having inspectors throughout the country to refer to.

4861. Are there no veterinary inspectors in the provinces in Ireland?—There are only 60 veterinary surgeons regularly graduated (meaning by that, members of the Royal Veterinary College) in the whole of Ireland, and the majority of those are in the large towns, particularly those towns which are thickly inhabited, and which are seaport towns: of those there are 10 or 12 in Dublin, and there are a number more in Belfast, but speaking from my knowledge, according to the last Veterinary College list, I do not believe that there is a single graduated veterinary surgeon in the whole province of Connaught.

4862. Do you make any use of any of those veterinary surgeons?—Frequently.

4863. Will you describe to the Committee, if you please, how it is that you make use of them?—When there is a doubt relative to the nature of the disease with which an animal is affected, or if there is any dispute about it, which not unfrequently occurs, through persons stating that their animals are perfectly sound, the nearest veterinary surgeon is sent for the purpose of reporting upon the case, or if I have a veterinary surgeon in town, temporarily attached to the office, I may send him down.

4864. Have you authority to employ the veterinary surgeons throughout the country as far as you think it desirable to do so?—I had that authority up to about a year ago, and then I was directed under no circumstances to employ a veterinary surgeon beyond the boundaries of the Dublin Metropolitan police district without previously getting an authorisation from the Chief Secretary's office to do so.

4865. Have you any difficulty in getting these

authorisations?—Not of late. I omitted to mention to you that, according to the Council Orders, the constabulary or the Dublin Metropolitan police, immediately on ascertaining that there is disease in any place, are obliged, if possible, to send at once notice to the department by telegraph.

4866. And do you find that they discharge their duty satisfactorily and efficiently?—They do as far as they consistently can; they are not professional men, but I find them of very great use.

4867. Do you believe that there are very rarely outbreaks of disease which are not detected by the police and reported to you?—Indeed they are not very rare, I regret to say. I think they are very frequent.

4868. How do you account for that; you have the police scattered over Ireland; as you say yourself, they are efficient and intelligent men; how does it happen that there are frequent outbreaks of disease which are not reported to you?—The people wish to avoid being put to the inconvenience of having their farms restricted, and the movement of their cattle prevented. They do not like that. And in the majority of cases I find that the percentage of persons who do not report disease, or who do not act according to the Orders in Council, are persons who are extensive graziers; this is particularly the case in regard to pleuro-pneumonia.

4869. But in a constabulary district, if the police are really active and efficient, would it very often be possible to conceal the incursions of disease?—It would be very easy, particularly in cases of pleuro-pneumonia; and the reason why they conceal the appearance of the disease is, that they dread having the farm put under restrictions, so that they cannot move their cattle. But now, we will say for the last couple of years or so, they say that since the restrictions were imposed relative to pleuro-pneumonia, they do not wait for the disease to be fully developed. Our herds in Ireland are generally continually with the cattle, and can detect the earliest symptoms of one of them becoming in the slightest degree ailing. An animal in the early stage of pleuro-pneumonia can be very easily ascertained to be getting unwell by the hand who is in charge of it, and attending upon the farm; knowing the habits of every animal upon it, he will detect insipient illness at early morning, perhaps at day-break; there is then a marked difference in the manner in which the animal departs itself until about the time when the sun is getting well up. When it is getting warm, at about 10 or 11 o'clock in the day, the animal appears to be well, and then no casual observer would observe any difference in its health. The orders generally given by large stockowners to their herds are, the moment they suspect an animal is becoming affected with pleuro-pneumonia, to let that animal be started off and sold.

4870. You complained very much of the inadequate staff of your department, and you stated that that prevented you from having the regulations properly carried out. No increase of staff would meet the difficulty which we are now speaking of, would it?—No; but it is my duty to state that, even with a much larger staff, I could not be prepared to cope with every difficulty.

4871. But upon the whole, I suppose you are able to carry out and enforce the Privy Council regulations

Professor regulations whenever you are able to detect the
H. Ferguson. existence of disease?—Thoroughly.

1 May 1873.

4872. Therefore the only weak point, as I understand you, in your system, and you do not suggest a way of remedying that, is, that you are not always able to detect the presence of disease?—We are not always able to do so; but since the Council Orders have been modified, and those relating to pleuro-pneumonia rendered less strict, it is astonishing how few now-reported cases we have been able to discover of late.

4873. Are there severe penalties upon concealing disease?—The penalty is 20 *l.*, and if the animals involved in the offence be more than four, there is a penalty not exceeding 5 *l.* for every animal involved.

4874. Do you conceive that those penalties are sufficient?—They would be sufficient if they were always enforced.

4875. Do you find that they are not enforced?—Decidedly not.

4876. Whose fault is that?—The fault of the magistrates. There are very few cases of prosecution ordered by the Government in which there are not convictions; but out of the Dublin metropolitan district, especially in the large grazing districts such as Meath, and sometimes down in Galway, the magistrates will not inflict more than a mere nominal penalty; in fact, it is very easy to come at a tolerably correct reason why they do not do so.

4877. Do the penalties generally run in this way: not exceeding 5 *l.*, or not exceeding 20 *l.*; have the magistrates discretion to impose any small sum they please?—They have; they have sometimes imposed a penalty as little as one penny. I recollect one very remarkable case, and that was, I think, in 1870 or 1871, the week before the Ballinasloe fair; a man drove a number of cattle affected with foot and mouth distemper through Ballinasloe and across the fair green; he was ordered to be prosecuted, and the bench not merely fined him only in the nominal sum of 1 *d.*, but they remonstrated against the hardship of his having been interfered with in the slightest degree.

4878. There have been several statements made before this Committee with reference to the railway trucks in Ireland not being disinfected as the orders of the Privy Council direct that they should be; whose fault is that?—The Council Orders requiring the disinfection of railway trucks, and also of steamers carrying cattle, were as perfect as could be; in fact, they were nearly identical with those which had been passed in England, but the railway companies remonstrated, and put such a pressure upon the Government, that there was first a postponement of the date at which the Council Order would come into force, and then there was a further remonstrance; and until very lately, until the latter end of March, no actual steps were taken. Since the month before last, in Ireland, we have been very active in trying to enforce the Council Orders relative to cleansing and disinfection.

4879. What effect upon the spread of disease in your opinion has the absence of those Orders which you have just described had?—I think it has been the cause of spreading the disease most extensively. I scarcely ask any person who is in the habit of sending fat cattle, even from the west of Ireland to England, and embarking them, without being told that, no matter how sound they may be when leaving his farm, or land, or

premises, they are too frequently found affected with foot and mouth disease when they arrive in Great Britain, and I attribute that in the majority of cases to the railway trucks not being disinfected; they were not then disinfected; they were in a most filthy state at the time I refer to.

4880. Having the police at your disposal, you had ample means to compel their disinfection, if you had been authorised to do so?—But all the orders to the police relative to that subject, true come from the Government, so that the responsibility did not rest upon me.

4881. You say your staff is so short, that you are not able to carry out the provisions of the law, and the orders of the Privy Council; I say that in this case the difficulty did not arise from any shortness of staff, you had ample means at your disposal to have those trucks disinfected?—Ample means.

4882. And also, I presume, to deal with the nuisances which have been complained of before this Committee at the point of embarkation at the North Wall?—Decidedly; some of the cattle lairs at the North Wall are in a most filthy and objectionable state, and others are as perfect as could be; those belonging to the London and North Western, and Great Western are very perfect and very clean.

4883. I have a letter in my hand in regard to the large Ballinasloe fair, in which it is stated by the writer that he thinks "the principal cause of the disease spreading in Ireland, and certainly the cause of great loss to farmers is the fact that there is no check whatever on the sale of diseased animals in the public fairs and markets; that the last two great annual sheep fairs at Ballinasloe spread the foot and mouth distemper over the greatest part of Ireland; a great number of diseased sheep were driven there, and vast numbers which came there sound, and got infected upon the ground, some from the foul ground, and some from being in contact with sheep which was affected; those sheep were then sent all over the country," and so on; now how do you account for such a state of things as that, are there really no means taken to prevent diseased animals being exposed in fairs?—To inspect all animals going into such a fair as that of Ballinasloe would be quite impracticable, the only reasonable thing to do in a case like that would be to seize the diseased animals and fine the owners.

4884. Then in what particular has the shortness of your staff, of which you complain in answer to one or two of my earlier questions, impeded the proper working of the law?—Unless there be a sufficient staff of veterinary surgeons to send to different parts of the country where the existence of disease is disputed, we have got no remedy.

4885. But did you not say that the police, though not competent to decide with reference to the particular character of the disease, were perfectly competent to decide as to whether the cattle were diseased or not, and to make a report to you, and that their reports were generally so accurate that from them you were able to detect what the character of the disease was?—They were; but very frequently persons applied for inspectors to be sent to examine the cattle, they denied the accuracy of the police reports, and it has frequently occurred that I have had as inspector to send.

4886. I thought you said that latterly, at all events, the Irish Government when you applied

to then allowed you to send down an inspector?—I did not say that that was invariably the case.

4887. You stated that latterly they had allowed you to do so?—Latterly there has been less difficulty about it than previously, but as a matter of fact, I have had no permanent staff of inspectors at my disposal for the purpose of sending them to inspect throughout the country.

4888. Looking at the different means of spreading the disease to which the last questions put to you have referred of trucks not being properly disinfected, the state of the North Wall, and the want of supervision of fairs and markets, none of those things arise from the absence of a sufficient staff of inspectors, do they?—No, I do not think that those things arise from the absence of a sufficient staff of veterinary surgeons, but they arise from prompt action not having been taken. The fact of it is, that the steam packet companies and the railway companies offered such remonstrances to the Government that they have been impeded with; the fault does not lie with the Veterinary Department.

4889. But I think you stated in answer to one of my former questions that you had ample means at your disposal for dealing with this disease where it was found out; that no additional number of inspectors would assist you in detecting disease?—I think that an additional number of inspectors would decidedly assist me in detecting disease, but they would not assist me much in dealing with the disease after it was detected.

4890. How would they assist you; how would an inspector, for instance, living in Limerick, assist you in detecting whether disease had broken out in the neighbourhood of Newcastle West in the county of Limerick?—When the disease was reported, if there was any doubt about its nature, the cattle and farm should be visited by an inspector.

4891. But it must be the local authority which must detect the disease, must it not; you must rely upon the police for the detection of the disease?—I rely now more upon the people themselves, for I find in the great majority of cases the people give notice of the disease themselves.

4892. But an additional number of inspectors would assist you in detecting disease?—I think if there were an additional number of inspectors the people would be afraid to try to evade the law; I think that a number of persons who now hide disease and do not acknowledge it, would then be afraid of being found out and prosecuted.

4893. How would that be; take the case I have put; Newcastle West is 20 miles from Limerick; why should the existence of an inspector in Limerick alarm a farmer at Newcastle West, and make him fear what he otherwise would not fear?—If the persons in Newcastle West were aware that the constabulary had the power of calling in immediately, without any scruple of sending up to my office, the assistance of a veterinary surgeon from, we will say, the next town at which there was a railroad station or a telegraph station, they certainly would be more alarmed, not alone in looking after their cattle, but in reporting cases of disease as they occurred.

4894. Was not the county of Meath one of the great sources of disease?—Yes.

4895. That is close to Dublin, is it not?—Yes.

4896. How long would it take to telegraph up 0.58.

to you from the county of Meath, and for you to send down an inspector?—It might not take an hour.

4897. Did that facility prevent the disease from being concealed in the county of Meath by the farmers?—No, it did not; but unfortunately the people in the county of Meath became careless, I think in consequence of setting at defiance the result of summonses, for in the county of Meath, generally speaking, the fines imposed in cases of conviction are merely nominal.

4898. Is that more the case in Meath than in other counties in Ireland?—I think it is.

4899. Do you know any reason for that?—Yes, there are two or three reasons; the majority of the magistrates there are persons very much engaged themselves in the cattle trade, and they sympathise with the persons who are summoned; and independently of that, I think, in the county Meath no ordinary magistrate or very few ordinary magistrates, unless in fact a stipendiary magistrate, would like to impose so high a penalty as he would in many other parts of Ireland, were he a magistrate there.

4900. I will now ask you a few questions with regard to foot and mouth disease; the spread of foot and mouth disease during the last year was very remarkable, I believe, was it not, and very alarming?—Foot and mouth disease did not exist so extensively in Ireland in the year 1872 as it did in the year 1871, according to the returns, but it existed much more extensively on large farms.

4901. Will you first state what number of centres of foot and mouth disease there were in Ireland in 1872?—The number of outbreaks on foot and mouth distemper reported as having occurred during the year 1872 was 14,857.

4902. And of pleuro-pneumonia, how many?—Four hundred and sixty-eight.

4903. What you mean to say is that was the number of farms upon which there was foot and mouth disease and the number upon which there was pleuro-pneumonia?—Yes.

4904. Can you state what number of cattle were attacked with foot and mouth disease?—Yes; the number of cattle which became affected with foot and mouth disease during the year 1872 was 152,573 cattle.

4905. And how many sheep?—Fifty-four thousand three hundred and seventy.

4906. And swine?—Eight thousand nine hundred and eighty-four.

4907. Are you able to state what proportion of the cattle were dairy cows?—I am not. I had returns arranged so that I could distinguish the difference between the sexes of the animals, and whether they were dairy stock, and their ages and everything else; but I had not sufficient staff in the office to keep the registry returns going properly.

4908. Do you recollect at all what the proportion was when you did keep the returns?—I do not; they were stopped in a very short time. I do not think they were continued a couple of months. I could give you the number of animals which died during the year 1872 from foot and mouth disease from those returns; but, of course, they are not absolutely correct, because there have been many cases concealed, no doubt; 718 cattle are returned as having died, 411 sheep, and 117 swine, and, in my opinion, that is less than the reality.

4909. Can you form any sort of estimate of how

Professor
H. Ferguson,
1 May 1873.

Professor H. Ferguson. how much less than the reality that is?—I cannot; I would not venture to do so.

1 May 1873. 4910. Could you form any approximate estimate (of course it must be rather rough) of the pecuniary loss by suffered the farmers in the last year by foot and mouth disease?—I would not venture to do so; the loss must be considerable, but it must be modified very much, according to circumstances.

4911. You stated that the farmers were very much inclined to conceal disease; do you think that the very severe losses which they have suffered latterly have at all educated them to submit to more stringent measures than those which now exist?—I think the losses which they have experienced have in a measure induced them to take a more reasonable view of the matter; and, as I have stated before, there is not that amount of concealment which there was before. I believe that the concealment, in the first instance, we will say in the year previous to the termination of the year 1871, arose from the restrictions imposed by the Council Order being so very vexatious that persons preferred running the risk of being fined, to having their farms placed under too vexatious restrictions, and the movement of their cattle prevented.

4912. In how many instances did you send down veterinary inspectors to inspect cases of foot and mouth disease last year?—I could not say. I have not the return, but I should say that I would be considerably above the mark, were I to say 50.

4913. Do you believe that a great number of animals affected with foot and mouth disease have been exported from Ireland to Great Britain during the last year?—I think that a great number of animals must have been found affected with the disease on or subsequent to their debarkation in Great Britain; but I do not think that many animals were intentionally sent across from Ireland in that state.

4914. Could the sending of diseased animals from Ireland to Great Britain be effectually prevented?—No, I do not think anything could completely prevent it, because, as far as regards portal inspection at the port of embarkation (setting aside that it would be very embarrassing, and almost impracticable, to be carried out thoroughly well or effectually), the animals, on their arrival in Great Britain, although embarked in an apparently healthy state, would frequently present appearances seemingly indicating their having the disease in a much more advanced state than they really had. At one time I was very much in favour of portal inspection at the port of embarkation, but now I have altered my opinion as the result of practical experience. There is one circumstance which should be regarded as a sort of circumstantial evidence that inspection at the port of embarkation could not be relied upon; I believe that it was in 1871, at the Smithfield Cattle Show, when every precaution was taken, as far as I can read in the journals, for the purpose of preventing animals in a diseased state from getting into that show; I understood that no animal would be received unless it brought a clean bill of health with it. There were inspectors, as I understand, stationed at the show yard door, and every animal was minutely inspected previously to entering the yard, yet, on the following morning, foot and mouth distemper was discovered to have broken out. Now, if foot and mouth disease broke out

under such circumstances as those, it could not be expected that portal inspection of animals upon their embarkation would be anything like a warranty against the introduction of disease into Great Britain at the ports of debarkation.

4915. Do you know whether the regulations in 1872, with regard to foot and mouth disease in the Smithfield Club Cattle Show were successful?—I do not.

4916. [Chairman.] You stated that, having been in favour of inspection, you have changed your opinion; a good deal from the result of the failure of the inspection in 1871; but if you were informed that the arrangements with regard to inspection and supervision in 1872 were successful, you would think that that required you to reconsider your opinion, would you not?—No, I should not; I should require it, in the first instance, to be proved to me that the conditions were imperfect in 1871.

4917. Would you not consider that the best of additional care with regard to inspection in 1872, at the time when foot and mouth disease was so rampant through the country, having been successful, was important?—I dare say it contributed to the success, but I am not aware of the regulations of 1872.

4918. Are you aware of what happened in 1872?—No.

4919. Mr. [Mr. Read.] In 1873, cattle were allowed to be shown at Birmingham and at other shows before they came to Smithfield, whereas, at the Smithfield Show in 1872, the animals had to come to the show direct from the owners' premises in horse boxes, with a declaration that they were free from disease?—That must have made a very great difference.

4920. Therefore, you would think that it was the regulation with respect to the animals previous to the exhibition, and the declaration which had to be made, rather than the inspection, that did the good?—That does not alter my original position as far as regards the inspection of exported cattle at the ports of embarkation, for we could have no extra control whatever over the cattle, previously to their being presented for inspection almost at the ship's side.

4921. Were you at the show in 1871?—I was not.

4922. Mr. [Mr. W.] Besides the suggestion which has been made with regard to inspection either at the port of embarkation or debarkation, another suggestion has been made with regard to quarantine, what is your opinion of that?—I think that would be perfectly impracticable.

4923. What are your reasons for thinking so?—It would be perfectly impracticable at the ports of embarkation, because under a system of quarantine, I presume you would not allow any animal to be removed from the quarantine ground or premises until 10 clear days should have elapsed subsequent to the total disappearance of the disease, you would have a great number of animals accumulating there, and the trade would be stopped completely. And we must take into consideration that in deciding on a matter like this, we are not to look at the abstract question of what is the best method of stopping or arresting a disease, or stamping it out, but I presume we must take into consideration the most that can be done in that direction, compatible with the requirements of the trade of the country and the absolutely necessary cattle movement. I grant freely that it is perfectly easy to stamp out the disease.

disease if you kill every animal, but then there is the consideration with reference to the amount of the loss; the question is, would it pay?

4934. We will come to that afterwards; now I presume you would agree with the other witnesses that foot and mouth disease is a disease of foreign origin, and that it cannot occur except as the result of the importation of diseased animals, or from the conveyance of the infection?—That is a very vexed question; it is a question which I am not at all in a position to give a decided opinion upon, inasmuch as I have seen cases frequently of the foot and mouth distemper breaking out where I could not by any possibility trace the carriage of infection unless it was conveyed through the medium of the air.

4935. Would you mention some of those instances?—I have observed the disease break out in cildh cows kept in stables and premises where there were no other animals, not even a horse kept, and where they had been for a considerable time previously, and I have no reason to believe that the persons in attendance upon the cows had been near diseased cattle.

4936. But I suppose you could hardly absolutely say with confidence that the persons in attendance upon those cattle had not been in contact with diseased cattle?—The thing has occurred so very frequently that you could scarcely regard it as such a sort of negative evidence, that it should not be relied upon in any way.

4937. Upon the whole, are you inclined to believe that the disease can be so propagated, or not?—I believe it can be propagated in that way; I believe it can be conveyed in other ways, I believe the disease can break out, I may say emphatically, the same as some fevers, such as typhus in Ireland, although that very rarely occurs, but the way to consider it genetically is to deal with the disease as a disease which is of foreign origin, and which is so highly contagious and infectious that it is easily transmitted from one animal to others, and one which requires to be dealt with upon that principle; upon no other principle can you successfully deal with it.

4938. Are you aware of Mr. Bakhwin's suggestions for the purpose of eradicating foot and mouth diseases from the country?—I am.

4939. Do you agree with his views?—His plan might be worthy of experiment, but I would not undertake the responsibility of recommending it to be carried out.

4940. Do you, in the first place, believe that if his plan were carried out it would be effectual?—I believe if his plan were carried out, most decidedly; if sufficient time were given, the disease could be eradicated from Ireland, but it would involve serious results.

4941. In what length of time do you suppose that could be done?—I could not give an opinion upon that subject.

4942. What is the longest time of the incubation of foot and mouth disease which has come under your notice?—I have seen some cases of an animal becoming affected with foot and mouth disease, which decidedly had not been exposed to any known infection or contagion for fully a fortnight, but previously to that fortnight it might have been with other animals which were infected in an incipient stage; for instance, a diseased animal might have licked it, and it might not have turned its tongue to the part of the hide which the animal had licked for the greater part of the fortnight.

058.

4933. Have you tried any experiments in that regard?—In any experiments which I have tried I have never known the length of the incubation of foot and mouth disease to be more than from 36 to about 50 hours, and seldom as long as the latter.

4934. If the period of incubation of disease has been such as your experiments lead you to believe that it is, could not you at all give the Committee the advantage of your opinion as to how long it would be necessary to stop the circulation of cattle in order to stamp out the disease?—That would greatly depend upon the size of the farms and the management of the cattle thereon. Thus, if a farm is a very large one, and there be several fields in it, and it be very heavily stocked, and these animals are separated in lots from one another, it might take four or five months before the malady would go through the whole of the animals upon the farm susceptible of taking it.

4935. Have the police the right of entry upon farms in Ireland?—They have. Another thing, which I forgot to mention is, that the movement of a living animal affected with foot and mouth distemper is prohibited, excepting under extraordinary circumstances, and by the authority of the Lord Lieutenant, but there are circumstances which require it occasionally to be permitted.

4936. Was that law or order of the Privy Council enforced at the time of the last Ballinasloe fair?—It was.

4937. And were the animals then suffering from foot and mouth disease prevented from moving?—They were not discovered, but as far as regards Ballinasloe Fair, I did not attend the fair, but from my own observation of many of the animals which came from it, I feel assured that thousands upon thousands of sheep were pronounced to be ailing with foot and mouth distemper, when the only thing which ailed their feet was foot-rot.

4938. The letter which I have already quoted speaks of the sheep in another fair as being "so very far gone in disease that a child could have detected it, but no one interfered in the slightest degree; the police all seemed to take it as a matter of course for which there is no remedy?"—I am not in a position to contradict that.

4939. Your idea is that the law must have been very inefficiently carried out?—My idea, as far as regards inspection is, that to do away with it altogether is perfectly absurd; it would be even worse than the position in which we are unfortunately placed now, but I think that there should be veterinary surgeons able to recognise the disease having power as inspectors to seize those animals, and to act with the police, for no police will undertake the responsibility themselves of making a seizure on their own responsibility.

4940. But if the police see that animals are moving about which obviously are diseased, do they not neglect their duty in not preventing the circulation of those animals?—Yes, it is a neglect of duty; but I do not think they neglect their duty to the extent which has been stated.

4941. But as a matter of fact, was not the result of the Ballinasloe fair, and the driving away of the quantity of beasts and sheep which were collected there, to spread the disease right and left throughout a great portion of Ireland?—I believe it was; but I do not know what could be done, even supposing there were a lot of inspectors there. I gave distinct orders to the gentleman who went down to report relative to the fair, not

C c

Professor
H. Ferguson.
1 May 1873.

not to interfere, unless he saw something extraordinary, with the movement of cattle. Several propositions had been made to the Government to stop Ballinasloe fair. I grant you that if Ballinasloe fair had been stopped, there is not the slightest doubt but that you would not have had the unfortunate results of the disease being spread from it, but it would be very impelid to stop such a fair at Ballinasloe. I do not see how the stock owners would be able to pay their rents or to meet their engagements, if you stop such a fair merely on account of foot and mouth distemper.

4942. But if during the months of June and July the disease had been extirpated from Ireland, there would have been no foot and mouth disease at Ballinasloe fair, would there?—Not unless it had been subsequently introduced. For instance, to show how uncertain we are with regard to the origin of foot and mouth disease, the Spanish and Portuguese cattle have been considered perfectly free from it, but there was a cargo either of Spanish or Portuguese cattle landed at the port of Dublin the day before yesterday, and it was discovered that the foot and mouth distemper existed among that cargo; three of the animals were affected, they were slaughtered immediately after landing, and the rest were removed. All those which were not apparently diseased were removed to slaughterhouses for immediate slaughter under license by the police.

4943. Can you suggest to the Committee any plan less stringent than that of Mr. Baldwin's, which would have the effect which you admit his plan would have, if it were tried for a sufficient time, namely, of extirpating the disease?—No, but with regard to another branch of the question, I could suggest a plan which, if adopted, would, I think, effectually prevent persons from wilfully attempting to export diseased animals from Ireland to Great Britain, that is to say, by extending the provisions of the Act of Parliament relative to foreign cattle on their debarkation to Irish cattle. Under the Irish Act, if a diseased animal is discovered to be disembarked in Ireland, we can seize that animal and confiscate it as a contraband, according to the laws of the Customs, and were an English Act or an English Council Order issued enabling the authorities to do the same thing, if that were put into force in two or three cases, depend upon it they would never attempt subsequently to send over cattle which were diseased, but I think the quantity of diseased cattle received by this country from Ireland is very much exaggerated.

4944. Can we so deal with British cattle?—Indeed we can.

4945. Will you give the Committee the section of the Act of Parliament to which you refer?—It is section 5 of the 33 & 34 Vict., c. 36. "If any person lands, or attempts to land, in any port or place in Ireland, or ships, or attempts to ship from any port or place in Ireland, to any part of England, Wales, or Scotland, any animal or thing, in contravention of any order under this Act, such animal or thing shall be forfeited in like manner as goods, the importation whereof is prohibited by the Acts relating to the customs, are liable to be forfeited." Now in the draft of the Irish Act, I altered this section when I was revising it, and I had it inserted in this way. In the English Act they can only deal with foreign cattle in that way.

4946. To recur to Mr. Baldwin's plan, to give his plan a full chance of success, what conditions

would be necessary?—It would be necessary that the action taken in Ireland and Great Britain would be similar and simultaneous; also that the importation of foreign cattle would be prohibited during that time, otherwise, I think, you would be very likely subject to the same thing that we were subjected to in Ireland the day before yesterday.

4947. But you seem to have dealt with that cargo which arrived in Ireland in a satisfactory way?—I have dealt with it, but I do not know what will be the consequences; I do not know whether a number of people who had been going about the custom house and docks, and feeding the animals over, and so on, may not have carried the disease further.

4948. Were they Spanish or Portuguese cattle?—The telegram mentioned Spanish cattle, but I should fancy from the name of the vessel that they were Portuguese.

4949. But are you aware that part of Mr. Baldwin's scheme was, after the disease was extirpated, to deal with the disease in the very summary way which you have described?—I understand that he intended to pole-axe them, and compensate fully the owners, but I do not know where the money will come from to compensate them, because with regard to compensation you were upon the committee which recommended compensation to be given for compulsory slaughter of the animals affected with cattle plague, and animals which had been in contact with them, and an Act of Parliament was passed in 1866 enabling the Government to compensate the owner out of a fund called the Cattle Plague Fund; that was a rate levied upon all the poor law unions in Ireland, but that gave a vast deal of dissatisfaction. A great number of people not engaged in the cattle trade at all naturally asked why they should be taxed for a trade which they were not at all interested in.

4950. Do you think that there is any person who enters meat who is not interested in putting down diseases in cattle?—I think not, but for all that there is a difficulty about it.

4951. Does pleuro-pneumonia ever occur in Ireland, except as the result of infection and contagion?—I am convinced that that disease does.

4952. Why do you think so?—Because I have frequently seen that disease break out in cattle while for months upon months could not by any possibility have been exposed to infection, and another reason is that pleuro-pneumonia has existed in Ireland, I think, about two years longer than is generally believed; it has been stated that it was originally introduced, not into Waterford, but into Cork, by some Dutch cattle which were brought over by Lord Clancourty's family, I believe, but I have made every inquiry, and I cannot find that any cattle had been introduced into Ireland at the time, and I requested the present Lord Clancourty (he was then Lord Dunlo) to make inquiries as to whether such a thing had occurred, and he assured me it had not; I was speaking to him about it the other evening. Many go so far as to state they know for a fact that such foreign cattle were imported into Ireland at that time, and that they themselves had them. I regard such statements as fictions.

4953. How would you propose to deal with pleuro-pneumonia?—I think that pleuro-pneumonia would be effectually dealt with by the complete

complete isolation of infected animals, and the prevention of their movement.

4954. Do you, in point of fact, deal with it in that way now?—No, we go further than that a great deal.

4955. Do you think your regulations at present are too strict?—No, they have been altered; under the regulations in 1871 it was imperative for the farm land, or place on or in which the disease was, to be kept as an infected district for 30 clear days after the disappearance of the disease, and the consequence was that it was found a very great hardship upon persons who had a quantity of cattle, perhaps, ready for the market, that they would be running the risk of being fined, or moving them, although not affected. And, again, it did not work well in another way; in Ireland we have a number of farms which take in cattle for grazing during the summer months; there would be several hundreds of cattle upon them, and sometimes, perhaps, just before the termination of the grazing season, the disease would break out, and then it would go on dropping from one lot of cattle to the other; if the animals were kept upon this farm until the disease had entirely disappeared, they would be starved. Therefore, in the last Order in Council relative to pleuro-pneumonia, there is a provision enabling the Lord Lieutenant to alter the provisions in certain cases, as he may think proper, from time to time, according to the circumstances, and that has been found to work remarkably well.

4956. That was a relaxation of a previous order, was not it?—No, there was no discretionary power in the previous order; it was all imperative.

4957. But there is now a discretionary power?—Yes, there is a discretionary power; it is absolutely essential that there should be.

4958. What is the state of Ireland now with regard to pleuro-pneumonia; do you know how many cases have been recently reported?—Pleuro-pneumonia and the other disease, foot and mouth distemper, appear to me to be coming down very rapidly to a minimum; reports are sent on to me in London twice a day by telegraph; the day before yesterday there were only two known new cases of foot and mouth disease reported from the entire of Ireland, and, I think, one case of pleuro-pneumonia; I think there was yesterday only one case of pleuro-pneumonia reported.

4959. It is generally the case, is it not, that at this time of year, the number of cases of disease diminishes very much indeed?—Yes; but the cases had not diminished previously with such extraordinary rapidity as they have of late; I think it is exceedingly probable that this foot and mouth disease, like epidemics in human beings, and some other epizootics, will run itself out.

4960. But assuming that there is very little disease in Ireland at present, would not this be a very good time for trying the experiment of extirpating it altogether?—If you determined upon doing it, this would be a good time, but supposing it were tried now, if you stopped all fairs and stopped all cattle movement, I do not know how the people would pay their next gale rents.

4961. But there is, as a matter of fact, very little sale of fat cattle at this time of year?—There is a great deal of store cattle exported at this season; there will be during this month 579 fairs held in Ireland; I can tell the number of

fairs which will be held upon any day in any county in Ireland.

4962. Will you mention the number of fairs held in each month in the whole of Ireland?—In January there are 367; in February, 402; in March, 400; in April, 394; in May, 679; in June, 557; in July, 442; in August, 571; in September, 488; in October, 539; in November, 579; and in December, 522; that is, the month of May, in fact, is the month in which the largest number of fairs are held in Ireland.

4963. But not, I think, the most important fairs?—No; but still there is live stock of one kind or another sold at the whole of them; the most important fairs are those which are held at the latter end of the year; the October fairs, for example; although in the months of September and October there are the two great fairs, the Banagher fair and the Ballinasloe fair, still there are only 488 fairs in September, and 559 in October.

4964. Mr. W. Jackson.] The month of May is the month in which the largest number of store cattle are sold, for exportation to Great Britain, is it not?—Yes, there is not the slightest doubt of that, at least of late.

4965. Mr. Howell.] Are you acquainted with the English system of dealing with the diseases of animals?—No further than from reading the Council Orders and the Act of Parliament, and from what I hear. I have had no practical experience of it.

4966. What are the main differences between the English and the Irish systems?—The English system is worked through the medium of the local authorities; there is a central power, and the local authorities are responsible to it. The Irish system is different; the central authority, the Government, works it directly itself. I consider that the Irish plan is the best plan; there are facilities of working that plan out in Ireland which there are not at all in England, because in Ireland you have one police under the central authority; therefore the English Veterinary Department is at a decided disadvantage. I do not think anything could be more perfect than the Council Orders and the regulations of the English Veterinary Department, if they had but the proper machinery for carrying them out.

4967. But you prefer the Irish machinery?—Yes, most decidedly.

4968. Why do you prefer it?—Because there is no intervening power. The English Veterinary Department, although it has the inconvenience of not having direct control over the police of the country, they belonging to the local authorities, yet has one very great convenient advantage over the Irish Veterinary Department, inasmuch as it can relieve itself from responsibility, and throw it and the onus completely upon the local authorities, which it is perfectly right to do; because, as far as I have read in the papers and in different proceedings, I do not think the local authorities in Great Britain act at all in unison; the very moment any particular action is decided upon in Ireland, you may rest assured that, if pressure is put upon the Inspector-General of Constabulary by the Government, in the course of 24 hours action will be commenced; that it will be simultaneously taken, and that it will be exactly similar in all parts of the country, which is not the case in England, I believe.

4969. Chairman.] The Order in Council under which

Professor
H. Ferguson.

1 May 1873.

Professor
H. Ferguson.
1 May 1873.

which you act in Ireland, in regard to foot and mouth disease, is that of the 3rd of November 1870, I think?—Yes.

4970. Before that order was issued did you take any steps to stop the spread of foot and mouth disease in Ireland?—There had been one order issued previously to that; it was not an order relative to foot and mouth disease particularly; it was a general order, in which the movement of animals affected with foot and mouth disease was prohibited. Its date is 6 March 1868.

4971. What I want to know is, when did you first attempt in Ireland to stop foot and mouth disease by restrictions upon home cattle?—Upon the 21st day of October 1869.

4972. You had had bad attacks of foot and mouth disease before that time?—We had.

4973. Had you had a worse attack than this of 1872?—Never; it was bad at first in the Dublin dairies, but until this last year it did not become so very bad generally throughout the country.

4974. Then, I suppose, we must acknowledge that the same thing has happened in Ireland as happened in England, that notwithstanding our attempt, both by our veterinary departments in England and in Ireland, to stop foot and mouth disease, we have had since we began these efforts as bad and prevalent an attack as we had in the previous times?—Yes, decidedly.

4975. In fact, the result seems to show that nothing which has been done in Ireland has seriously checked the spread of the disease?—That is so, compared with other diseases.

4976. You have the power of entry by the 6th clause, have you not?—Yes.

4977. Is that often made use of?—Frequently.

4978. I understood you to state that there was a great want of veterinary surgeons throughout Ireland?—Yes, that is so.

4979. In Connaught, for example, you stated that there was no duly certified veterinary surgeon?—No, there is no duly certified veterinary surgeon in Connaught, and according to the last list there were only about 60 or 70 of them in Ireland altogether.

4980. Where there are no duly certified veterinary surgeons, do the cattle owners get on without any medical assistance at all, or do they have uncertified practitioners?—The practice among cattle owners in Ireland is very different from what it is in England; they will not call in veterinary surgeons, as a general rule, to treat their cattle.

4981. I suppose they have what a veterinary surgeon would call "cow leeches"?—Yes; but they treat their own animals to a great extent.

4982. We have had it given in evidence by Professor Baldwin that there are parts of Ireland, mountainous districts, in which there is no foot and mouth disease, in Donegal and Kerry especially, I believe?—In the year 1872 there were 379 cattle affected with foot and mouth disease in Donegal, 34 sheep, and 11 swine.

4983. How many counties are there in Ireland from which you had no returns of foot and mouth disease in 1872?—None.

4984. What are the figures in Kerry?—In Kerry there were 4,789 cases in cattle, 494 cases in sheep, and in swine 261.

4985. The statistics of the total number affected give a very much larger number of cattle affected than of sheep; do you think you have got anything like accurate returns with regard to the

sheep?—No, nor all the returns of cattle either.

4986. Would you not be much more likely to have imperfect returns of sheep than of cattle?—Much more so; I do not think the people themselves, in some of the large sheep-farming places, could ascertain the exact number which are affected.

4987. Nor would they perhaps think it so important to send in a return of the number of sheep affected as they would of the cattle?—I think they would, because the police generally are very anxious to get a conviction; they are very anxious to show their zeal.

4988. But you gave a very much smaller number of swine; do you think that return was at all complete?—I do not.

4989. I was very much struck with the fact, that although the number of swine affected was smaller yet the proportion of deaths was larger?—It is a very well known fact, that although it is not at all a fatal disease with cattle it is an eminently fatal disease with swine.

4990. That is an important point; what percentage of the swine should you say would be likely to die?—The percentage in 1872, 5.75.

4991. I see that in the 14th page of your Report there is a table which shows the average per-centage of the deaths of swine to be 5.1, of sheep to be .09, and of cattle to be .32?—That is so.

4992. You say you work through the central authority in Dublin, and you show an advantage which you have in having the police under your orders, working in the same manner throughout the kingdom, but as regards the veterinary inspection, you are almost driven, are you not, to the central authority, from the want of local veterinary inspection?—That is the fact.

4993. You have to rely for a very large part of Ireland, upon the veterinary inspectors whom you send out from the central office?—Yes. At present, and since July 1871, the Treasury will not go to greater expense for veterinary inspectors in connection with the office than one guinea for any one day. There are two kinds of inspectors; the pay for inspection throughout the country must come out of the fund called the Cattle Plague Account, which is to be levied; it has not been levied as yet a second time.

4994. But you mention the advantages of the principle of stopping these diseases by the central authority; is it not a very considerable disadvantage to be obliged to send the veterinary inspectors and the veterinary surgeons from Dublin to all parts of the kingdom?—A very great disadvantage; and the fact of the matter is, that there have not been persons to send. My opinion is, that there should be persons posted throughout the kingdom for that purpose, particularly at telegraphic centres from which there are railways running.

4995. Why would you want those inspectors throughout the kingdom?—It very frequently occurs that a person applies to have the restrictions taken off from a farm; and the constable may be of opinion that the restrictions should not be taken off; under such circumstances, it is very reasonable for the owner of the farm to require an inspector to visit and inspect the stock.

4996. We have had it suggested with regard to England, that the only effectual way of stopping the foot and mouth disease would be by the stoppage of fairs for a shorter or longer space of time.

time, and by the restriction of movement during that time; but that suggestion has been accompanied with a recommendation of a power to some one in the locality to grant licenses for movement, he being guided by veterinary information; supposing such a plan were started in Ireland, would it be practicable to work it, without veterinary knowledge, upon the spot?—I do not think so; I should not like to undertake it.

4997. You have been asked one or two questions with regard to the suggestions of Professor Baldwin, and I should like to ask you about them more in detail. Professor Baldwin's first statement was, that he thought the stoppage of fairs during the months of June and July, and the stoppage of the movement of cattle would so diminish the disease as to reduce it to a minimum, which could be easily dealt with afterwards; do you think that a stoppage for those two months would be sufficient?—It might be, but I should not like to say that it was.

4998. Am I right in supposing that in order that it should answer, there are at least two conditions necessary; first, that that two months should give time for a herd in which there was disease, to have that disease cleared out of it; and secondly, that we should have reason to expect that the police, whose duty it was to act upon the orders issued, would discover all the herds affected during those two months?—Yes, I should imagine so.

4999. Now with regard to the first condition; do you think that a period of only two months would give you time to banish the disease from all the herds that were affected at the beginning of the two months?—A gentleman gave evidence before this Committee relative to the introduction of the foot and mouth disease into Victoria, and he attributed it to an animal which had been put on board in an assumed state, which animal had not perfectly recovered when it arrived out at Victoria. If I were in my office in Dublin I could show you reports of fairs which in the earlier times of the last outbreak of the disease were considerably more than two months under restrictions; I cannot exactly recall the names of them, but if it is necessary I will lay the names before the Committee.

5000. With your experience you would find it difficult, would you not, to state a time which you are quite sure would be sufficient?—I would not venture to do such a thing; I would not impair my reputation by doing so.

5001. Of course the second condition would still more require to be fulfilled; that is to say, that the whole of these experiments would have been almost tried in vain, if at the end of the two months there were herds or cases which had never been reported, and in which no action had been taken?—Yes, decidedly.

5002. Could we rely upon the police discovering all these cases through Ireland?—I do not think you could, particularly when I reflect upon one thing, that it is proposed after the expiration of the two months, when they would get a clean bill of health, to pole-axe all the animals as they were supposed to become affected, and to recompense the owners; in that case, I think that a number of persons would be very glad to keep back their diseased animals and hide the disease, with a view to getting the remuneration as soon as possible.

5003. Those fairs which are held in June and July are fairs of what description; they are not

very large fairs like Ballinacree, I believe?—They are not so very large, but they are very considerable fairs, there is a very large number of them; the fact of it is, that on every day in June and July in every county in Ireland there are a number of fairs.

5004. Do you think, from your knowledge of the cattle trade throughout Ireland, that many of the cattle owners depend upon selling their animals in those months?—I do. I will tell you the reason why. The half-year is from January to June; the farmers have always to meet engagements, if not of rent; if the gale days are not at that date, they have always serious engagements to meet.

5005. When is the gale day generally?—The 25th March and the 29th of September.

5006. They would have to make sales to meet the autumn gale day?—Yes, they would have ample opportunities for doing that.

5007. Supposing the fairs were stopped, there would be enormous inconvenience, would there not, unless there were opportunities afforded for private sales?—There would be great inconvenience, inseparable inconvenience.

5008. I understand the proposal to be to stop the movement from private sales except by license, but would it not be necessary, unless the farmers were put to very great inconvenience, to allow a great number of movements in the case of private sales?—I consider the movement would be as bad as the fairs.

5009. But it would be necessary to have that movement, would it not?—It would be necessary to have that movement; you could not stop all movement, the people would be starved.

5010. Supposing you carried that out with the stringency which was really necessary to make it effectual, do you imagine that you would have the public opinion of the cattle farmers in Ireland on your side?—My impression is that you would not.

5011. Will you just turn to those statistics of Ireland in "Thom's Almanac," with which I dare say you are acquainted?—Those are my own tables.

5012. Will you give the Committee the number of cattle exported from Ireland to England in the month of June?—The exportations last year were greater than ever, but taking this year which is given the exportation in June of oxen, bulls, and cows, was 28,779; calves 6,438; sheep and lambs 7,712; and swine 26,191.

5013. Now will you take July?—In July (this is about our greatest month of export), the number of oxen, bulls, and cows exported was 32,043, calves 7,514, sheep, 104,183, and 12,729 swine.

5014. Looking at the figures of that table, is it not the case that in June and July there was a larger exportation than in any of the previous months of the year?—Yes.

5015. But the exportation goes on during the other autumn months; August and September are also large?—Yes, they are.

5016. Then, so far as regards the present trade between England and Ireland, its stoppage during the months of June and July would be a great interference with it?—Decidedly so.

5017. And if it was found necessary to extend the stoppage into the autumn months, that would be a greater interference than if it was done in the spring, would it not?—So it would appear.

5018. Is there a larger proportion of fat cattle, compared

Professor
H. Ferguson.
1 May 1873.

Professor H. Ferguson. compared to store cattle, in those months than in other months?—I have no statistical information upon that point.

1 May 1873. 5019. What is your opinion on it?—I should fancy that there was not a larger number in June and July; you will excuse me giving a decided opinion upon that point.

5020. At any rate, you have no reason to suppose that the number of fat cattle would be larger than that of store cattle?—No, decidedly not; because the fat cattle go over just at the finishing of the grazing season, and then at the end of the season there is the stall feeding; those are the two seasons.

5021. There was a letter read to you by my right honourable friend about the immense quantity of animals which were evidently diseased with foot and mouth disease a month after a large fair?—Yes; in this particular extract it says, that the sheep at Berrow fair were so far gone in disease that a child could have detected it.

5021*. You made a remark about foot-rot; do you think that many of those cases would be likely to be foot-rot?—Most decidedly; we had a frightfully wet season last year, and last winter was frightfully wet; and I have seen thousands of animals which came from Ballinasloe, and throughout Ireland, which were stabled in Ireland, and by some professional men, to be affected with the foot and mouth distemper, but it was nothing more nor less than foot-rot.

5022. What were the particulars of this Spanish or Portuguese cargo which arrived the day before yesterday?—It arrived the day before yesterday, and I got a telegram stating that out of 176 cattle (which I should presume, from the name of the vessel, were Portuguese, although the telegram said Spanish), there were three affected with the foot and mouth distemper.

5023. What did you do?—I telegraphed back to give the order that they must be slaughtered.

5024. Have you not got a rule that if there is one animal diseased in a foreign cargo, they must all be slaughtered?—It is not a rule; it is optional with us; I have by telegram submitted to the Government that it would be desirable to stop the importation altogether; it is so very trifling.

5025. I suppose you would be prepared to acknowledge that unless we can have much more stringent regulations with respect to foot and mouth disease, it is of little use attempting to stop it by the present restrictions in Ireland?—Were you to revoke or repeal all the restrictions relative to foot and mouth disease, it would have a most injurious effect, and I will explain the reason why: it is necessary, with regard to foot and mouth disease, to have it reported; if you took the restrictions off that disease, and ceased requiring it to be reported, even were cattle plague to come into the country, the people would say that they fancied it was foot and mouth disease.

5026. That is an inference; but I mean with regard to the actual effect of foot and mouth disease; I understood you to admit that you had not stopped that disease any more than we have been able to do in England, but do you think that if you had no restrictions at all you would at this moment have less foot and mouth disease than you have?—I do not; most decidedly not.

5027. I understand that you are not prepared to interfere with your authority the very strong recommendation with regard to the stoppage for

two months, or such time as may be required, of all movement; I am right in presuming that, am I not?—I would not take the responsibility of doing that; but I think it looks a plausible suggestion.

5028. Have you any suggestion to make yourself with regard to the stoppage of the foot and mouth complaint in Ireland?—None; I think if the Council orders in Ireland and those in England could be carried out further, they are as good as could be made.

5029. Do you agree with the estimate of loss for this last year, which was made by Professor Baldwin, in which he estimated that the loss to Ireland was a million and a half from foot and mouth disease?—I could not form any estimate of it; it is a matter I could not go into at all; I know that the loss of feeding-stuff and capital lying dormant, from not being able to be duly turned, must be very great; but I have never turned my mind to it; the fact is, I could not do such a thing without too much loss of time.

5030. What is the order upon which you require the railway trucks to be disinfected?—The order of the 19th of May 1871, that is, an order cited as the "Transit of Animals Order," and the Order of the 6th of March 1868.

5031. That is the order under which you were at work?—Yes.

5032. Has that order ever been modified?—Yes, it has been modified by the order of the 28th of July 1871.

5033. I see that the order of the 28th of July 1871 postpones the operation of Section 11 of the previous order, which requires spring buffers to be fitted to each truck, and that order entirely revokes No. 14?—Yes.

5034. No. 14 being the one for the disinfection of trucks and carriages; is not that so?—There is another order requiring disinfection, which I have not got with me; a previous one.

5035. Upon the 28th of July the disinfecting order of May was revoked?—Yes.

5036. Was it reimposed?—It was reimposed, I think. If not reimposed, that was in consequence of the Order of 6th March 1868, being still in force.

5037. Were the railway companies in Ireland informed that the railway companies in England had not dissented from the disinfecting clause with regard to trucks?—They were informed of it; everything was done that could be done.

5038. You have had forwarded to you from the English Veterinary Department, from time to time, have you not, complaints from the local authorities and other persons in England, with regard to the introduction of disease, particularly foot and mouth disease?—Frequently.

5039. Has anything been done by the Irish Veterinary Department in consequence of those representations?—Yes; there have been persons placed at some of the ports for the purpose of watching the ports and inspecting the cattle, and, strange to say, some of the cattle which passed muster on embarkation in Ireland, have been found to be diseased almost immediately after debarkation in Great Britain.

5040. At which of the ports have persons been placed?—At Dublin, at present.

5041. And where else?—I had an inspector at Cork, but Dublin is the only place where I have an inspector at present.

5042. Dublin and Cork are the only places where that plan has been in operation?—No; I had

Professor
H. Ferguson.
1 May 1873

had a person at Waterford, a person at Drogheda, and another at Belfast, but an order has been issued recalling them; I think Dublin is the most likely place at this season of the year particularly to make a seizure or arrest; I have given directions for no animal to be seized until it is on the gangway, and if they attempt to ship a diseased animal, no matter with what disease, it would be seized and confiscated.

5043. When did you appoint the first officers for the purpose of inspecting at the port of embarkation?—Except during 1866 and 1871, I think it was in the month of January this year, but it is only just for our own information; the fact of it is, in Ireland there is practically no regular portal inspection of the cattle previous to embarkation.

5044. I understood you, in answer to my previous question, when I asked what steps had been taken, to state that persons had been employed to inspect at the ports?—This year, only one person has acted, and he has been sent to two or three different ports more with the view of reporting than anything else.

5045. From what port does the export to Bristol chiefly come?—Mostly from Cork and Waterford.

5046. No person was employed at Waterford?—We had a man at Waterford.

5047. I gather from what you state, that you do not consider it to be any use to send anybody?—I think there is very little use in it, except in the way I say.

5048. What were the instructions you gave to the person who was sent to inspect, in case he found any animals affected with disease?—The instructions given in Dublin were, that the animals should be seized, and that it was the intention to confiscate any animal that was diseased; unfortunately that has become known, and no opportunity of making a seizure has been as yet afforded.

5049. That direction was given under the 5th clause of the Act?—Yes, the clause which I read to you some time ago.

5050. This clause gives the power to the Irish Government through the Customs, and acting, I suppose, by the advice of your department, to confiscate any animal found diseased on embarkation?—It says we shall, but it has never been attempted to be carried out.

5051. It orders you, in fact, to confiscate any animal which is discovered to be affected with fatal and maul disease at the port of embarkation?—Yes, that is the case.

5052. Has that clause ever been carried into effect?—Never, although it has been frequently suggested that it should be.

5053. By you?—By me; at least I have succeeded in getting permission for it to be done.

5054. And you have now given instructions that it should be done?—I have now given instructions that it should be done at the port of Dublin.

5055. What is the Act of Parliament which provides for a rate in Ireland for the expenses incurred in working these Acts?—That of the 6th of March 1866, the 29 Vict. c. 4.

5056. For what purpose was it contemplated in the Act of 1866 that the rate should be levied?

—For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the Act.

5057. But that was an Act for the stoppage of the cattle plague, was it not?—Yes; then subsequently, by the 35 & 36 Vict., the provision was extended to all other diseases.

5058. Has any rate been levied under that Act?—Not as I understand.

5059. There has been no attempt to raise by rate under that Act any sum of money in Ireland for the purpose of stopping the spread of what may be called the home diseases?—No.

5060. Supposing that anything approaching to Professor Baldwin's suggestion was carried out, implying a very considerable compulsory slaughter, and consequently a very considerable amount of compensation, do you think it would be easy to obtain that compensation by a rate from Ireland?—Physically it might be very easy, but it would give a great deal of dissatisfaction.

5061. Do you think that the fact that such a rate was levied, and had to be paid, would at all militate against the working of the Act by preventing its being supported by the farmers?—As far as regards the farmers, I should say they would be delighted; I think you would have an enormous number of animals reported as being diseased; but as a natural result the farmers would never take precautions under those circumstances to prevent disease getting into their farms, and they would take good care to see that the animals were well valued before slaughter.

5062. Supposing there were slaughter without compensation, you would have the farmers doing all they could to defeat the Act, would you not?—I cannot reasonably suppose that; I do not think the Government in Ireland would venture upon a Council Order making such an unjust regulation.

5063. The rate contemplated by the Irish Act was a general rate throughout Ireland, was it not?—It was a general rate throughout Ireland.

5064. Thereby differing from the English plan, which makes the expense fall upon the locality in a local rate?—Yes, the conclusion was come to, that it would not be desirable to follow that plan; for instance, Dublin is an exporting port, and there is a very great deal of disease brought there from other parts, and it would be a very hard thing for the citizens of Dublin; they would kick up a row if they had to pay all the expenses incurred in consequence of diseased animals from all parts of Ireland passing through their city in transit for exportation.

5065. Upon the other hand, if the measure was applied as suggested, and there was a good deal of slaughter in some of the country parts of Ireland, would there not then be an objection to paying the rate if it was a general rate?—There would be some objection; but as a matter of fact, I think that in Ireland, although they are exceedingly poor, they are, as a general rule, very good tax-payers.

5066. You do not think that the feeling would be so strong about it?—I do not think they would kick up such a row about it, being engaged in other matters which they think more important as grievances.

5067. Mr. Monell.] Under what circumstances do you receive your remuneration?—

Mr. ROBERT FISHER, called in; and Examined.

Mr. R. Fisher. 5068. Mr. *Clare Reed*.] You are a farmer in Yorkshire, and Chairman of the East Riding Chamber of Agriculture, are you not?—Yes.
1 May 1879. I am.

5069. What extent of land do you and your sons farm?—About 1,700 acres; that is not all in Yorkshire; there are about 500 acres in Rutland.

5070. So that you have great experience in the management of cattle and sheep?—Yes.

5071. Do you know anything about the recent outbreak of cattle plague in Yorkshire?—Yes; I know principally about it.

5072. Have you any doubt that the disease came through the port of Hull?—No, not at all; it went from the port of Hull to Poeklington, and from the port of Hull near to Bridlington; there were two centres where it went from near Hull at first.

5073. Do you consider that the local authority did its duty well upon that occasion?—Yes, remarkably well; both the local authorities.

5074. Which local authority do you mean, the local authority of the county or of the borough of Hull?—The local authorities in the country. As soon as it was known to be the cattle plague at Bridlington, which was the last place it was known to be, of course the magistrates took action at once, and then it spread from there to Poeklington, and that district.

5075. You are now speaking of two local authorities in the country; not of the port of Hull?—No.

5076. *Chairman*.] You have, in the East Riding, committees appointed in particular districts by the general local authorities, have you not?—We have not, lately; but we had in the former cattle plague times.

5077. How do you come to have a local authority for a particular part of the East Riding?—The local authorities of the East Riding meet and appoint committees.

5078. When speaking of two local authorities, you mean the two committees which were appointed to work in each locality?—Yes.

5079. Mr. *Clare Reed*.] You think the local authorities did all they could?—Yes.

5080. Notwithstanding that you had very considerable difficulty in stamping out the plague?—We had very considerable difficulty indeed.

5081. Do you think that resulted from what you consider the inadequate compensation given to the owners of stock?—Yes, in a very great measure, it did.

5082. Do you think that if a larger and more just compensation was given, the farmers would give notice of the disease more readily than they do?—Yes; the moment they had a beast ill they would send to the veterinary surgeon somebody, to ascertain whether it was the cattle-plague or not.

5083. I suppose, in the very early stages of cattle plague, the disease might be mistaken for a bad cold?—Yes.

5084. And an ordinary farmer would not, in the very first stages of the disease, know what was the matter with his stock?—He would not at all know.

5085. What is your idea of proper compensation?—The full value of the animals ought to be paid.

5086. Do you mean of those in contact, as

well as those that are slaughtered?—I would give three-fourths of the value of those that were diseased, but with regard to all those which had been in contact, and ought to be slaughtered, I think the full value ought to be paid.

5087. You mean the full value before the disease appeared?—Yes.

5088. And who should pay it?—It ought to be paid from the national exchequer.

5089. Why so?—Because it is for the nation's good to cheapen the food of the people.

5090. You mean to say, that as the cattle plague is introduced from abroad, and the cattle are imported for the benefit of the whole nation, it is the nation and not the locality which should pay the compensation?—Of course.

5091. I think you are aware that all that the local authority can now do, and that is optional, is to slaughter those animals which have been actually herded with the diseased cattle; would you extend that power to those animals which, although not in actual contact, were in close proximity to those that were affected?—Certainly I would.

5092. Do you think that if the local authorities had had that power at the first outbreak of the cattle plague, and if there had been adequate compensation given, you would have got rid of the cattle plague in a much shorter time than you did?—Yes, and at very much less expense; I am quite certain of that.

5093. Why would it have been at much less expense?—Because there would have been so many cattle which would not have been destroyed, and the disease would never have spread as it did; if the farmers had made it known at once, when they had a beast ill, and had sent for the inspector, and the disease had been detected to be cattle plague, it would have saved a great many beasts from being killed which had to be killed.

5094. And there would be no necessity for actually destroying the carcasses of beasts which had been in an adjoining herd, I suppose?—Not at all.

5095. Although it might have been necessary to slaughter them?—They might have been slaughtered for food.

5096. There would have been very good salvage upon animals in adjacent herds, so that the loss would not have been very material upon them?—No; if they had been anything like getting up to maturity in fatness there would not; if they had been store animals the loss would have been greater.

5097. There would be the after results to the farmer, for which he would not be compensated; he might lose his whole season's grass, might he not?—The after loss is very serious; when I had the cattle plague attack me, I lost all the cattle upon one farm.

5098. When was that?—That was in 1865. When I lost all the cattle in the beginning, it was in November 1865; the cattle were bought to make the straw into manure. After the loss I could not purchase any more. I durst not take them on to the premises, and the consequence was that the straw was not made into manure at all, and it was a very great loss. The loss to me was before compensation was paid, so that I lost the whole of it altogether.

5099. And

5099. And in a less degree, I suppose, after an attack of foot and mouth disease, the farmer is subjected to similar inconveniences?—Yes; it is a long time afterwards, if he has the foot and mouth disease severely, before he dare be at the expense of introducing fresh stock upon his farm.

5100. Are you at all acquainted with the port of Hull?—Yes, I am.

5101. How far do you live from it?—About 12 miles.

5102. Are you aware that at the port of Hull foreign fat stock and foreign store stock are imported?—Yes.

5103. Do you think that should be permitted?—No, certainly not.

5104. You do not think that foreign cattle, both fat and store, should be allowed to be imported at the same port?—Certainly not.

5105. However good the regulations may be?—No; with the slaughtermen going backwards and forwards in markets, if there is any cattle comes up with cattle plague; the infection must necessarily be conveyed, and it was conveyed, there is no doubt about it, from the foreign cattle into the store cattle market; those were store cattle that went from Hull, in which the cattle plague broke out, and no doubt it was that very lot of cattle which came up to Hull in the "Joseph Soames," which spread the cattle plague in the East Riding this time.

5106. Without there being any actual contact between the cattle?—No, there was no actual contact between the cattle, but the markets are not far distant.

5107. *Chairman.* You seem to say the foreign cattle market is not far from what market?—From the home cattle market for both fat and store.

5108. It is one market for both fat and store cattle?—Yes, it is.

5109. It is chiefly the fat cattle, is it not?—No; there is a great deal of store cattle now which comes down from York to Hull, after the York market.

5110. *Mr. Clerk Read.* Would you say that Hull was better adapted for store cattle from foreign ports, or for fat stock?—For fat stock, decidedly.

5111. What would you say with regard to foreign store stock?—Foreign store stock ought all to be properly quarantined.

5112. Where?—At one place, if possible. The best suggestion I have ever heard was from Mr. Machi; he thought that it might be possible to quarantine the store stock on the "Black" River, in Essex, where there was plenty of land which might be made available for that purpose. I certainly do think (and I have seen the locality myself) that there seems to be a good deal in it, if the land could be procured, if all store stock could be quarantined at one place; then they could be sent about by rail all over England, after they were made safe.

5113. You would have the dairy cows, and the foreign store stock generally, quarantined at one or two ports only?—Yes, because the expense would be so enormous to quarantine them at every place where foreign cattle are now landed.

5114. Are not you of opinion that animals carry the infection of the foot and mouth disease in their coats some time after they are themselves cured?—I am quite certain of that.

5115. What would you do with the foreign sheep after they had been quarantined, or rather before they went into the country?—I would

have them all dipped with a disinfectant, and well washed in the usual way with a strong disinfecting solution.

5116. Are you aware that foreign sheep are very often infected with scab?—Yes.

5117. And your dressing might, perhaps, cure both diseases at once?—Yes, possibly. If the Committee will allow me, I will give them a case in point. I bought some sheep which I knew had had the foot and mouth disease; I kept the land clear for a fortnight, and then I kept them another fortnight after that. It was in the autumn, when the rains were very drenching. I thought there could not be any possible fear of infection; but I found in a few days, when I turned them amongst my own sheep, that the disease broke out amongst the others, while those which were turned in amongst them did not take it a second time.

5118. Do you suppose that those sheep were suffering from any secondary symptoms, or do you think that the germs of the disorder were located in the wool?—In the wool, I have no doubt about it, the same as scarlet fever is in the clothes of people.

5119. Returning to the subject of quarantine for foreign store stock, I suppose that if you had one or two, or three, ports set apart for that purpose, that would entail special stampers being required for that trade?—Yes.

5120. You think, perhaps, that that would be an advantage, as being less likely to communicate disease?—Yes.

5121. Have you many store stock imported into the port of Hull from abroad?—There are a good many imported, but I think not so many as there were at one time.

5122. Sheep as well as cattle?—Yes; but the farmers do not seem to appreciate them. Many farmers have tried them, but they do not seem to get on well with fattening; they are about tired, I think, of having them now. There are very few farmers, I believe, who buy them now.

5123. Is that in consequence of their being liable to disease, do you think, or in consequence of their being badly bred animals?—Both. They have not sufficient aptitude to fatten, and there is the risk of disease as well. Those are two things which tell very much against the farmers buying foreign store cattle.

5124. Are there many dairy cows imported?—There are a good many dairy cows imported.

5125. Do you think that if a reasonable system of quarantine were established for store stock, they would be worth anything more after the quarantine than they are now?—Yes, there is no question about that; people would have more confidence in buying them; the cows are the principal things which are cured for now.

5126. How much do you think it might raise the value of the cows?—It would be very difficult to tell, because a cowkeeper, if he had no risk in introducing those animals amongst his herd of cows, would have something very considerable, I should think.

5127. £. 1. or 2 £. a head?—Yes; there is no doubt about that, and more, I should think.

5128. Have you had much experience yourself of foot and mouth disease?—Yes, a very great deal too much.

5129. When had you it first?—In the month of September, in the year 1840.

5130. Was that the first outbreak in the East Riding?—It was the first I heard of.

D 2

5131. What

Mr.
R. Fisher.
1 May 1874.

Mr.
R. Fisher.
1 May 1873

5131. What sort of cattle were they?—They were Irish cattle, purchased at Market Weighton fair, upon the 25th of September 1840.

5132. They seem to have made a deep impression upon your mind?—Yes, they did.

5133. Were they very badly affected with the disease?—Yes; I turned them among my breeding ewes, and of course they were all attacked with it in a very short time.

5134. Being ignorant, I suppose, of the nature of the disease?—Yes; we were very much alarmed then.

5135. You did not know anything about its contagious nature, perhaps?—Not in fact; I had not heard of it before.

5136. Did you lose very much?—I think we did not lose so very many; I lost some half dozen sheep out of about 100 ewes, perhaps.

5137. I do not refer to that; but was your pecuniary loss great or little upon that occasion?—Of course it was pretty considerable for the number of cattle I had at that time.

5138. But I suppose you lost a good deal in condition; the disease, I presume, was as bad then as it is now?—But it was at the latter end of the year, and the principal part of the grazing cattle had gone off the farms then.

5139. What is your recent experience of foot and mouth disease?—My losses have been very serious among sheep from the foot and mouth disease during the last twelve months.

5140. Will you explain to the Committee the particulars of the loss?—It will be rather more than the twelve months, but taking it for the year, the sheep were attacked twelve months last February, just before lambing commenced, and the result was that we lost 50 ewes out of about 300, through foot and mouth disease.

5141. What was the loss in lambs?—In lambs we should lose at least 150; perhaps I might explain the way in which the ewes were lost; when the time came for the ewes to produce the lambs, the lambs died at the time the ewes had the disease, and they were swollen to an immense extent, and the ewes could not get rid of them; they were obliged to die; in other cases the lambs were dead in the mother, and the ewes got quit of the lambs, and got better.

5142. Have you had any loss this year among sheep from sheep-pox?—Yes, I had a loss this year of which I told you amongst sheep which had had the distemper; I thought they were all right and I sent them among a flock of 100 fat sheep and 600 hogs, and they all took the foot and mouth disease; the fat sheep had it so badly that the heads of many of them slipped off, and there was such an amount of suppuration that after the horny part came off you might have zipped the sheep's foot all to pieces; it would all crumble in pieces; the effect of that was that the sheep could not stand for weeks, although we got them up under sheds and houses; but the result was that the disease flew to the lungs and liver; we had a very great loss indeed, and we have many of them now which are showing the after-effects of the disease.

5143. Of course a sheep would continue very lame after it had recovered from the actual effects of the disease, would it not?—Yes, it is so long before the horny part can grow again that the sheep is laid, and the pressure upon the lungs causes a sort of inflammation, and then suppuration of the lungs takes place after that, and of course there is an end of it; they die at once.

5144. Are your losses exceptional, or do they extend to your neighbours?—Hundreds and thousands of sheep in the East Riding, during the lambing time have died; I have heard of one farmer, four or five miles from me, who had lost 183 ewes out of about 600, a fortnight or three weeks ago, and very many young sheep.

5145. Is there much mortality amongst lambs?—There is a great deal of abortion; the ewes cast the lambs, if they have the disease, in an early stage of parturition.

5146. Have you experienced any abortion amongst cows?—Yes; I never had the disease amongst my cows without having a great loss by abortion.

5147. Do you attribute that to foot and mouth disease?—Yes, entirely to that; I had it twice amongst my cows last summer.

5148. Do you mean twice over?—No, two separate times; I had about 50 cows, and by adopting the plan of isolation, I think I only had about eight of the cows attacked each time, but then I had sheep in the fields which were suffering from it all round, and that caused the cows to be attacked at different times I have no doubt.

5149. During the cattle plague restrictions I suppose you lost the foot and mouth disease from your district?—Yes, we entirely lost it; I never heard of a case, although some one said they knew there was a case, but I never heard of one myself.

5150. How long was that, do you think, after the cattle plague restrictions were issued?—It would be at least for about six months; and then, immediately after the restrictions were taken off, we got beasts from Ireland, and for all they had to suffer the same fatigue and everything that they have now; there was no foot and mouth disease in them; they were entirely clean.

5151. Do not you think that the fatigue and misery which they undergo in transit very much accelerates the disease?—It predisposes them to it, no doubt; when they come into our cattle markets, if there be any infection left, they, as I said, are very much predisposed to it by the journey and the hardships they have to undergo.

5152. You are of opinion, are you not, that no amount of misery, starvation, and bad ventilation, would produce the disease of themselves?—I feel quite certain of it, from my own experience and observation; I am certain that the disease does not break out spontaneously.

5153. Because you had not it before 1840, and I suppose the Irish cattle were subject to all the same inconveniences and miseries then that they are now?—Yes; I had cattle from Ireland previous to that time, and we had no foot and mouth disease, and they had the same sufferings to undergo then as they have now.

5154. And perhaps even rather more, considering that there were then no regulations in force?—Yes, I should think that would be so.

5155. Do you consider the markets the great centres of disease?—Yes.

5156. What would be your remedy against the constant outbreak of foot and mouth disease?—I would not allow any cattle to leave any farm without the farmer signing a declaration that the cattle to be removed were clear of the disease, and that they had not been in contact with any diseased animals for so many days.

5157. Then if they come to the market, what then?—If they came to the markets, and the markets

markets were properly disinfected and cleaned, which they never have been to my knowledge, I have no doubt that the foot and mouth disease would very soon be got rid of without closing any fairs or markets at all.

5158. What I meant was this, would you have any declaration made by the owner of the stock?—By the owner or his agent.

5159. Before he moved the stock to market?—Yes, to any place out of the village.

5160. Would you have one person in every village to give those licenses?—Certainly I would, and I would have a very heavy penalty imposed upon every one who was convicted of making a false declaration.

5161. What do you call a very heavy penalty?—I should say 20*l.* for the first offence, and imprisonment afterwards, and I would allow a certain portion of the fine to be given to the informer on conviction.

5162. Then you do not agree with the recommendation which we have had for the stoppage of the cattle transit during say two months in the year?—No, there would be no occasion to stop it at all if that plan was properly carried out.

5163. How long would you continue those regulations with regard to licenses?—I would continue them until the foot and mouth disease was exterminated, the same as the cattle plague was.

5164. And then upon a future outbreak what would you do?—I would put the restrictions in force at once, that no person should move any cattle from any farm in the United Kingdom without signing a declaration.

5165. Do you imagine that the farmers are so afraid of the disease that they would cheerfully comply with those regulations?—The breeders would.

5166. How would you get on with the jobbers?—Many of the jobbers would do anything; I would make them take out a license the same as horse dealers and auctioneers do; I do not see why they should not do so.

5167. What would you call a jobber?—If a man did not keep stock in his own possession upon his own premises for 14 days, I should call him a jobber.

5168. Would you make him take out a license for the purpose of increasing the revenue, or for the purpose of increasing his respectability?—For the purpose of increasing the respectability of the dealers, and there would likewise be very much less cruelty in driving animals about from one fair to another.

5169. Who, in your opinion, should give those licenses; would you say the magistrates in the immediate vicinity of the residence of the jobber?—I have not considered that point.

5170. I suppose if a man was guilty of gross cruelty to his stock in the way you have stated you would say he should forfeit his license?—Yes, if that was so; that would be an after consideration, but I would have every one who dealt in stock obliged to pay a license; if a man did not keep the stock in his possession on his own premises, or premises hired for 14 days, I should consider him a dealer.

5171. Would you oblige the owner if he jobbed cattle to take out a license?—Yes, I would.

5172. That is to say, anybody who did not keep his stock on a farm, or premises, for 14 days?—Yes.

5173. *Chairman.* We will suppose a man

keeps some stock a good deal more than 14 days, if he also buys and sells in 14 days you would make that man take out a license?—I would, indeed, if the man sold any of them under 14 days.

5174. *Mr. Clerk Read.* What better regulations would you have for the disinfection of fairs and markets?—I would have a very similar process to what the local authorities adopted in the case of the cattle plague; they had all the fields where the cattle had been grazing done over with lime, and the gate posts with chloride of lime, &c., and there has not been an outbreak there since; I am quite certain that it can be done, but it has not always been done; I will instance York if the Committee will allow me; the York market was shut up for a considerable time while the cattle plague was raging in the neighbourhood of Pocklington, and after the first market that was opened at York cattle came into my neighbourhood, and broke out with foot and mouth disease.

5175. You do not think that the shutting up of fairs and markets does any good, unless they are properly disinfected?—It does not do the slightest good. That market, I should say, had been closed two months; the infection was there, and I know of many lots, both of sheep and beasts, which came from York market and broke out with foot and mouth disease; that was the first market after it had been shut up.

5176. Would you have one local authority for a county, or would you allow the borough still to have their own separate authority?—I would make the legislation compulsory. Now there is no compulsion at all; one local authority acts, and another does not, and the large expense which is incurred might as well be thrown away; it does not do the slightest good.

5177. And you would trust to uniformity of action by compulsory legislation rather than have one local authority for a larger district?—Yes. As it is, one local authority acts and another does not; one local authority is trying to stop the disease, and another is allowing it to spread; and it is wasting all the money which is expended over inspection and everything else.

5178. Without wishing to say anything disrespectful of the local authority of the city of York, I should imagine that their great idea was to get a good market; they would not care so much about the health of the cattle as your local authorities in the county would?—That may be so, but I hold the opinion that market inspection is impossible to be carried out fully; it is impossible for the inspectors to detect foot and mouth disease in every case where there are so many cattle going, as in such a market as that of York. For instance, take a lot of beasts from any fold and drive them 20 miles upon the road; having been treading upon the heated manure before they get there, their feet are in such a state and are so tender, that the inspector might think they had foot and mouth disease, and there would be such an immense quantity of beasts to examine; their mouths would have to be looked into, so that it is utterly impossible to inspect them properly; there is not such a thing possible; in fact, we should want the market full of inspectors, and we should want three or four men all over the market to keep catching the beasts to look into their mouths, and that is a very difficult thing to do.

5179. They might convey it from one to the other?—Yes, there are some cattle so to which it

Mr.
R. Fisher.
1 May 1873.

Mr.
R. Fisher.
—
1 May 1873.

is impossible to tell without examining their mouths, whether they have the disease or not; some which apparently have it, have not got it, and you cannot tell without looking into the mouth.

5180. Then you do not place much reliance upon inspection?—Not at all; it rests with the farmers generally, I may almost say as a rule, if the farmers have any fat cattle, the moment that they observe a few attacked with foot and mouth disease they will send for a dealer and he meets them at a fair, and they are sold there; we know that at all fairs or markets now the store and fat cattle are mixed; the railway trucks got infected, and the store cattle are brought to the same market, and perhaps go in the same trucks where the animals have been which have been in contact with those which have been left at home, and after going to the fairs perhaps they break out with the disease.

5181. Would you have a general separation of store and fat markets in the country?—No, there would be no need for that if every farmer had to make a declaration that he did not send any animal which had been in contact with a diseased animal; it is animals which have been in contact which generally spread the infection; people are not so stupid as to send animals which are actually suffering from disease; the dealers, many of them, will risk it; if the farmers dare not do it the dealers will.

5182. With regard to animals coming from Ireland, do you agree with the suggestion of the Central Chamber of Agriculture, that they should be kept for six hours after they are landed in order to be fed and watered, and rested and inspected; do you think that is a good suggestion?—It would be a very good thing for the animals certainly; I do not know that it would prevent the foot and mouth disease, but I think that animals certainly ought to be fed and watered after coming over, before being removed to York or any other place.

5183. Although you do not think it would check the disease, at the same time it would be very agreeable to the animals?—I do not regard it at all as a means of preventing foot and mouth disease.

5184. What do you consider the cause of the dearth of meat at the present time?—The principal cause is the very great loss of animals through these different diseases; there is no question about that.

5185. Do you think the chief reason of the dearth of meat, irrespective of the extra consumption, is the small quantity that is produced in consequence of these diseases?—I feel quite sure of it.

5186. How much do you put down to the extra consumption?—Supposing I had 50 beasts last summer (I had not more than fifty that were fat) which were attacked; they were six weeks before they appeared to be as good as they were when they were attacked with the foot and mouth disease. If the butchers happened to get hold of one of them they told you that if it was a 60-stone beast, it weighed five or six stone less than expected; that the disease had taken the nature out of the meat, so that instead of weighing like a lump of lead, I might say, it will weigh like a parcel of feathers, comparatively; they are very particular in asking, if they come upon your farm, if the beast they are looking at had the disease lately.

5187. That is to say, that frequently a bullock so entirely loses his flesh that he really never entirely recovers that amount of sap that he had before?—No, after about six weeks he will have pretty much the same appearance in bulk that he had previously, but still he has not got the weight; the flesh has lost its nature through having the fever so strongly.

5188. And although he might look almost as well he loses his internal fat, and does not weigh so heavily?—Yes, and the sap from the flesh; the meat is drier, and not so good.

5189. Is that what the butchers tell you, or have you reason to believe that it is so?—I believe it to be quite correct, because the butchers shun those beasts.

5190. Could you, or any other farmer, tell whether a beast had had the disease by the touch after it has recovered?—I could tell myself for some weeks afterwards, having been a very close observer of it for so many years.

5191. How would you ascertain that?—For one thing, there is quite a thickness of appearance in the hair; the hair of the animal, and the skin, does not get that bright appearance; even by the look of it you may tell; the hair is stuck up, and looks dry; it is not sleek, and the teeth will be quite hard.

5192. It would have lost the mellowness of a good fat animal?—Yes; there would be as much difference as between touching a fine-bred short-horn and a rough-bred animal.

5193. One of the causes of dear meat you imagine to be the increased consumption; do you think that that has as much to do with it as the losses from disease?—The increased consumption certainly has a great deal to do with it, but I am of opinion that if proper statistics could be come at, of the loss of animal food in the United Kingdom, it would be something fearful, and it would perfectly astonish many people who have no conception of it at the present time.

5194. It would perfectly astonish honourable Members who represent great manufacturing towns?—I have no doubt they would gladly submit to any restrictions if they could be carried out fairly and properly; I mean that the loss of animal food from different diseases, pneumonia, foot and mouth disease, and the cattle plague, is of minor importance.

5195. But with regard to honourable Members who represent large towns and cities, and who do not happen to possess any cattle; you mean that they would not object to restrictions upon the importation of foreign stock?—Yes, nor the expense of quarantine, &c. If they could only know the actual loss they would not object to paying the expense from the national Exchequer.

5196. Do you, or other farmers, keep less stock in consequence of the fear and dread of disease?—I have not done so, but if I had the losses every year that I have had this last, I should soon be compelled to do so, because I think I shall have lost, at a small calculation, 1,000l. from foot and mouth disease.

5197. Upon what value of animals do you suppose?—Taking sheep, beasts, and calves, I think I have lost about 6 per cent. of calves, and I think I have 80 living now under a year old.

5198. I think you breed pedigree short-horns, do you not?—Yes, I do upon one farm.

5199. And you keep a very superior class of sheep?—Yes, I always let about 100 rams in the year.

5200. Therefore

5200. Therefore your losses would be very much more than upon ordinary stock?—Yes; but I have only taken them as ordinary stock in making my calculation.

5201. What would your stock, if they were ordinary stock, be worth, do you suppose?—The ewes that I lost would be worth 5*l.* each; many of them which were not nearly so large nor so fine as those I lost were sold at sales for 5*l.* each.

5202. That was the market value?—Yes.

5203. As good breeding stock?—Yes, as good breeding stock.

5204. What sort are they?—They are Leicester, or long wools.

5205. But not Lincoln?—They are not exactly pure blood.

5206. Have you had any loss from pleuro-pneumonia at all?—Scarcely any; I may say that I have had some beasts which had the foot and mouth disease three times within six months last year.

5207. What would you do to exterminate pleuro-pneumonia?—I would deal with pleuro-pneumonia in the same way as with cattle plague, with the exception of isolating those which had been in contact instead of killing them.

5208. Of course you would compensate the owner?—Yes, I would compensate him the same as for cattle plague, but I would not kill those which had been in contact; although I have not lost any from pleuro-pneumonia, I have had some attacked with inflammation of the lungs, but not contagious pleuro-pneumonia; but from what I have seen, I believe it to be a very infectious disease, and would treat it as cattle plague, except that I would adopt isolation instead of slaughtering.

5209. You would isolate those which had been in contact, and when they became the subjects of disease, you would slaughter them, giving the owners three-fourths of their value?—Yes; and I would have the person who grants the passes make known to the inspector at once, when there was any disease in the village. I, myself, this winter, had a neighbour who had the foot and mouth disease among his cattle for at least a month before I got to know of it myself, and neighbours were sending their cows to his hill.

5210. You think that the Act which makes it imperative to give notice to the inspector should be extended, so that the neighbours should know of the existence of the disease?—Yes, if there was a person appointed to take the declarations and grant the passes; if a farmer had the disease break out, he should communicate at once to that person, and then he to the inspector. I would allow the inspector to pass all animals which were fat and fit to be killed, if they had been in contact with diseased ones; that is to say, with regard to foot and mouth disease, I would allow them to be removed to a near slaughterhouse to be killed, not to let them stop upon the premises until they had the disease and lost a great deal of their flesh. I may put it in this way: if a farmer had an attack of foot and mouth disease amongst his fat cattle, the inspector immediately comes, and he passes all those which are not actually suffering from the disease, and gives a pass for them to go to be slaughtered at once.

5211. For the purposes of immediate slaughter?—Yes; to save food. It would save an immense deal of food, because those beasts would otherwise have to stop in the field, as many have been

doing, and get the disease. That is such an immense waste of food, that it is quite monstrous; there would be no danger, if they were not suffering from the disease, in taking them to a near slaughterhouse. I would not send them by rail 20 or 30 miles; but I would have them sent to the nearest slaughter-house, whence they could be conveniently removed for food.

5212. Mr. Dodson.] When your beasts get foot and mouth disease, what do you estimate the average loss per animal affected?—It would vary very much according to the value of the animal.

5213. Setting aside your pedigree animals?—It would depend upon whether it was a fat animal or a store animal; upon store animals the loss would not be nearly so much as upon fat animals.

5214. What would you put the loss at upon a fat animal on an average?—I should put it at 1*l.* per stone, at least, upon a fat one.

5215. And upon store animals?—Upon store animals it is the after effects which they suffer most from; if they have the disease very badly it often leaves a something. There are a good many of them that fall off in inflammation of the lungs, and the liver is very often diseased as well.

5216. If an animal gets affected with foot and mouth disease, should you say that you stand to lose 1*l.* or 2*l.* by it?—Yes; more upon a fat beast of from 60 to 70 stone, I should put the loss at 1*l.* per stone.

5217. And amongst cows?—In cows it is fearful; I only had eight cows diseased at each time, and they took up about the time of two men to keep them anything like right; the skin came all off the teats; the udders were swollen, and the men had to keep attending to them to draw them, to keep them from losing the whole udder; but they frequently do lose either one teat or perhaps more, and the disease is very often dangerous to the animal itself, although I did not ever lose one from the foot and mouth disease, except from the after effects of it.

5218. But the udder is sometimes permanently injured, is it not?—Very often so.

5219. Could you estimate your loss in milk upon the average?—The milk is destroyed for a long time when the animals have the disease badly.

5220. Could you give us the average of what you lost in milk, by having a cow affected with foot and mouth disease?—People who sell milk would lose a very great deal. I boiled some of mine and gave it to the calves, and the young calves, those which were under three months old, took the disease and died.

5221. Could not you give us the average of what your loss in value of milk is?—If a cow gives you a gallon of milk, or a gallon and a half, it would be all lost for a considerable time.

5222. In fact, statistics with reference to the loss inflicted by foot and mouth disease, and diseases which are not fatal, cannot be got at?—They cannot be got at, unless the farmers would honestly and fairly give them, the same as you rely upon the farmers giving the statistics with regard to the number of acres of corn. They can give the number of cattle they have, and all that sort of thing.

5223. In the case of loss from disease it can only be an estimate?—If all the farmers were asked to make returns of their yearly loss from these

Mr.
R. Fisher.

1 May 1873.

Mr.
H. Fisher.
1 May 1873.

those diseases, and were to do it honestly, it would be come at them.

5234. Have you had sheep-pox among your sheep?—No, I do not know of it at all.

5235. Have any of your neighbours had sheep pox?—No, I do not think so; I may just say that when the cattle have the disease a second and third time, they appear to have it worse than the first time. I had one that was all swollen in the head, and some of them we had to feed with gruel for some days, or they would have been lost.

5236. You stated that you had had animals which had taken foot and mouth disease three times over in six months?—Yes, in six months, between Christmas and Midsummer last.

5237. Have you ever known that to happen before?—Never before.

5238. Had you ever known an animal to have the disease twice over before last year?—Never before.

5239. Chairman.] Where is your farm?—At Leosfield, near Beverley; Beverley is nine miles from Hull.

5240. I suppose if there was an entire stoppage of foreign importation, you would not expect that by that alone you would get rid of foot and mouth disease?—It would be impossible.

5241. In fact, it would be of little use unless you had strong measures for the stoppage of the disease at home?—Certainly not.

5242. I understand your recommendation relies upon a license for the movement of every animal?—Yes, upon a declaration such as, "I declare that these cattle that I wish to remove to So-and-so are clear of any infectious disease, and have not been in contact with animals diseased for so long a time."

5243. You remember the regulations with regard to movement at the time of the cattle plague?—I recollect them perfectly well; I was upon the committee at the time with the magistrates.

5244. When you had the same regulation in force?—Yes, except with regard to the granting of passes.

5245. What change would you make in the granting of passes?—I would have one person appointed in every parish, and I would pay him.

5246. What sort of a person would you have?—I would have a respectable man; it would rest upon the farmers more than upon the man, because you hear what they have to say and then you grant the pass.

5247. But you would allow no pass to be granted for an animal which had the foot and mouth disease?—Decidedly not.

5248. The man who grants the pass should be able to tell the disease, I suppose?—No, it should rest with the farmers, and if a man was found out to have made a false declaration, which, I think, he would be very careful about doing, I would fine him, and if he did so twice I would imprison him.

5249. Your reliance would be, that the farmer would be too much frightened at having to pay the fine to attempt to pass an animal which was not healthy?—Yes, because all his neighbours would have their eyes upon him; and I would actually go further, as I said before, and give the informer, upon conviction of any farmer who had broken the restrictions, some part of the fine.

5250. You would give the informer part of the fine upon its being found out that the animal had

been diseased?—Yes; if the farmer made a false declaration.

5251. Have you ever considered that there might be a difficulty in proving that the animal was diseased at the time it was removed?—There might certainly be a little difficulty about it, but there would not be a very great deal.

5252. You rely upon this check upon movement, much more than upon the stoppage of the fairs?—Yes, and more than upon inspection; that is no use in the world. I told you of the case where the York market was stopped.

5253. But you would not stop the fairs?—No, certainly not.

5254. Now with regard to compensation; in the cases of cattle plague and pleuro-pneumonia you would compensate to the extent of three-fourths of the value of the animals which had been affected, and the whole value of the animal which was herded with it?—Yes.

5255. Take cattle plague, for instance; supposing one of your animals caught the cattle plague, do you think that animal would be worth anything approaching to what it was before it caught the disease?—No, it would not be worth so much, certainly.

5256. Therefore, do you think it would be quite reasonable that you should have three-fourths of the value of the animal given to you?—Yes, I do think so when the disease has been brought to me when I had no business to have it at all; where the animal has been brought in for the good of the nation at large.

5257. You base your belief that you ought to have the value of the animal previously to its being affected upon the fact of the cattle plague being brought in from somewhere else?—Yes.

5258. You admit that if one of your beasts caught the cattle-plague, which was worth 50l. previously to becoming affected, it would not be worth 15l. after it had caught the disease?—I should not think it worth 1s., because the skin and all would have to be buried altogether.

5259. Do not you think that the animal which was alongside of a diseased animal, would be worth a good deal less, seeing its danger of catching the disease would be so great?—Of course it would; upon one farm I had an attack of a single beast with the cattle-plague amongst my largest herd of shorthorns, but having had it before, and paying close attention to my animals, I noticed in that animal two days before an inspector told me it was cattle-plague; I took the animal off from the rest, and had it two days isolated before it was known to be the cattle-plague; I saw the very first symptoms of the disease; that was when it rose stretching down the back.

5260. To go back to your remedy for the foot and mouth disease, would you not be afraid that the jobbers would throw great difficulties in the way of working it?—No, I do not think the jobbers would do that; there would be some of us very glad to have the remedy in force.

5261. I understood you to say that you relied upon the farmers themselves not attempting to move any animal which had the disease?—Yes.

5262. Have you the same reliance upon the jobbers?—The farmers durst not sell them to the jobbers, because they could not go away from the village without that declaration being made.

5263. Would you have the same reliance upon that very large class who are partly farmers and partly jobbers?—Decidedly; it would have quite

the same effect; I would not have cattle removed from one fair to another, without a declaration being made, before they were shown in the next fair, that they were clear of disease.

5254. You have got less disease now than you had in the beginning of the year; it is going down, is it not?—Yes.

5255. Now supposing the same thing was to happen as has happened several times before, that the disease was to be very much diminished, do you think that the farmers would quietly put up with these restrictions if they were ordered at a time when the disease was not very prevalent?—I am quite certain that a great many of the farmers who are breeding would, and those are the people who ought, I think, to be protected, both for themselves and for the good of the country; I would just add that I am afraid that when stock comes to be passed about, the disease would re-appear; I heard the other day of a lot of beasts which came from the Leicester market, which are down now with the disease, and I fear that that would be the result generally.

5256. Mr. Kewenagh.] You stated that after a farmer had had the foot and mouth disease upon his farm, it would be a long time before he could introduce any fresh stock; how long do you think it would be before it was safe to do so?—It would very much depend upon the nature of the stock which he bought; if it was store stock he would run the risk of it for so long a time.

5257. But how long do you think a farm is infected after an attack of the disease?—It would be infected a long time; the farmer would not get the beasts into the same field; he would keep that field clear in which there had been cases of disease, until there had been a good deal of rain.

5258. What do you call a long time?—I should explain that there is a very great amount of saliva, which comes from the animals when they have the foot and mouth disease, left all over the field, and if there came a very heavy rain, I think that that would take away the infection in a very short time; but it would depend very much upon the weather with reference to the time of the infection lasting in the field.

5259. You stated that all foreign store stock ought to be quarantined, do you include in that Irish stock?—No, by no means. I would have Irish stock treated similarly to our own stock with regard to restrictions. The Irish stock is a very great assistance to English farmers; we could not do without the Irish cattle on any account; they are very good cattle, and there is an immense deal of them.

5260. You would not like the Irish trade to

be put a stop to altogether?—No, by no means; we should suffer a great deal.

5261. Mr. Conely.] You would have the same restrictions upon moving cattle in Ireland, as we have upon moving cattle in England?—Just the same.

5262. You do not want cattle to come from Ireland to England affected with foot and mouth disease?—No; and we do not want the vessels to be infected that bring them.

5263. Nor the railway trucks in Ireland?—No.

5264. Mr. Dodson.] And you do not want quarantine?—No; I might say that the animals might be fed and watered for a short time when they come over, before they are put upon the rail; I think that is necessary. Some people have urged the watering of cattle during the transit by rail, but I do not think that that is necessary; I think they would take no harm in 24 hours.

5265. Mr. Kewenagh.] Do you think that watering animals when they are upon a long journey, does not make them liable to scour?—I do not think so; it cools them, I think.

5266. Mr. Bareslay.] Does not the great risk of disease discourage the keeping of high bred stock?—In a very great measure, I think it does amongst farmers.

5267. Is the risk of loss from disease greater in a high bred expensive breeding stock than in store or fattening stock?—No, I believe the better they are, bred the better constitutions they have.

5268. But if the disease gets into a herd, is the loss greater to a farmer who keeps breeding stock than to a farmer who keeps fattening stock?—Yes, so far as they have cost him a great deal more in rearing; the expense of keeping bulls and all that sort of thing is much larger.

5269. The salvage upon a high bred stock is only in very small proportion to its value; it is much smaller in high bred stock than in fattening stock?—Yes.

5270. Therefore the loss is far greater if the disease gets into a breeding stock than simply into a fattening stock?—Yes, because the farmer who takes up short horns breeding in a district where there are no gentlemen breeding, is dispersing his bulls amongst the farmers and doing a great deal of good, and he is keeping them up at a great expense.

5271. If disease should unfortunately come into his herd his loss would be far greater than if he had kept simply a fattening stock, would it not?—Yes, much greater.

Mr.
R. Fisher.
May 1873.

Monday, 5th May 1873.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mr. William Edward Forster.
Mr. James Beresley.
Mr. Jacob Bright.
Mr. Clay.
Mr. Dent.
Mr. Dobson.
Mr. William Johnston.

Mr. Kavanagh.
Mr. Mossell.
Mr. O'Connor.
Mr. Clare Read.
Mr. Ridley.
Sir Henry Solwin-Ibbetson.

THE RIGHT HONOURABLE WILLIAM EDWARD FORSTER, IN THE CHAIR.

Professor HUGH FERGUSON, re-called; and further Examined.

Professor
Ferguson.

5 May 1873.

5272. Mr. *Clare Read*.] YOU are Director General of the Veterinary Department in Ireland?—I am.

5273. Have you a secretary in that department?—There is no allowance for one by the Treasury.

5274. Have you a chief inspector at the office?—Yes; I have of late occasionally had one, but I am only permitted to employ him as urgent occasion may require.

5275. Have you a permanent officer whose whole time and attention are devoted to your department?—No, I have not Treasury permission for that.

5276. Are you ever called away yourself for the purposes of inspection in Dublin, or any place in the immediate neighbourhood?—I do not go unless something very extraordinary occurs; I generally send a person; it would be impossible for me, excepting under very extraordinary circumstances, to leave the office duties even for a day.

5277. Will you kindly repeat how many hands, all told, you have in your office?—At present there are five clerks in the office, and a veterinary surgeon whose time, as I have stated, is partially devoted to it; I am authorised only to have him occasionally. There are five clerks at present engaged, but the Treasury wanted to reduce the number to two, but now after a great deal of difficulty they have allowed me one extra: I, however, keep on the five, two at my own risk of expense.

5278. So that you are at present only paid for three clerks?—I am only paid at present for three clerks.

5279. You gave the Committee on the last occasion, a return of how many papers went through the office in the year 1872, namely, 55,785, and you stated that those papers required to be registered, and most of them to be noted as well as registered?—Yes.

5280. Does that number include letters?—Yes.

5281. How many of those 55,000 papers would be letters, do you suppose?—The letters received were 926; these are letters which are not from

the constabulary; those reports which I receive from the constabulary I do not put down as letters; the constabulary reports relative to the outbreaks of disease, were 13,672; one report may allude to many outbreaks. Then there are weekly returns. The stock is taken upon each farm at the termination of the week, it is checked over and the return sent up with my observations which the constabulary may deem necessary to make upon them. The number of these returns were 9,279 last year; and then there were declarations received which only require registry, unless there was a mistake or some informality in them, and then they were sent back; the number of these was 1,243. The applications for the reports of the removal of restrictions were 5,583. Then there is a thing which only requires registering, that is to say, the applications for farms, &c., from constabulary stations in the provinces; they only require short registry; the number of these were 1,745. Then the number of licenses which were returned to the department, in consequence of some informality for further instructions, were 153. Then we received 294 magistrates' notices sent up for further instructions. Then there were general letters and other documents registered and replied to to the number of 926. Then this is a formidable item, "Constabulary reports upon the outbreaks of disease." These reports have not alone to be registered, but a minute of instructions has to be written upon each, and then they are returned to the constabulary to carry out those instructions; the number of these were 13,072. Then there are weekly reports which were returned to the constabulary for correction and explanation; the number of these were 2,302; declarations made before magistrates returned for the same purpose amounted to 245; and we have returned reports relative to the removal of restrictions from different farms, lands, premises or places, which reports come up from the constabulary when restrictions are about to be removed in consequence of the disease having disappeared, which amounted to 5,583. Now is another item which only requires registry; there is no trouble whatever about this item, and the

is the receipts from the constabulary for stores, stationery, &c., sent to them; we are obliged to produce those receipts; they have to be registered and placed at the disposal of the Stationery Office or of the clerk at the Chief Secretary's Office who deals with the stationery; they amount to 1,745; but they are not much trouble. The number of licences returned to the constabulary for correction and explanation is only 20, and there were 25 magistrates' notices returned for some informality.

5282. You, yourself, and five clerks do all that amount of correspondence without the aid of a secretary?—Yes; the permanent staff allowed me is only three clerks. Since the Treasury have undertaken to pay for the conducting of the office duties of the department, and have consented that the money for all expenses should not be levied on Ireland alone by taxation, something like the local rates, there is a very great difference in the authorization as to expenditure. To recur to the papers dealt with in the office. There are applications which are sent out, those already referred to are merely such as I receive; may I be permitted to add that the return speaks of "general letters and other documents;" with regard to parcels, when sending them out to each police district or local authority, instead of putting down the circulars and such papers in the return, we have not taken them into account, for each parcel contains the letters and declarations as well as the Council Orders, forms, or circulars required, as the case may be; but were each individual paper recorded as a separate document they would amount in that item to upwards of 60,000; but then in the return given they do not so amount, because one envelope will carry away a great number of such papers, perhaps all that are required for one entire county.

5283. Do I understand you that if you had two more clerks you would be satisfied?—I do not think I could, because the average hours which my clerks work are 10, 12 or 14, and sometimes 16, Sundays included, and not very unfrequently all night; there is no such thing as a holiday in the office, for it is carried on completely on the police system.

5284. Will you explain to us English members what you said with regard to certain expenses being levied under local taxation?—When the office on which was founded what is called at present the Veterinary Department (it was always called the Veterinary Department, but now it is a department re-organised by the Treasury) was brought into operation, and the Bill of 1866 had passed, provision was made in that Bill for the levying of a rate in aid for the purpose of defraying all the expenses of carrying the Act into operation.

5285. Was that rate levied in different counties in proportion to their loss, or what?—No, not at all; it was levied in a certain sum; I think it was a sixth or half a farthing in the pound which was levied upon what we call the poor rate valuation of the whole country. I was appointed immediately upon the passing of that Act to undertake the management and superintendence of the Irish Veterinary Department under that Act, upon the distinct understanding that the salary was to be at the rate of three guineas per diem, Sundays included, for the office is not closed on Sundays; and there was a warrant appointing me, which did not require the Treasury sanction. It was signed by Lord Wodehouse, now Earl of

Kimberley, who was then the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland; when we had succeeded in stamping the cattle plague out of Ireland, and you had succeeded in England in attaining the same result in Great Britain, Lord Mayo, in fact, the Government, determined to return the surplus of the money which had been collected, and then the Irish Department stopped as far as paying me any salary, although I still worked on.

5286. Do you mean they determined to return the surplus to the different counties?—To return it to the different Poor Law Unions, in proportion to the amount which had been levied upon them. That is what is done.

5287. So that, in fact, the whole cost of your Veterinary Department is now discharged from Imperial sources?—Yes, that is so as regards the mere office work, but not as regards the outer work.

5288. What is paid by the rate?—There has been nothing levied under this rate at all since the return of the surplus moneys of the Cattle Plague Accounts.

5289. In the case of an outbreak of cattle plague, there would be a rate in aid levied?—Yes, there would be a rate in aid levied at once, at least I suppose so.

5290. For compensation?—Yes, and unless the Government come to some arrangement, of which I have had no intimation, or unless they come to some different decision, the cost of all inspectors, and all operations outside the mere office, irrespective of cattle plague, must be defrayed by the country by a rate in aid, which is by no means relished in Ireland.

5291. But which at present have not been defrayed from that source?—No; since 1866 the Treasury have advanced the Irish Government some sums of money from time to time, to be recouped when the rate in aid will have been again levied.

5292. Do you in these papers which you have handed in, or are about to hand in, give the Committee any statement of the expenses of your office?—I can give it you, independently of my own salary.

5293. We have not heard at present what your salary is?—Since the Treasury has undertaken the payment of it, they have reduced it from very nearly 1,200*l.* a year to 750*l.*; although the work is upwards of twenty times as much, and my time is fully occupied by it, I am obliged to devote a great deal of my time to it, I may almost say the whole of it.

5294. Is the whole of your time entirely devoted to this purpose?—I have not pledged it, but I gave up the whole of it practically; I gave up the whole of my cattle practice, and my visiting practice, which was a most lucrative one; the only thing I now do is, that if a person asks my opinion relative to an animal, say a horse, for example, I occasionally give it, if brought, but not otherwise; I have relinquished my cattle and visiting practice, and I have relinquished being a teacher and a lecturer; but the salary allowed by the Treasury is insufficient to enable me to continue doing so.

5295. Then I suppose that almost all your time is devoted to this department; you have no time to spare?—I give almost double the ordinary official time to it, because I work almost solely at it from seven or eight in the morning until ten or eleven or even twelve at night.

E x

Professor
Ferguson.
5 May 1873.

Professor
Ferguson.

5 May 1873.

night, even on Sundays. I took but two holidays, and those only in parts, in seven years.

5296. You have given the Committee the amount of your present salary; how long have you received the reduced salary from the Treasury?—For a couple of years I got nothing; the reduced salary dates from July 1871.

5297. Mr. Dodson.] Do you mean to say that for two years you gave your services gratuitously?—Yes; as I organised the department, and it succeeded, and as I wished the system thoroughly tested, I still attended to it regularly.

5298. During what years was that?—That was in 1867 and 1868, and if my memory serves me rightly, the Treasury did not recoup me further back than from late in 1869, but on this point, as to dates, I am uncertain.

5299. Mr. Clere Read.] Will you be kind enough to furnish the Committee with the other items of expenditure, showing us what your office has cost the country in the last two years?—Commencing with my present salary, which is 750 l., the senior clerk gets, including extra pay for extra hours' work, 114 l. 2 s. 10 d.; then there are two clerks, one at 102 l. 6 s. 9 d., the other at 90 l. 0 s. 6 d., in the year, and the incidental expenses may be calculated at 200 l. a year.

5300. What do the incidental expenses include?—They include travelling, fuel, lights, and a great number of other things.

5301. What would be the total amount?—£ 1,446. 10 s. 5 d., or thereabouts; I may be a shilling or a pound out.

5302. It is under 1,500 l. a year then?—Yes, decidedly it is; that is exclusive of rent and veterinary assistance, for the latter of which I can expend 1 l. 1 s. in case of emergency, but do not do so; I am not allowed to incur more annual expense for everything than 1,982 l. 19 s., and the office does not cost that much. Here is an account of all items. I must tell you that the office is a large house and premises, which were placed at the service of the Veterinary Department. At first, all the Treasury would allow me for a person to reside in the house, keep the fires, clean up offices, and do everything else, was 7 s. a week; I could not get anybody for that, and I put in a servant of my own, for which I have never been repaid; they have now consented to allow me 31 l. 4 s. per annum. They also allowed me a messenger at 17 s. a week, and a boy at 14 s. 6 d.; now they have taken the man messenger away, I suppose because I did not charge for him, and they want to allow me only a boy messenger, which would be perfectly useless as a final arrangement, as no boy would be able for the work, which is sometimes severe, and while one messenger is out, there must be some one remaining in charge.

5303. There is no rent for the house, I presume?—I should have mentioned that the rent and taxes of the house and quarantine yard all come to about 150 l. a year.

5304. Including the quarantine yard?—Yes; that is exactly the rental and taxes that are paid for them.

5305. How many more clerks would you like?—With the five clerks I could manage with a great push at overwork; working in the same way as I have described, I could keep the thing going, because I do not think I am a fraction in arrears up to to-day, but if there were any changes made and more inspectors were required, I should require certainly a greater number of

clerks. Taking the ordinary office hours, if I were to go into the office at 10 o'clock, and leave at 5, and also allow the other men to go away at five, I should say it would require from 14 to 15 clerks, but the men that I have in the office at present, being members of the police force, it is a desideratum with them to be kept one-hour, inasmuch as they are certain of a title of extra pay; they get a certain extra hour pay, as they call it.

5306. I am asking you with reference to the number that you actually require now at the present moment; do you mean that you would require 14 or 15 more clerks?—Not altogether. At the present moment, in order to conduct the office properly, and not to overtax the men by working them over-hours, I should think 13 clerks at least would be required, because there is a branch of the department which is now working very energetically and has been so for the last three weeks or a month, that is, with the disinfection of railroad tracks and carriages and vessels, which will require a considerably larger staff in the office, inasmuch as we get a return of every vessel which leaves Ireland, what it takes away and what it brings back, and as regards all the railroads, and the disinfection and the number of cattle they take.

5307. Who looks after this disinfection; have you an inspector?—No, the constabulary look after it, because as regards the disinfection it does not require professional men to supervise it; there are a certain number of constabulary, and a certain number of the Dublin Metropolitan Police told off at each of the ports in Ireland, and their business is now to see that a vessel is properly disinfected and cleaned previously to its starting with animals.

5308. How long has that order been in force?—It has not been above a month in force, and it has commenced to operate pretty well. I received a communication with regard to that to-day. I ordered some prosecutions against the Dundalk Railroad Company for having their vessels filthy, and we were successful in those prosecutions and obtained convictions in each case with the result of a nominal fine of 1 s.

5309. It was a nominal fine just to show that they must keep the vessels clean in future or else that they would be subject to a heavier fine?—I hope so.

5310. You do not imagine that that is going to be the usual fine?—I have found it the usual fine in that locality; there are a great number of magistrates sitting at petty sessions who are very much interested in the pecuniary welfare of Steam Packet Companies.

5311. Mr. Dodson.] Have you prosecuted the Steam Packet Company before?—No, those are the first cases which have been prosecuted.

5312. When you spoke of having found similar fines imposed in that district before, you were not speaking of the Steam Packet Company?—I was not; I was speaking of other breaches of the Council Orders, such as shipping cattle in contravention of the Council Orders, and not reporting the existence of disease.

5313. Mr. Clere Read.] Have you ever made application to the Irish Government in consequence of the magistrates inflicting these nominal penalties?—Frequently so.

5314. What was the nature of those communications?—The nature of those communications was something similar to this, that I considered

the Council Orders and the law to be a dead letter unless proper fines were inflicted; and I am aware that the Government, upon several occasions, have written, remonstrating with the magistrates.

5315. When were these remonstrances made; was it lately, or some months ago?—That has been done, I should say, within the last three or four months. Although there are, generally speaking, resident magistrates attending, I wrote to the Government requesting their attendance in all such cases, but a resident magistrate has but a single voice on the bench, and he is, in the majority of such cases, overruled.

5316. Mr. Deat.] Can a stipendiary magistrate in Ireland attend any petty sessional bench at any time?—He has a right to attend anywhere within his district.

5317. Mr. Clerk Read.] Does he ever sit alone?—Not in such cases; the Government do not deem it desirable that he should do so; they are peculiar in Ireland, and it is deemed a very arbitrary proceeding to try a person merely by a stipendiary magistrate. In Dublin everything goes on very satisfactorily, because they have there what are called divisional magistrates.

5318. What is the expense to the local authorities of putting this Act and these Orders in force in Ireland?—I do not know what the expense may be; but it is not upon any particular local authority that the expense would come; the expense comes upon the county generally.

5319. How are those veterinary surgeons paid whom you are obliged to call in in cases of disease?—They must be paid out of the Cattle Plague Account, but at present, although there is a recent Act of Parliament to enable the Government in Ireland to re-tax and make a collection, that has not been as yet done. It is desirable, if possible, to avoid it.

5320. I suppose it is so extremely small that it is not worth while doing it?—That is what is thought; but if things were done properly, it might perhaps be worth doing. I think there is a desire, if possible, to refrain from levying this tax except in a case of very great emergency. The people, as a nation, are really very poor in Ireland, and it would cause a great deal of dissatisfaction.

5321. I should say that in England the working of the Act by the local authority costs at least 30,000 £ a year; you have no idea whether the expenses of your Act approach 5,000 £?—The expenses have hardly approached 2,000 £, and I do not suppose that since the Cattle Plague Account was closed in 1866, and the surplus moneys refunded to the Poor Law Unions, I have spent anything like 3,000 £, i.e., irrespective of my own salary.

5322. Are all your Government offices conducted upon the same economical scale in Ireland?—I tell you candidly it is generally believed that there is an attempt to make them as economical, that is, as low as possible.

5323. Working as you do through the central authority, it appears that your Act is very much more cheaply administered than ours, and you think more efficiently too?—I do most decidedly, but we have got a great advantage, as I stated on Thursday last, in having such a constabulary; such machinery.

5324. In England the rural police are always employed for the purpose of carrying out the Act, but I suppose you have a superior class of

men?—I do not say that is so with respect to the men. If there be any failure in England, I attribute it to the working of the Act being left too much to the discretion of the local authorities. In Great Britain you may have one local authority, who will push matters to extremes, and the very next situated local authority may set the Act completely on one side.

5325. There being county authorities and borough authorities, you apprehend that that is a bad thing for carrying out this Act?—I should fancy so, but I have had no practical experience. I am speaking only from what I read, and what I conclude. The failure is from the defective nature of the police system in Great Britain.

5326. Is it true that cattle are ill-treated during the process of shipment at the Irish ports?—Most decidedly, but not so much so as they were.

5327. Have you made any report to the Government upon that subject?—Yes, and the Government have sent circulars round, still it is a very difficult thing to deal with. Were I to present myself at any port in Ireland to watch the shipment of cattle, you would see them treated with the greatest kindness, and then my back would scarcely be turned before you would hear the whistles off their ribs and their horns, with the ash or other sticks, many like bludgeons. Some time ago the Dublin Metropolitan Police were called upon for a report, and they gave a most favourable one. I happened to be down with the police when they were inspecting, but on the very day following that upon which the report went in to my office a man got two months for knocking the eye out of a cow upon the gangway of the steamer "Countess of Dublin," at the North Wall. Those cattle drivers are not a very humane race of people.

5328. You think that these barbarities are not so common as they were three months ago?—They are not nearly so common as they were a year ago.

5329. Do you attribute that to the orders of Government?—I do, to the orders of Government, and to the fact that the police have done a vast deal since it has been required that there should be a certain number of constables present at the embarkation of cattle, for the purpose of seeing that the vessels are in a proper state. I think the presence of the constabulary and police will have the effect of preventing the barbarous treatment which was so common.

5330. To whom do the Government address those circulars?—The way in which that is done is, that the original official circular is sent to the Inspector General of the Constabulary, and he sends it round to the different constabulary stations concerned; it is not to the public that these circulars are addressed, because it is to be presumed that every person knows sufficiently well that it is illegal to ill-treat an animal, and that he is liable to punishment for doing so.

5331. Could you furnish the Committee with a copy of that circular?—I have not one with me; I did not anticipate being asked for it, but I could procure it. I shall put in some Papers relative to the matter; my own report to the Government on the subject.—(Fide Appendix.)

5332. You say that in consequence of the issue of that circular there has not been so much cruelty as there was?—Yes.

5333. Has anyone been prosecuted for cruelty?—Yes, we have prosecuted for it.

Professor
Ferguson.

5 May 1873

5334. For instance, you told the Committee just now of one man who beat out a bullock's eye?—But it was not the Government who persecuted; it was the Humane Society, or a private person; but to tell the truth, I do not think that you are much better off on this side the Channel than we are upon the other; I went down on Saturday last, to see one of your markets, and everything within the market was perfect, but I certainly saw a vast deal of what I considered cruelty, in the way of beating animals, in getting them up out of the hold of a vessel at Deptford, on Saturday last.

5335. Who had the management of those cattle which came to Deptford; were they drovers?—No, it was the people on board the vessel; people who seemed to be connected solely with her and with the landing; the people all about the place, who I imagined were connected with the market, were really kind, considerate, and humane to the cattle, but as far as regards the sailors, and those people who were getting them out of the holds of the vessel, they certainly did make their sticks resound off the animals' backs in a most barbarous manner.

5336. You think that the cattle, as a rule, when they are shipped or when they are unloaded, receive a good deal of punishment?—Yes, I think they receive a good deal more than in the generality of instances is absolutely necessary, but the infliction of a certain amount of suffering or the use of force, as a general rule, is necessary with wild cattle; there are some of them very stubborn. In Liverpool some of the persons there who are agents for the receipt of cattle, manage it much better; instead of the ordinary heavy sticks, they have got little things like prickles; a very short spike at the end of a stick; you just touch the animal gently with the point, and he flies from it as from a pin prod.

5337. The Irish cattle are specially wild, are they not, as a rule?—I think they are more so than the English cattle, and decidedly a great deal more so than the foreign cattle, but I do not know much about foreign cattle, except the Spanish and Portuguese cattle.

5338. Those coming from Spain and Portugal are particularly docile, are they not?—They are generally as gentle as dogs; almost every one of them will lead.

5339. I suppose this treatment which they receive, in the way of beating them across the ribs with a thick ash stick, is very detrimental to the meat as well as cruel to the animal?—Every heavy blow which they get across the ribs causes an effusion of blood just the same as though a person got a blow upon the head or upon the arm, and it takes some time for that effusion of blood to be absorbed, and the flesh to be restored to its pristine state; that is the chief reason why the Irish fat cattle in the English markets have got a depreciated character in comparison to English-fed animals.

5340. [Chairman.] But that makes them more careful with regard to fat cattle than with regard to store cattle, I suppose?—Yes; they are generally more careful with fat cattle, but still, for all that, unless a man's own drover goes with the cattle as a bullock-man, they are treated badly in transit. It is not the drovers themselves, but it is the people on the quays who are employed in loading the vessels who ill-treat them most. You will see 8 or 10, or may be 20 persons, assisting in the embarkation of cattle; those

cattle arrive only 10 or 12 minutes before the vessel is about to start; the port is a tidal one; time is an object; and then they desire to load those cattle as quickly as possible, and if a bullock or any animal steps upon the gangway he is belaboured generally by those fellows who assist in the embarkation.

5341. Mr. *Clare Reed*.] But you are quite satisfied that this cruelty is diminishing?—I am confident of that, not alone from my own personal observation, but from what I hear officially.

5342. Why do some of the Irish store cattle come in such a wretchedly starved condition; I suppose it must be in consequence of the bad feeding of them at home; it cannot arise from the want of feeding in transit?—I hey are originally badly reared and badly fed. In Ireland a little farmer rears an animal; or it may be that he is a farm servant, or a country person who has saved a few pounds, and he and a few other people join together, and they go to a country fair and purchase animals which have not been half fed, often even before they are quite weaned. Then they put those animals, it may be, upon a mountain farm, and the object is to keep life in them until they have attained a certain age; then they are brought into the fairs and sold. They are collected up by another class of men, who feed them for sale and then sell them; but you get some animals back to England which we receive in Ireland as calves from England. It appears to me that that trade has been greatly under-estimated; we get an immense number of calves from England.

5343. Where do they come from?—They come from Bristol, and a great number from Liverpool. They are not all veal calves, but calves to be reared.

5344. Do you suppose that they come from the Cheshire and Wiltshire dairies?—With regard to the surplus calves here, generally speaking, we consider in Ireland that you have got a very good breed of dairy cattle, and we desire the best calves for breeding purposes.

5345. What counties do they go to; are they landed in Dublin?—They go to the County Dublin. There are a great many calves exposed in the Dublin market. Sometimes they are brought to go to the port of Dublin, and are then brought into the County Meath. The last importation that we had of foot and mouth disease was in consequence of an import of calves, which were brought over, I think it was, from Bristol. They were landed in Dublin, and brought to a fair in Meath, at Castle Pollard. They unfortunately had the foot and mouth disease, and disseminated it all over the country, and we have never been free since, or anything like it.

5346. You attribute your recent outbreak of foot and mouth complaint to the importation of those calves from Bristol, do you not?—Certainly I do. It was in the month of April or May 1871, just about the time when I pronounced, as far as I could ascertain, the country to be free from foot and mouth disease. I do not say that it was quite free, but I could not ascertain any cases of it; and two persons whom I knew had been extremely desirous of ascertaining that there was disease there, with the view of being appointed inspectors for its suppression.

5347. About the end of May 1871, you think that Ireland was almost, if not entirely, free from foot and mouth disease?—Yes; it is the only time I have remembered it so since 1839.

5348. To

5348. To what do you attribute its suppression?—To the energy with which we acted. I think that in the majority of cases, as a general rule, where foot and mouth disease is brought by infection or contagion into a locality, if the parties who direct matters make the proper inquiries you are generally able to obtain information as to where the animals go, and if the outbreak occurs in Ireland in a northern county, a manufacturing not a cattle-grazing district, say about Belfast, for example, it is very easily suppressed; I do not believe in the spontaneous generation of anything. I say that because honourable Members might fancy, from an observation which I made on Thursday, that I wished to impress their minds with the idea that the disease might spontaneously arise; I do not believe it can, or that any disease can spontaneously arise, but it is conveyed or caused to occur in ways which we certainly cannot discover.

5349. I understood you on Thursday last to say that you considered that there were some cases of spontaneous pleuro-pneumonia in Ireland—I am now speaking of foot and mouth disease; I firmly believe that pleuro-pneumonia frequently arises in Ireland in some way in which we cannot possibly trace the source of the contagion or infection, but then there is one fact greatly in favour of the theory of these diseases being almost invariably propagated by infection or contagion, and that is that if we look at the map we find that the course of the disease is always in the way of the cattle traffic.

5350. So that, although there may be some instances in which you cannot trace the contagion, you still believe that it does not arise from spontaneous generation?—I think that in the majority of instances, if I were obliged to give an opinion one way or the other, I should be obliged to confess that the evidence is in favour decidedly of the contagious and infectious principle of the dissemination of the disease.

5351. That is to say, with regard to pleuro-pneumonia, foot and mouth disease, cattle plague, sheep-pox, and glanders?—No, decidedly not glanders; glanders is a disease to which I have devoted a vast deal of my attention throughout my life and for one case of glanders in Ireland, which is the result of infection or contagion, my firm opinion is that there are a thousand cases in which it arises idiopathically from bad ventilation and other ill-treatment. If you put 50 or 100 horses down in the hold of a sailing vessel, and from stress of weather you are obliged to bathe the hold down, allowing but little for ventilation, for three or four weeks, there is not the slightest doubt but that glanders and farcy will break out amongst the animals if they survive.

5352. Can you cure glanders?—Some cases have recovered by themselves; but I know of no reliable remedy for it. Glanders and farcy are perfectly identical; glanders is no other than farcy inside the nose, but farcy is more upon the surface, and by giving the animal some tonic, and burning well the farcy buttons or sores, the disease may seem to disappear, but in 99 cases out of 100 the disease comes back again, sooner or later.

5353. I gather that you consider farcy almost as incurable as glanders?—Not quite so much, because it is more localised; it is more upon the surface; the poison is exactly the same; you can produce glanders by inoculating with the morbid matter of a farcy button; and you can produce

a farcy button and farcy cords by inoculating with the discharge from a glandered horse's nose.

5354. We have it in evidence, as a recommendation from one witness in extensive practice, that all glandered horses should be killed; would you coincide with that?—Decidedly I should, because it is a most dangerous affection even to human beings.

5355. Would you say the same with regard to farcy, too?—I would not allow horses affected with farcy to be moved; I would have them slaughtered unless they were under very extraordinary restrictions, unless there was a certainty of their being kept isolated.

5356. I understood you to state that you do not think cattle plague, sheep-pox, pleuro-pneumonia, and foot and mouth disease arise spontaneously?—I will not say that none of these diseases ever do arise spontaneously, for they must have arisen some time or other; but if it is the case that they can arise spontaneously, I am confident that for once they do arise spontaneously there are thousands upon thousands of cases in which the disease is propagated by infection or contagion; and I look upon it in this way, that to deal with these diseases in a practical way you must deal with them solely on the principle that they are diseases of a highly infectious and contagious character.

5357. Now we will refer to the calves imported into Ireland; could you give the Committee any idea of the number of them?—I could not at this moment, for I did not anticipate being asked the question, but perhaps I could furnish it to the Committee. I do not say that I could furnish it for the last year, but some time ago there was an inquiry instituted, and the books of every steam packet company, that is to say, a copy of their manifests, were looked over, and it was found that there was a very extensive importation of calves into Ireland and Great Britain; but unfortunately the Customs keep no account of the importation of animals into Ireland; the Board of Trade does of the exportation from Ireland, but not of animals imported into it, because it appears that although there are two distinct kingdoms of Great Britain and Ireland, all the vessels plying between them come under the designation of coasters; but I think that will be remedied. The Irish Government has laid before the Board of Trade the desirability of producing such returns.

5358. I suppose these little creatures undergo a very great deal more of privation and even of suffering, do they not?—They do not; it is very strange, but the persons who bring them to Ireland are what are called cattle dealers, and it is a great desideratum to them to bring the animals into market in the very best condition, looking as well as possible; if they are brought over for veal, they are in tolerably good condition; then they are generally bull-calves, but the heifer-calves, unless they look comely, do not find purchasers in the fairs, and they are generally heifer-calves.

5359. Is there much mortality amongst these English calves?—They are very liable on going over to Ireland at certain seasons of the year (the climate being more damp than it is here) to a paratubercular disease called "hoose;" I call it paratubercular bronchitis, that is an affection caused by the presence of a number of paratubercular worms within the bronchial tubes, which multiply to such

Professor
Ferguson.

5 May 1873.

Professor
Ferguson,
—
5 May 1873.

such an extent that they actually choke the animal; but it is a very strange thing that the per-centage of mortality amongst calves coming from England when turned out to grass is not nearly so large as amongst our own calves. Our own calves, if they have been badly fed after they have been weaned, if they have been purchased as yearlings, or even before they were yearlings, when they are put on very good grass in the spring time, are very liable to what I call apoplectic congestion; other people call it blood-stroke; others, splenic apoplexy; other people call it black-leg or quarter-evil; that disease is very prevalent in our country.

5360. Mr. Kennaway.] Does that arise from bad feeding?—From bad feeding at first, and then putting them too suddenly on good feeding they become so very plethoric that the vessels cannot retain the blood while circulating through the frame, so that you have a kind of apoplexy caused. They sometimes, when the effusion takes place within the head on a certain part of the brain, fall as though they were shot. The blood is effused under the skin most frequently, particularly in the hind-quarters, and sometimes mortification takes place, and that is called black quarter.

5361. Mr. Clark Stead.] I understood you to state on the last day of your examination, that no inspection could prevent the introduction of disease from abroad?—I do not think it could, and I will give you an instance of it: supposing a lot of animals come here, and that 30 or 40 of them are affected with foot and mouth disease, a number of people would be going about amongst these cattle, and I know thoroughly well from practical experience, that the foot and mouth disease can be carried great distances by the infected dirt that may be, and often is, picked up by the covering of persons' feet, such as their boots and garters.

5362. Do you approve of the recommendation of the Central Chamber of Agriculture, that all sture cattle coming from Ireland should have six hours' rest at the ports of debarkation, and be fed and watered before they proceed inland by railway?—The majority of cattle come over so very rapidly that I think that is unnecessary; you may feed cattle if they are going from Ireland to England; that may be judicious certainly; it could do no harm to allow them a small portion of hay and a little water. If they are fat cattle, unless you do that, they might if delayed waste too much; but if you allow them to drink much water before placing them on board, particularly if it is rough weather, it may have the effect of giving them what is commonly called the scour. The drovers have a decided objection to doing that. There is one exportation yard at Dublin, which has very capital linage; I do not think there are better lairs in the world than those in the London and North Western yard in Dublin; they have got troughs for water and everything that is necessary; but the drovers, instead of allowing their cattle about to be embarked to go in and drink water, will wait till the last moment, and then quickly drive the animals through the yard to the ship's side. It is a regulation that the Company will not allow any cattle to be shipped unless they come from the yard; but many of these drovers are so afraid of coming scour or bove upon the voyage, that they drive them as quickly as they can through the yard to on board the vessels.

5363. Would water have the same effect generally, if given in moderation upon this side of the channel before the cattle are put into trucks?—It would not, but I should feel very strongly disposed to oppose the detention of animals; I should be afraid of disease breaking out amongst them; supposing that 150 or 200 cattle are to be detained six hours, and that foot-and-mouth disease at the expiration of five hours makes its appearance amongst those animals, according to your Council Orders, every one of them would be obliged to be detained; you could not move them from the port, and then perhaps the next lot of cattle would arrive, and you would have such an accumulation of cattle that it would cause great inconvenience; that is the practical way I look at it.

5364. Do you think that cattle should be sent from Ireland, and come to Norwich without being fed or watered all the way?—I think it would be desirable to have them fed if it could be possibly arranged some time previously to embarkation; but the majority of the cattle that come over from Ireland are the property of the cattle drovers, men of great experience, and they will do nothing which they fancy would detract the value of their cattle or risk their health if they can possibly avoid it, and it is their opinion that the watering and feeding of cattle immediately previously to their embarkation is decidedly running a risk of their getting ill upon the voyage, and as far as regards my experience and observation I certainly confirm their views.

5365. That does not affect railway travelling?—No; but upon the railways in Ireland the distances travelled by the animals are generally very short, they are not like the immense distances that you have here in England, such as from Scotland, we will say, to London.

5366. But it is a good long journey from Holyhead to Norwich, is it not?—Yes; I think it is decidedly desirable that the animals should have an opportunity of being fed, if possible, without delay.

5367. Even if the drovers thought otherwise?—The drovers when they once get their cattle this side know that in the course of the 24 hours which they will have before them, or 48 hours as the case may be, there will not be much diminution in weight, and the drover as a general rule will not consent to any action that will involve him in any expense; they do not like the expense, they have got every opportunity in the London and North Western Company's yard in Dublin of feeding the cattle and watering them, but they will not take advantage of it.

5368. That is on your side?—Yes, that is only the London and North Western Company's yard; as to the City of Dublin, that is as bad as it could be, but I believe they are going to make a very good cattle yard there.

5369. Our idea was, that after they were landed from the steamers and were put into the railway lairs, they should be fed and watered there before they were trucked and sent inland, we will say at Liverpool or Holyhead?—I do not see any objection to that, if their owners consent to it, and there is proper accommodation.

5370. You do not see much in favour of it?—I tell you candidly I think the principle would be humane.

5371. The great interest of cattle jobbers is to get as much as they can out of them, and they do not care very much as to the after consequences.

so long as they do not affect them during the time they have the cattle?—They do not care; cattle drovers, whether English or Irish, have just about as much humanity about them as there is about slave dealers.

5372. Mr. Berdy.] What is the usual percentage of mortality amongst animals which have been attacked with pleuro-pneumonia?—The percentage of cattle which died, as compared with the total number of cattle attacked with pleuro-pneumonia, is 59.05.

5373. Nearly 60 per cent.?—Yes, that is according to the returns at my disposal.

5374. Do you think that is about the correct per-centage?—I should fancy so; upon this principle I should fancy it was a very good average, because this return is obtained from reports relating to all cattle on infected farms. The disease is reported in the first instance, the stock upon the farm is taken and the number of animals which are affected, and the number of animals which have not been affected; and then every week the number is checked over, and as every fresh case occurs the farmers must give notice of it at the police station.

5375. Have you any return showing the percentage of the animals attacked or not attacked in a herd where pleuro-pneumonia has appeared?—The per-centage of cattle affected with pleuro-pneumonia as compared with the total number of cattle on infected farms is given as 16.12.

5376. Only 16 per cent. of the whole animals on a farm were affected with pleuro-pneumonia?—I should not say that it is fully as much as that; pleuro-pneumonia is nothing like so rapidly spreading a disease as the foot and mouth distemper, although so much more fatal.

5377. Assuming that pleuro-pneumonia appears upon a farm, upon the average 16 per cent. of the animals upon that farm become affected before the disease disappears from that farm?—Yes, unless great precautions are taken to isolate.

5378. Strictly speaking, is contagious pleuro-pneumonia curable?—As yes, although it is not invariably fatal, I am not aware of any mode of attempted curative treatment which can be relied upon.

5379. But assuming that an animal gets well again, does it ever get thoroughly cured, and free from the effects of the disease?—I feel thoroughly confident that when any animal has ever had an attack of pleuro-pneumonia such as you allude to, no matter how seemingly perfect may have been his recovery, no matter in what good condition he is on being slaughtered, if the contents of the chest (what the butchers call the lights) are examined, you will invariably be able to find that the animal has been diseased.

5380. Can you state with confidence any precise period at which an animal will cease to give off contagious or infectious matter?—I could not, neither could I venture to give an opinion relative to the length of time which the disease occupies in incubation after being contracted by an animal.

5381. Taking an animal which had suffered from pleuro-pneumonia and recovered apparently, to what extent would you say it had become deteriorated by disease, as compared with what it was before it was attacked?—It all depends upon what purpose you want the animal for; if you want the animal for stock purposes, for breeding, I should say that it had deteriorated very considerably; if you want an animal merely for fat-

tening purposes, the amount of its deterioration will depend upon the effects of feeding upon it. Some of them, although one of the lungs may have been partially destroyed, or one lung may be entirely destroyed, will recover rapidly, or at least regain flesh, and become very fat; but recoveries are so very exceptional in the case of downright real epizootic pleuro-pneumonia, that I do not think that it is worth much consideration.

5382. You have told us that the number of recoveries was 40 per cent., that is to say, the mortality was 60 per cent.; from which it results that the recoveries are 40 per cent.?—Yes; but I am very strongly of opinion that a great number of the cases that have been reported as recoveries from pleuro-pneumonia had not been cases of pleuro-pneumonia at all. If pleuro-pneumonia breaks out upon a farm, and an animal becomes ill, with difficulty of respiration, and all the different symptoms common to pleuro-pneumonia, and that animal is slaughtered or dies, and on being opened the lungs are found in that state which unmistakably indicates pleuro-pneumonia, all the other animals on that farm which become affected with difficulty of breathing, or even heave, are very likely to be reported as cases of pleuro-pneumonia when they are not so.

5383. Then I presume you are not prepared to dispute the statement which has been given in evidence here that the mortality of really contagious pleuro-pneumonia is 80 per cent.?—My private opinion is this, that if the mortality consequent upon pleuro-pneumonia is not quite 80 per cent., it is not very far from it.

5384. Of course an animal when it is labouring under pleuro-pneumonia in any case will lose considerably?—Yes, because they cease to eat and to ruminate.

5385. And those few animals which do recover would be deteriorated in value after they came out of the disease as compared with what they were when they were attacked?—Yes, and would remain so for a considerable time.

5386. That consequently reduces the animal attacked with pleuro-pneumonia, if you are going to treat it, to a very small value compared with its value at the time of attack?—Yes.

5387. Do I understand your view to be that pleuro-pneumonia and foot and mouth disease were both originally imported into Ireland?—I can get no evidence of their being imported, for both diseases appeared in Ireland previous to the restrictions being taken off the importation of cattle into Ireland. Many people state that pleuro-pneumonia came into Ireland in 1840, but I cannot find any importation of cattle at that date upon looking into the manifestos, and from inquiries with regard to the importation of cattle into Ireland at the time.

5388. Foot and mouth disease, at least, might have been imported without importing any cattle?—It might, and I think probably that is the reason why, in 1840, foot and mouth disease appeared in Ireland.

5389. And pleuro-pneumonia at the same time?—I think so; it is generally thought not to have appeared until 1841, and they say that it appeared at Waterford and Cork, but I saw some cases of it, I think, about 1840. I saw some lungs of cattle affected with the disease which were shown me as a curiosity at a knacker's yard.

5390. There is no report of those diseases having prevailed in Ireland before 1840?—No.

5391. After

Professor
Ferguson.

5 May 1873.

Professor
Ferguson.

5 May 1875.

5391. After that date the disease spread rapidly in Ireland, did it not?—Very rapidly; it was in 1842 that the disease was very bad in Ireland. In fact I saw so many cases of pleuro-pneumonia occurring in animals that were perfectly isolated, that when in 1842 I wrote a pamphlet first upon the disease, I was under the impression that it was not infectious or contagious, but in the course of the 10 or 12 months following I had ample evidence that it was so.

5392. Practically, looking to this disease you think it ought to be treated as entirely contagious or infectious, that it does not originate, as I might say in Ireland at the present day?—Yes, decidedly; the only way of dealing with the disease is to treat it as highly infectious and contagious, and to set aside all other ideas as to its being generated otherwise, even supposing it can be so.

5393. I gather from your evidence of the last day, that you do not seem to place much reliance upon the inspection at the port of embarkation in Ireland of cattle coming from Ireland into this country?—I do not; if there is inspection, I think the safest way would be to have it upon this side, as I have seen so many cattle embarked apparently in a thoroughly healthy state, and which I had no reason to believe were in anything but a thoroughly healthy state when they left the farm of their owner, and when they arrived at Liverpool, if not upon their debarkation, at all events very shortly afterwards, they were found to be affected with foot and mouth disease.

5394. Have you altered your opinion upon that point since 1869?—I always considered foot and mouth disease to be highly infectious, and contagious disease, and the most highly infectious and contagious disease that I have ever met with.

5395. I am speaking now of inspection at the port of embarkation; you do not think that it is of very much value?—I was very much in favour of it, and the reason I was in favour of it was this, that it had such a salutary effect on the health of the herds in Ireland in a very short time after the inspection of Irish cattle about being exported to England, took place at the ports of embarkation in Ireland, when no animal was allowed to leave Ireland without a certificate given by the inspector that he had examined it, and that it was free from disease; shortly afterwards I found the disease (although I had no statistics of it) diminish very much in Ireland, and that the disease continued to diminish as long as this inspection was continued; but when the inspection was discontinued, I found that in a very short time there was an increase of disease; I have no statistics, no official information of it, but from my position I came to the conclusion that there was an increase of disease, and I was confirmed in that opinion by the fact, that the years 1867 and 1868, we had a diminution of animals in the country; and it was a strange thing that in 1867, 1868, and 1869, three years in which there were no restrictions at all, we found the number of cattle diminish; but particularly in 1867 and in 1868, the cattle diminished from 3,746,157 in 1866, to 3,707,803 in 1867. In 1868, with an increase of disease and no restriction being imposed, you have a still further diminution according to the Registrar General's return of the cattle in the country to 3,646,795 cattle; notwithstanding that those two years there was a diminution of the exportation. Then comes the year 1869, when we commenced to look about us, and impose

whatever few restrictions there were imposed; it was in the latter end of 1869 that we brought out the foot and mouth distemper order, and in order relative to pleuro-pneumonia, and, as the result of that, we have in 1869 the cattle population of the country jumping up to 3,783,474, and from that day to this it has been increasing, until last year it was 4,057,153.

5396. So far as your answer bears upon my question, are not the reasons and facts which you have been stating, strong arguments in favour of inspection at the port of embarkation?—That inspection at the port of embarkation would be advantageous as far as diminishing the risk of cattle being sent diseased or infectious from Ireland to Great Britain, there cannot be the slightest doubt; but I should prefer the examination, or the inspection, to take place at this side instead of the other, because you may have animals thoroughly sound, to all appearance, at the port of embarkation, and on their arrival at this side you may find them decidedly diseased; and, further than that, I have no reason to believe that they catch the disease on board the vessel; I am speaking now of vessels coming to the port of Dublin which have always been kept in a clean state.

5397. But from the fact of all those cattle being crowded on board ship, would not a great deal of mischief have been done before they came to this side?—Yes; but I think very few cattle discoverably or recognisably diseased are exported from Ireland; that you have received cattle frequently from Ireland which were diseased upon disembarkation, I cannot doubt from the Report you have received from Dr. Williams; but all I can say is this, that the animals, in my opinion, have not been in a diseased state when they left Ireland. I had one man for about three months at a couple of ports; I had him first at Cork and also at Dublin, and we have not detected disease in a single case attempted to be embarked at Dublin, although some suspicious ones at Cork, but not such as would justify prosecutions, although the animals were turned back; but from Dr. Williams' Report I believe that some cattle have been landed in a diseased state in this country, although seemingly sound when embarked. What inspection previous to embarkation could prevent such an occurrence?

5398. Have you had complaints from this side since these inspectors were put on to whom you refer?—No, not that I am aware of, but I have occasionally had complaints from this side that animals were diseased when they came over.

5399. That is since you employed these inspectors you speak of?—Yes; I had one inspector, a most practical, painstaking man, at the port of Cork, working hard, and notwithstanding that there were a number of pigs, which he certainly states he examined, found to be diseased upon their arrival at Bristol.

5400. In 1869 you made a Report to the British Chamber of Agriculture, did you not?—I did.

5401. In that Report you made a statement which I understood, and which was generally understood, to be strongly in favour of inspection at the port of embarkation; I will read the statement you made then, and see whether you adhere to it still after further experience; you say, "For many years the general practice in Ireland has been to sell the affected animals as soon as they

are observed to have the disease?"—That is the case.

5402. "For the purpose of sale they were, before it was prohibited, frequently travelled through Ireland in railway trucks, and to Great Britain in steam vessels. Their exportation to Great Britain was, however, prohibited in June 1866 by a Council Order, which required that each head of cattle should, before embarkation, be examined by a Government inspector, and, on embarkation, be accompanied with a certificate from the inspector that, as far as he could ascertain, the animal was perfectly free from disease (not merely from cattle plague but from any disease whatsoever). Although the Council Order alluded to, and others subsequently passed, prohibited the exportation of cattle affected with any kind of disease whatsoever to Great Britain, they did not, except in cases of cattle plague, illegalise the movement of diseased cattle throughout Ireland, either by high road, by railroad, or in any other way, or their exposure in public fairs or markets; notwithstanding which, in a few months there was a very perceptible diminution of lung distemper in Ireland, and before the expiration of 18 months, as far as could be ascertained, the total disappearance of foot and mouth distemper. This may be accounted for by infectiously diseased cattle being no longer travelled throughout the different parts of the country to the various markets for embarkation to Great Britain, thus spreading infection along their routes. As long as the exportation from Ireland to Great Britain of diseased cattle was prohibited, the owners of such animals, having no profitable object in travelling them long distances, sold them for slaughter to the nearest purchasers they could find. The Council Orders requiring certificates of health to accompany all cattle exported from Ireland to Great Britain remained in force until the commencement of the present year (1868), when they were revoked. From the first of them being passed up to their revocation, a period of upwards of 18 months, according to the official reports received, the monthly diminution of lung distemper in Ireland was most marked; but shortly after the restrictions relative to cattle exportation to Great Britain were removed, pleuro-pneumonia commenced suddenly to extend its ravages in many parts of Ireland, and continued to increase so rapidly that the Government in Ireland deemed it necessary to pass a Council Order imposing restrictions relative to the movement of diseased live stock in Ireland, and prohibiting both their exportation to Great Britain and their importation into Ireland. Although the Order is very frequently evaded, from inspection, postal and otherwise, having been discontinued since last January, excepting in very occasionally reported cases of suspected cattle plague, and little more than six months have elapsed since the imposition of the restrictions, there is already a recognisable diminution in the extent to which pleuro-pneumonia exists in Ireland, when compared with the progress that malady had made in the country in the short space of less than the first three months of this year, the interval between the taking off all restrictions and the imposing of the subsequent ones. For some weeks previously to the revocation of the prohibition against the exportation of diseased cattle, many jobbers and dealers, in anticipation of the Council Order being revoked, purchased throughout Ireland all the infected cattle able to

travel they could, at extremely low prices, collected them in different batches, and had them ready for exportation to Great Britain on the export restrictions being revoked. With such animals there was an introduction of lung distemper into England, Wales, and Scotland, on a most extensive scale. Fortunately, the majority of the beasts, although not fit, were sold for slaughter. The lowness of the prices for which they were offered commanded a ready sale." Do you adhere to the opinions there expressed?—Yes, I adhere to them.

5403. And to the statements made there with regard to the purchase of diseased cattle in Ireland for the purpose of being shipped to this country?—That was done, but it can no longer be done; things are very different at present in Ireland, and have been for a long time, from what they were when I wrote that. Now the movement of diseased cattle is prohibited. In the first place, no living animals affected with the foot and mouth distemper, according to the Irish Council Order, can be moved from any farm, lands, premises, or place, at all, in which the foot and mouth disease exists; and in the case of pleuro-pneumonia, no animal affected with the disease can be removed, except for immediate slaughter under a license.

5404. *Chairman.* In your previous answer, you said that no living animal can be moved from any farm, lands, premises, or place, at all, in which there is disease; that applied to foot and mouth disease?—No living animal affected with foot and mouth disease can be removed, except under very extraordinary circumstances, and no animal affected with pleuro-pneumonia, can under that Council Order be removed, except with a license for immediate slaughter.

5405. *Mr. Barclay.* Do you think that practically the order is carried into effect, to as great an extent as in the nature of the circumstances could be expected?—I think it is carried out to a most extraordinary extent, taking everything into consideration, because I have a return here of the number of animals which were reported by the owners themselves, and there is not the slightest doubt but that, as a result of Council Orders being so much obeyed, pleuro-pneumonia has diminished most considerably.

5406. Do you think, upon the whole, that this Order in Council is carried out by the police as effectively as you could reasonably expect?—As effectively as you could expect; I think it is fairly carried out.

5407. *Chairman.* As regards both foot and mouth disease and pleuro-pneumonia, no animal affected with either disease can be moved, except for immediate slaughter; is not that so?—Precisely; but if the animal be absolutely affected with the disease called foot and mouth disease, it cannot be moved, unless it shall have been previously slaughtered. Order No. 13 says, that "No animal affected with foot and mouth disease, or the aphthous disease, shall be moved alive from any lands, premises, or place which are so affected;" and then it goes on to show that no animal which has been herded with diseased animals shall be so moved, except with a license.

5408. *Mr. Barclay.* How do you account for so much foot and mouth disease appearing at these fairs and markets last year, if the police discharged their duties reasonably well?—I do not attempt to account for it at all, but the foot

Professor
Fergusson.

5 May 1873.

Professor
Ferguson.

3 May 1873.

and mouth distemper certainly was much more severe. I presume you are alluding to about the period of September and October, about the time of Ballinasloe Fair, for in August and September foot and mouth disease became very virulent.

5409. Were there many prosecutions at that time under the Act for offences against that Order in Council?—A good number; but none in connection with the Ballinasloe fair excepting one, and that was the case of a magistrate who had a lot of animals moved, and he persisted in it, and I think he was fined 10*l.* by his brother magistrates.

5410. Do you think it would have been possible to carry out the Order in Council so effectively that no visible foot and mouth disease could have appeared at those fairs last year?—I do not believe so; I must tell you that I was not at the fair myself, but as the result of very careful inquiry, through the medium of the constabulary and through the medium of other persons, I ascertained that there were no animals discovered that were sent from their owners' farms, or places, or byres, to the Ballinasloe fair, which were affected with foot and mouth disease when they left home.

5411. Even although they were only a dozen miles off?—Even although they were only a dozen miles off; there is one lot which was alluded to in the Honourable Mr. Mayne's Report; those animals were seen on the evening previous to the fair in a field or paddock nearly adjoining; they were partly purchased; they were apparently sound then, and on the following morning in the fair they were decidedly diseased.

5412. Are you in favour of giving veterinary inspectors power of entry into private premises?—They have it with us, but they are obliged, if it is required, to give in writing their reason for making use of that power.

5413. I am asking you whether you are in favour of inspectors having that power?—I am; if I was not in favour of it, it would not have been in the Council Order.

5414. In the Report to which I have already alluded, there occurs this sentence, "Although it would be desirable to render it obligatory for the proprietors of diseased animals, irrespective of the nature of the malady, to give notice to the police of the locality of the animals having become diseased, I do not think it desirable that publicity should be given to the fact of there being disease on their farms or premises, nor that the appointed inspectors should have it at their own discretion, without being authorised specially in each and every instance by a responsible authority to interfere with the rights of private property. The power of veterinary inspectors being uncontrolled would very likely lead, too frequently, to its reprehensible abuse;" that is written about the end of 1868?—I do not think there ever was an inspector in Ireland, although the power was retained for him, who entered a man's premises without having proper reasons for doing so; but when the constabulary had not the power to enter, I found that persons denied the existence of the disease, particularly in the towns and in the Dublin dairies. If I found that an inspector who was sent down from the Department was detected prying and going unnecessarily to any place, I should not have the slightest hesitation, not only in admonishing him, but if he were guilty of it again, in dismissing

him; you will observe that, according to the Council Order, the inspector or constable who enters a place is bound to give in writing the reasons for his having done so, and he must show that he has reason for thinking that there is disease at the place.

5415. You are not disposed then, apparently, to put very great confidence in the inspectors?—I think they are a necessity, but I should never allow an inspector to go about the country interfering and walking into a man's farm, and interfering, unless he had a reasonable idea, or unless the police said, we have reason to believe upon enquiry, or that such and such a person reports to us, that there is disease in such a place, and we have gone there and the symptoms are something like those of foot and mouth disease or pleuropneumonia, but the existence of the disease is denied by the proprietor; then, under such circumstances, I say let them have the assistance of a veterinary inspector, but I have never allowed the veterinary inspector to intrude or go into a place, unless it was by reason of being called in by the police.

5416. You would not be disposed to employ inspectors for the discovery of the disease, as has been suggested in England?—I would not be so disposed.

5417. Would you be in favour of the disease being kept private, as suggested in this report, where you say that publicity should not be given to it?—I should feel confident that a great number of persons, if their names were to be published in the papers, and the names of their farms, and everything of that sort, would object very strongly to reporting any case.

5418. Some of the witnesses have suggested here that it ought to be imperative that a farmer who has got one of these contagious diseases upon his farm should send notice of it to his neighbours; would you agree to that suggestion?—I would not recommend such a course.

5419. (Chairman.) Do you think that farmers would obey such an order if it were made?—I think they are not such fools.

5420. Mr. Barclay.] How would it be feasible to do it?—I think it would act exceedingly injuriously upon the farmers. Suppose a farmer, who is a very large stockholder, had one animal affected with pleuropneumonia, and he were to send to his neighbours to tell them of it, and those neighbours were unicious, if they were to go to the different farms and say, This man's animals are affected with pleuropneumonia, I do not think it would work well. It would have an injurious effect upon the farmer; I think it is a thing which should be kept as quiet as possible, and that is one of the reasons why I do not publish reports frequently.

5421. There are many cases in which the cattle of neighbours come in contact; would it not be a prudent thing for a farmer to keep his cattle separate from those of a farmer amongst whose cattle the disease existed?—The farmers are advised to keep their cattle from the farms; and I tell you one reason why I do not advise a farmer to send word to his neighbours, namely, that if there are cattle on the adjoining land, and if they come near each other, the constabulary give the man of the adjoining land notice, and advise him to keep his cattle away. We insist upon the cattle being separated as much as possible.

5422. Then we come to this, that, practically,

the police come to the neighbours of a farmer who has diseased cattle, and warn them to keep their cattle separate?—Yes, in certain cases; but it would be out of the question for a man to have his farm under restrictions without his neighbours knowing it. A man might hide the disease, perhaps, for some time, but he could not hide the fact of the farm being under restrictions.

5423. Then the neighbours, according to the existing regulations, do know the fact, and they may spread it in the market, if they think proper?—That may be the case, but people frequently prefer trusting the police instead of their neighbours in such cases.

5424. *Chairman.* They know the fact, provided the police know of the existence of the disease?—Yes, I am speaking of that.

5425. But the neighbours know nothing of the disease if the owner of the cattle has succeeded in keeping it from the knowledge of the police?—They may know it or not, but very frequently, as far as regards the cattle, the people in Ireland are very much afraid of each other, and I think one of the reasons why reports are so very regular is coming in is, that a man is afraid of being injured against by his neighbours.

5426. *Mr. Barclay.* I was assuming that the disease had been discovered, and I wished to know what extent of publicity you would give to the existence of disease upon a farm; now, as I understand, the police warn a neighbour of the existence of disease upon a farm?—If they deem it necessary, if there is a common pathway, or a common bye, or a common road through, then they give warning, but, as a general rule, I do not see an instance of a farm or a place being put under restrictions, or any part of it, which is not immediately known to the neighbours. As a matter of course it is necessary to know that the disease is there before it is put under restrictions.

5427. I understand now that you do not approve of the disease upon a farm being advertised in the newspapers?—I do not; certainly not.

5428. How would you propose to deal with pleuro-pneumonia, with a view to its being exterminated in the country?—I do not think it can be exterminated from the country.

5429. You do not propose to do anything with a view to its being reduced to a minimum?—I think we have got it reduced immensely; according to the returns, I find that many places which were full of it are now comparatively free from it.

5430. Am I to understand you that there is at present existing in Ireland only a very small amount of pleuro-pneumonia in cattle?—I do not think it is as prevalent as it was in former years, but there is one thing to be taken into consideration, and that is, that you scarcely ever have pleuro-pneumonia during the time that foot and mouth disease is so much in the ascendant as it has been during the last two or three years.

5431. You do not propose to endeavour to suppress or reduce pleuro-pneumonia by slaughtering aside affected with it?—No, and I will tell you the reason why; of course I presume that you would not sanction slaughter without compensation.

5432. In the meantime, I am only asking what, in your opinion, would be the effect upon the disease of slaughtering animals affected with it?—It would be a salutary one decidedly.

5433. Would it be possible by practising a

rigid system of slaughtering out diseased cattle, to reduce pleuro-pneumonia to a minimum in Ireland?—That would be a very practicable way of accomplishing the object.

5434. Supposing a farmer with a herd of cattle found one animal attacked with pleuro-pneumonia, what would you recommend as the most prudent course for him to adopt with respect to that animal?—If it were in a good state, to dispose of it to the best advantage for immediate slaughter. I have no objection to that being done, but you must take it into consideration that the farmers are very much interfered with by the provisions of the Sanitary Act.

5435. Do you think that the flesh of an animal in the earlier stages of pleuro-pneumonia is at all affected by the disease?—No, I do not, that is as food when fresh, but it is not as easily saved by salting.

5436. It requires, in fact, to be in a very advanced state in the animal before it shows in the flesh?—It all depends upon the manner in which the disease affects the animal, but in the majority of cases, for a considerable time after the animal has become affected, that is to say, perhaps, not visibly affected, or even when visibly but not much affected, I consider the flesh to be as good as possible for food. But there is one thing to be taken into consideration, that, as far as regards our Irish metropolises, the municipal authorities work this Sanitary Act as extremely as they can. When I say that they work it as extremely as they can, I mean that they confiscate the carcasses, or parts of them, of all animals affected with pleuro-pneumonia, on the principle that the Act states that any animal affected with disease shall not be used for human food.

5437. That is the Sanitary Act?—Yes.

5438. Do you think that provision unnecessarily stringent?—I do, most decidedly, because, according to that Act, if the animal has the slightest disease imaginable, in fact, according to the strict letter of that Act, if an animal had an ulceration in the eye, or in the knee, from an accident, that Act requires the carcass to be confiscated. I have not got the Sanitary Act before me, but that is one of the reasons why the dairy-keepers within the borough of Dublin have in a great number of cases declined to report the existence of disease when it was pleuro-pneumonia. When I went to ask those persons the reason of their not reporting, they would say, "What can I do? If I report this disease through the medium of the police, the market-inspector knows it, and if you allow an animal to be removed for slaughter, and get a license for its removal, the moment it is slaughtered they walk in and get their adviser to say whether the animal has been affected with disease or not. No matter how trifling the disease is, if the officer of health certifies that the animal has been or is affected with pleuro-pneumonia, these market inspectors have the power to confiscate that animal entirely, and generally do so, even when the meat is not at all affected."

5439. Would you approve of inspectors under the Cattle Diseases Act passing carcasses, instead of the inspectors under the Slaughter Act?—No, I do not think that that would do; I think sanitary inspection and inspection of butchers' meat are two distinctly different functions; I think that as far as regards the inspectors under the Cattle Diseases Act, they should confine themselves to dealing with disease and its prevention,

Professor Ferguson.

5 May 1874.

Professor
Fergusson.

5 May 1873.

vention, and have nothing to say to the other; it is mingling one distinct thing with the other of quite a different nature.

5440. From that answer, do I understand you to approve of a veterinary surgeon passing the carcasses?—Decidedly not; I do not think a veterinary surgeon has any right to interfere with the state of a carcass in reference to its being fit or unfit for human food. Butchers and cooks are the best judges of raw meat.

5441. Would not the veterinary surgeon who saw the animal alive, and could compare it with the carcass afterwards, be the best judge of whether it was fit for food or not?—I think that a good practical butcher would, in point of fact, know more about it than any veterinary surgeon, with regard to its being fit for human food.

5442. Is the sanitary inspector a medical man?—Yes, he is. As far as regards the quality of meat, I should prefer a practical butcher, a good honest man, to any other person; I think they are two distinct questions involving experiences of a different nature for their satisfactory solution.

5443. What would be your objection to slaughtering animals affected with pleuro-pneumonia?—I do not see that there is any objection to it whatever.

5444. What would be your objection to the system of slaughtering animals affected with pleuro-pneumonia, and compensating the owner?—If you compensate the owners for animals slaughtered compulsorily on account of pleuro-pneumonia, I am confident they will not hide the disease, but I am greatly afraid that every animal which is affected with anything, they will pronounce to be affected with pleuro-pneumonia, and will give us a great deal of bother about it; but if I mistake not, this compulsory slaughter, with compensation, has been tried upon the Continent, and given up.

5445. Assuming that a farmer was to receive four-fifths of the value of an animal, and that it was to be determined by a competent authority after the animal was slaughtered whether he was labouring under contagious pleuro-pneumonia or not, what would be the objection to such a system?—None.

5446. Then do I understand you to say, that you would approve of the stamping-out process as applied to pleuro-pneumonia, the owner getting compensation, say, to the extent of four-fifths of the value of an animal, upon its being authoritatively determined to have been suffering from that disease?—I do not say whether I approve or disapprove; if you ask me what would be the result of such a measure, I tell you candidly that I consider its effect would be very salutary, and I fancy that, looking at it in a commercial point of view, for the country it would be the cheapest in the end, that is if all parties acted honestly.

5447. *Sir H. Selous-Bibbston.* I understood you to say just now that a very large number of cattle are thoroughly sound at the port of embarkation, and yet turn out diseased afterwards?—Apparently so.

5448. And you say it in evidence that you would suggest that the law for the two countries should be brought into more harmony with regard to the 5th Section of the 33rd and 34th Victoria?—That is relative to diseased animals being treated as contraband when landed; I think that very desirable.

5449. Has that Act been put into force in Ireland as against the import of diseased cattle?—No, I have only had permission to require it to be put into force within the last fortnight or three weeks.

5450. Have you acted under that permission yet?—Either fortunately or unfortunately, I should say unfortunately, it has got ahead and people are aware of it, and the inspector has not been able to succeed in getting a case.

5451. You believe, do you not, that that power will be efficient in checking the importation of animals suffering from disease?—Such is my impression, particularly if there was a similar power upon this side, and if it were exercised upon this side.

5452. Such a power being exercised at all ports, in fact, would practically do away with the necessity of the more stringent restrictions which are proposed to be applied in the country itself?—I think so, as far as regards the relative situations of Ireland and Great Britain.

5453. Do you think that the exporters in Ireland would object very strongly to such measures?—I think that they would object to everything, no matter how reasonable, that would in the slightest degree interfere with their getting rid of diseased animals; but I think that if it were enforced firmly for a while they would become a most efficient corps of detective police on against the other.

5454. And having that power, as against the introduction of the disease into Ireland, they could not resist the justice of such a regulation upon the other side?—I think not; that is my impression. But if evidence were produced that it was not nor could have been known that the animal was diseased when embarked, I would not confiscate.

5455. With regard to that Spanish or Portuguese cargo which was landed upon the 28th of April this year, some of the animals in which were affected with foot and mouth disease, have you any knowledge of the vessels in which they were brought into the country?—None whatever, as to the countries it may have previously traded with.

5456. Do your Privy Council Orders contain provisions similar to those in our orders, which prevent a vessel which has carried cattle from a country within the Schedule from importing cattle from another country within three months?—I think that would be very desirable, but I think it would be more desirable to prohibit altogether the import of foreign animals into Ireland; very few come in, and there is a considerable degree of danger attached to their importation.

5457. Have you any return of the number of foreign cattle which are imported into Ireland?—Not with me, but I do not think that there have ever been so many as 1,000 foreign animals imported into Ireland in one year; last year there were only 941 foreign animals imported into Ireland. I have sent in returns of such importations for the last two years.

5458. But setting that aside, you would consider that it would give you a great safeguard, if you had this provision enforced in your own Privy Council Orders, which would enable you to prevent a vessel which had been carrying cattle from countries comprised in the Schedule from trading to another country for cattle within a certain time?—I think that would be an admirable provision.

5459. Precisely.

6 May 1873.

5459. Practically, at present, a vessel which was forbidden to trade by our English Privy Council Orders, might go to Spain as an infected vessel and fetch cattle from there, and land them in Ireland without any restriction, might it not?—Decidedly so; but the only vessels which have hitherto brought Spanish or Portuguese cattle into Ireland, belong to the Palgrave, and it was really thought it was unnecessary to impose a provision like that, because those vessels are continually doing the English trade.

5460. But there is nothing to prevent their running cargoes into Ireland, after having been forbidden by the Privy Council Orders in England to carry out cattle from a certain country?—That is so. It has been rather an oversight that there has been no provision against it.

5461. Would you think it necessary to require a ship to produce a certificate of having been disinfected after carrying one cargo before carrying another?—We get very little cattle into Ireland, and the ships must be disinfected before they go away. We now have the constabulary visiting each vessel, and although they do not interfere to prevent the cattle going on board, yet if the certificate of the police is not satisfactory that the vessel has been disinfected according to the Council Order, we order a prosecution, but that has been only quite recently put in force.

5462. Practically, now you think you are protected in that way?—I think we are protected in that way, provided the magistrates take a reasonable view of the cases brought before them; but in the prosecutions that were instituted the other day for not disinfecting vessels leaving one of the Irish ports, they only imposed a penalty of 1 s. each.

5463. Mr. Ridley.] I wish to ask you a question about what you said with reference to your carrying out of the 5th clause with regard to diseased animals being discovered at the port; in the case of discovering an animal so diseased upon the gangway, what are your orders with regard to the rest of the herd in which that animal had been?—I should not interfere with them; to do so would be unjust, and interfere too much with the operations of the legitimate trader.

5464. If you should discover an animal so diseased, the rest of the cattle would be allowed to be shipped and sent over just the same as if the disease had not been discovered, is that so?—Yes.

5465. Do you think that desirable?—Theoretically it may not be desirable, but if you attempt to interfere with all the cattle, you might as well impound all the cattle in a market in which there was any foot and mouth distemper animal discovered.

5466. Is not that the law at present?—Yes, but it is not enforced either upon one side of the channel or the other, as it would cause the total stoppage of the trade. Sufficient good can be accomplished without going to such ruinous extremes as that the punishing of a single individual must involve the oppression, perhaps ruin, of several innocent persons.

5467. Would you be in favour of doing away with section 13 of the November order?—I would not be in favour of doing away with it at all.

5468. Would you allow it to remain a dead letter?—No; I would let it remain and act upon it.

it as often as it could be done, consistently with the interests of commerce, or the legitimate movement of cattle.

5469. Mr. O'Conor.] I gather from your evidence that you think it is not of much use to summon people before magistrates for an offence of this kind?—In a great number of places it is not; in others it is.

5470. You stated, did you not, that in the north of Ireland that was found practically useless?—No; I stated that it was practically useless in the county of Meath, and I stated that in one of the ports north of Dublin, where the first prosecutions were instituted, we obtained convictions for having a vessel in a filthy state, and not being properly disinfected, and that the magistrates only fined the parties a shilling each.

5471. So that in the north and in the Midland Counties, such as Meath, and also in the west, I think you stated Ballinasloe, you found a disposition upon the part of the magistrates not to carry the law into effect?—Yes; that was in 1871, but they have changed lately very much, but not so much as is desirable.

5472. Does not that show that there is rather a feeling against that severe restriction than in favour of it?—Yes; because almost the majority of the magistrates in those counties are persons connected with the cattle trade; and, as I stated to the Committee before, in the county of Meath I do not think a man would dare to fine, as he would feel it his duty to do; I think he might as well cry a tannak. Such, however, will of course be denied.

5473. Under those circumstances do you think that it is practicable to carry out a scheme such as has been proposed?—It is practicable, but the thing is, is it desirable.

5474. I am speaking of desirability; supposing all the magistrates and people who have power in the country are against it, by what means can you possibly carry it out?—I would have issued at once a general order to the constabulary, that instead of summoning people they should arrest them when they have the power.

5475. But you must bring those persons before the magistrates when you have arrested them?—You might keep them a short time, and if the local magistrates persisted in shirking their duty, I should submit the question to the law officers of the Crown, whether there could not be an appeal to the higher courts.

5476. You would have in fact a kind of civil war between the authorities and the resident gentry?—Professor Baldwin's proposition is theoretically decidedly the most practical one for accomplishing the desired object, but I feel sure that if the object were effected, considerably greater time would be necessary than two months, in proof of which, several of the farms which were placed under restrictions in consequence of the foot and mouth distemper, remained under those restrictions a considerably longer time than two months.

5477. But during those two months, or whatever time it might be, you stated upon the last day, in answer to Question 5009, that you believed it would be impossible to stop the movement of cattle; that some of the cattle would be starved?—When I say that it would be impossible, nothing is impossible practically; if it is necessary to have the movement stopped, if the Government decide upon stopping the movement of cattle, I shall have the movement stopped, but

Professor
Fergusson.

but I fancy the consequences of doing so would be most disastrous to the country.

5478. For all practical purposes we may assume that that would be a very disastrous thing?—That is my impression.

5479. You stated also that foot and mouth disease has rapidly diminished of late, that there is not so much of it as there was?—It has diminished very much.

5480. And it is probable, is it not, that it will in the course of time run itself out?—I think it is very likely to do so.

5481. The object of Professor Baldwin's scheme is, as I understand, to bring about that very result; if that result is likely to come about without Professor Baldwin's scheme, there would be no object whatever in adopting it?—I should prefer, with the permission of the Committee, not to pass an opinion relative to anything proposed by another person. I think the most satisfactory way would be to ask me what I consider would be the probable results of such a thing being done, and whether it would be practicable, and the reasons for my opinions.

5482. I will ask you, as a fact, is it not likely that by doing nothing at all we should find foot and mouth disease reduced almost to a minimum?—I think it is very probable. I have here a Return (producing the same) for the week ending the 3rd May, this month, and I find that there is a decrease in the number of farms, lands, or places under restrictions during that week as against the week before, of 39, and there is also a decrease of 18 in the number of outbreaks reported during the week. We had only 25 outbreaks of disease in the whole of Ireland reported during that week, 21 of foot and mouth disease, and four of pleuro-pneumonia.

5483. [Chairman.] Do you know what it was this time last three years?—I have not got the paper with me, but I have the Return for the week ending the 16th September 1873; that is not very long ago; five months ago, at the termination of that week, we had 4,458 farms, lands, premises, or places under restrictions for pleuro-pneumonia and for foot and mouth distemper; 4,318 were for foot and mouth disease, and 140 for pleuro-pneumonia; making 4,458. Now all the cases that we had last week for foot and mouth disease and pleuro-pneumonia, both together, were 271.

5484. That might be owing to the time of year; but could you at all recollect what the amount of foot and mouth disease was this time last year?—At this time last year foot and mouth disease was considerably more than it is at present.

5485. [Mr. Dent.] In 1871, Ireland was free from the disease, was it not?—As far as we could ascertain.

5486. Upon the 3rd April there is no return; there was no foot and mouth disease whatever?—But in last year, 1872, there were a considerable number of cases.

5487. [Mr. O'Connor.] Then, assuming the possibility or probability of the disease being reduced to a very low ebb, would you consider it admissible, supposing it were reduced to that very low ebb, to slaughter every animal that was affected with the disease afterwards?—I would not think so, because I do not think that compulsion would have the effect desired with respect to foot and mouth disease; and I think that people have been so very severely bitten by the results of holding over long distempered animals that

they are very desirous to get rid of them as quickly as they possibly can. But I do not see any objection to slaughtering them, but not at public expense.

5488. But you would not recommend it?—I should not like to take the responsibility of doing so, although I think it is very possible that it might, taken in the abstract, be a very beneficial measure, as far as regards diminishing the disease, but the sacrifice of animals almost certain to recover would be an unnecessary loss to the food resources of the United Kingdom.

5489. There was a charge made in your Report to the Scottish Chamber of Agriculture against jobbers buying diseased beasts for the express purpose of sending them to England?—I know that has been done, but I do not think it has been done lately.

5490. Do you think that that has been done to a large extent?—To an immense extent, but not since the imposition of Council Order restrictions relative to pleuro-pneumonia.

5491. Have you any remedy to suggest supposing that that practice were prevalent?—The only remedy that I would suggest would be to extend the provisions of the Act which relate to the attempted embarkation of diseased foreign cattle, to all cattle; and I feel thoroughly assured that five or six seizures and confiscations would in effect be worth all the inspection in the world, because when once cattle had passed and had got a clean bill of health, people would think it very hard for you to seize an animal on this side, and yet no inspection, however minute, if carried on at the port of embarkation, would be successful in preventing the occasional landing in England of diseased animals, particularly in the case of foot and mouth disease; I have seen animals that were apparently thoroughly sound, on embarkation become within 24 hours, or less, very badly affected with the disease.

5492. On landing in England if you were to confiscate them, how could you tell that they had been put on board in a sound state?—If the animals had been at all exposed to the disease, I think the knocking about that they get on the journey would very likely develop it; I have seen animals within a few hours of being landed in England present all the appearance of having been affected for five or six days with foot and mouth distemper, and yet they had appeared to be perfectly sound when embarked in Ireland.

5493. Do you not suppose that under your proposal you would be very likely to confiscate the property of innocent persons as well as that of intentional offenders?—It is one of the necessities of the case; the law at present in Ireland is that if there is an attempt to embark or debark any animal, the embarkation or debarkation of which is prohibited by Council Order, that animal is liable to seizure and confiscation according to the laws of the Customs, and I have not the slightest hesitation in saying that were I in Dublin, and were I to find a hallock or a bull or cow which had been sent over in a diseased state, I should try the experiment. It is not permissible at all; the Act says that such shall be done; I think it would be desirable that we should have that Act in force and not interfere with the trade by putting on inspectors at the ports of embarkation, only confiscate in extreme cases, such as where the offence is intentional or the result of culpable negligence.

5494. Now, returning to another subject, we

have had some evidence given before this Committee of horses and rabbits being affected with foot and mouth disease; are you aware of that having been stated?—Yes, I am.

5495. Are you aware of there having been any considerable outbreak of that disease amongst horses and rabbits?—Yes.

5496. When?—Last year.

5497. Was that in Ireland?—Yes.

5498. In what part of Ireland was that?—In Kildare and Meath; in Meath a great number of horses were affected.

5499. Do you think that that would have the effect of giving the disease to cattle?—I feel quite assured, and know, that even if horses and rabbits are not affected themselves, they can carry the disease, and so do dogs carry it on their feet. I recollect one remarkable circumstance which occurred in 1869, when the disease first appeared in Ireland. I had a number of animals affected with foot and mouth disease at a place of mine off Morrison-square, and at the same time I had a small pack of harriers which I used to van out to hunt, and I recollect bringing those hounds about eight miles out of the town in a van. There was no straw in the van, or anything of that kind; the van had been thoroughly cleaned out. I stopped at a farmer's house near Tallaght, and the dogs, whilst we were at breakfast, were let out into the farmyard to empty themselves, and in 48 hours afterwards, certainly before three days, the disease appeared among the cattle at that homestead. That was the first case that over I saw of dogs carrying the disease. That rabbits become affected I have not the slightest doubt, for some of a number of pet rabbits that were going about the place became affected; and I have lodged at the Chief Secretary's Office, for the inspection of the Lord Lieutenant and Lord Harrington, some specimens of the disease in horses and rabbits and woodpeckers as well as deer.

5500. Were you in the county of Meath at the time the cattle plague was supposed to have broken out in 1866?—Do not say "supposed;" I was there when it broke out.

5501. You are perfectly convinced that it broke out?—I am perfectly convinced of it, and it is not only I that am convinced, but the gentlemen who were sent over to Ireland by the English Privy Council. The very persons who succeeded in moving the Government to prohibit the import of all animals into Ireland, as a preventative of our getting cattle plague from England into Ireland, were the very parties who opposed the fact most strenuously of the disease having broken out in the north and in Meath. When I went down I was told by the inspector that it was cattle plague. I did not believe it, as there were no animals coming into the country at the time; but I went down by a late train, and I found that it was cattle plague, and I caused all the animals that were affected with it to be slaughtered immediately, and a return made of the number which had died. There was so much opposition offered to the course adopted, and the Government were so much abused at public meetings, that I solicited the Lord Lieutenant to send over a proper person to investigate the matter, and Professor Brown was sent over.

5502. Are you aware that there was a very strong opinion in the country that it was not cattle plague?—There is even at present.

5503. You were not able to trace that disease?—I am not able to say how it came to Meath, O.S.R.

and I can only say that it is a most wonderful thing that it did not spread through the whole of the country, because the discovery was quite accidental, for the man on whose farm it had broken out had resolved to bring all his cattle to the fair of Kells, but he was away from home a little longer than he expected, and when he came back a lot of the animals were dead, otherwise we should have had the cattle plague at Kells, whence it would have spread all over the country. As regards the outbreak in the north, on inquiry we found that some cattle dealers were in the habit of bringing over animals from Belfast to Scotland. Three men had been mixing with diseased cattle in Scotland, and one of them, who owned a number of cattle plague animals near Glasgow, had gone on his return to Ireland to the byre with the very view of purchasing the very cow, which was the first animal which became affected; but as far as regards the outbreak in Meath, near Enfield, I have not the slightest idea how the cattle plague was brought there.

5504. Mr. W. Johnston.] In the Report of the Veterinary Department for the year 1872, it is stated that "it is probable that more animals affected with disease of a contagious nature are imported from Ireland than from all foreign countries, and that the regulations as to the examination and transit are less efficiently carried out in the former than in the latter case." The Report also goes on to say, "A better method of preventing the introduction of disease from Ireland, namely, the examination of all vessels and animals coming from that country has also been suggested." What have you to say with regard to the inspection and detention of Irish cattle at the English ports of debarkation?—I think even on account of England, setting Irish interests completely aside, it would not be at all desirable, because these quarantine places, or detaining places, would become nests of infection and disease if a diseased animal happened to get into them.

5505. I asked Dr. Williams if there was any communication between the Veterinary Departments in London and Dublin; what answer would you give to that question?—There have been communications when occasion required. I perceive Dr. Williams writes to me, or to the under secretary, when he requires information, and when I think it desirable I write to Dr. Williams, and I get a reply.

5506. Dr. Williams stated that he thought it would be desirable to have more frequent communications between the Veterinary Departments of Ireland and England as regarded the treatment of disease; that the Veterinary Department in England had furnished information to the Veterinary Department in Ireland, but that the Irish Department had not furnished information to us?—It has not been asked for. I had not the pleasure of becoming acquainted with Dr. Williams until I came to London; but I dare say after this our communications will be mutually satisfactory.

5507. Do not you think it desirable that there should be friendly communications constantly between the two departments?—I think that there are, because as regards the English Veterinary Department they are very regular in giving us their reports relative to the outbreaks of disease.

5508. If you had a better staff at the office in Ireland,

Professor
Ferguson.

5 May 1873.

Professor
Ferguson.

5 May 1873.

Ireland, do you think you would be able to send better reports to the English Department?—I do not think that any department can furnish better reports than I can furnish at this minute, even with so small a staff as we have, and being so crippled as to pecuniary means. If Government would allow me a sufficient staff and sufficient means, I would soon make very short work of infectious and contagious diseases in Ireland, and that without embarrassing trade.

5509. The Treasury refused your application for permission to retain your two or three additional clerks; were any dismissed at that time?—I have kept them on upon my own responsibility; the case is still under consideration.

5510. According to your tables there is a considerable falling off in the amount of foot and mouth disease in 1872 as compared with 1871, with the exception of sheep?—It is a curious fact that the foot and mouth disease did not spread extensively amongst sheep until 1872, yet they were as much exposed to contagion or infection in the former as in the latter year; but the type of disease was different.

5511. Have you any information with reference to the cause of the increase of foot and mouth disease amongst sheep in 1872, as compared with it in cattle?—No; except that they appear to have been much more susceptible of the disease; although foot and mouth disease has affected such a great number of sheep, I do not think that sheep as a rule are so susceptible of the disease as cattle; I know some very large grazing farms and sheep walks, and the quantity of disease amongst the sheep has been very little compared to what it has been amongst cattle.

5512. I have a letter in which it states that lambs and sheep will be many shillings a head dearer this year in consequence of the neglect last autumn in carrying out the system of supervision at fairs and markets; what do you say with reference to that?—I do not agree with it; everything is becoming dearer, but it is very hard to know what mutton should become dearer from, certainly not from neglect, because I think as far as regards sheep the provisions of the Act have been fairly carried out; if we have a scarcity of sheep this summer it is only what should be expected totally independent of foot and mouth disease, after the immense quantity of wethers that we have had during the preceding 12 months. The foot of it is, we shall have liver rot to a most extraordinary extent, and we are commencing to have it already.

5513. Would you suggest any penalty for non-reporting to the police cases of contagious diseases?—We have that, and that is the one of the things we can fine them about; what I suggest is that the minimum of the fine should be fixed.

5514. With regard to steamboats and railway carriages, have you any suggestions to make?—None; I think the orders are about as perfect as can be, and within the last month or six weeks I have been furnished with a staff amply sufficient to carry those orders out.

5515. Mr. Keenevagh.] Is it not the fact, that the law has been put into force a great deal more actively with regard to steamboats than it has with regard to railway trucks?—Yes, but both have been only energetically enforced within the last three or four weeks, but the restrictions will be energetically enforced with respect to railroad trucks; there is a hitch about it; there appears to be some doubt in the opinion of

the law advisers, relative to the party who should be prosecuted. When I was revising the draft of the Act, I was desirous of having it so worded, that instead of attempting to prosecute the railway porters, or the station master, or one of these servants, we should in turn be able to prosecute the company through the medium of its secretary, but there seems to be a doubt about that, and that is not yet decided; but there has been nothing done to embarrass the steamboats, because for one thing, we have done away with the precaution of swabbing beneath the decks too much; it was found that the water getting into the bilges and the hulls was injurious, whereas now we allow them to scrub with a brush and water. I think on the whole it is certain that the Council orders have been more energetically enforced with respect to steamboats, than with respect to railroads; there is one great thing in favour of steam boats, they always have a supply of water at hand for the purpose of washing and securing the vessel out; whereas as regards the railway stations, some of the cattle-receiving railway stations have no water at all.

5516. Do you think for the future that you will be able to enforce satisfactorily the regulations with reference to cattle trucks?—I feel assured of it.

5517. Are you of opinion that a great deal of the disease has arisen from that source?—Certainly; I have not the slightest doubt of it.

5518. I must refer very shortly to Professor Babiwen's suggestion in order to ask you one or two questions with regard to it; you seem, I think, from your evidence of to-day to be rather more in favour of it than I gathered from you on Thursday?—I cannot say that I am in favour of it; I am only an administrative officer. Anything ordered to be done I will do as well as any person, consistently with the staff at my disposal, could do; I only say that it is a thing I would not undertake to recommend, and I do not think the proposition would answer; certainly if all fairs and all cattle traffic is to be stopped, totally irrespective of any other circumstances, I feel assured that two months would not be sufficient to stop the disease, and I can bring forward evidence that will be satisfactory that that period would not be sufficient.

5519. [Chairman.] How long a time do you think would be sufficient for that purpose?—I could not say; there are several very large grazing districts in Ireland which have been put under restrictions; but there is one very happily situated for being under supervision, and that is the Curragh of Kildare; there is an ample force of constabulary there, and there are sentries on it, and when the place had been a short time put under restrictions some cattle were driven across it, and the people were prosecuted and heavily fined; the place was very well guarded. It is a very large plain with only sheep grazing upon it; I telegraphed yesterday to know when the Curragh was put under restrictions in consequence of the foot and mouth disease, and when those restrictions were taken off; and this was the answer I got, "Curragh restricted 19th July 1872, restrictions removed therefrom 26th October 1872; reported by Lamb as affected 812 sheep; 4,731 sheep did not become affected at all, and 15 of the affected ones did." That is a proof that two months would not be sufficient. There are other places, particularly in the south of Ireland, which were under restriction

tiers a considerably longer time merely on account of cattle disease; but I thought it more desirable to refer to the report of the outbreak in the Curragh, because that was a place as to which I could be certain that no additional animals were put on it, and no animals removed therefrom, after the first few days.

5320. You were able to keep up the restrictions upon the Curragh thoroughly?—Yes, thoroughly; the only trouble I had was this: I sent round and had the farmers recommended (although it is one large plain without divisions) to keep their sheep as separate as they possibly could, and the result shows what a number of animals escaped.

5321. Those restrictions were in force upon the Curragh for upwards of three months?—Yes.

5322. What number of animals were diseased at the end of the three months?—There were none at the end of the three months.

5323. Mr. Keeneagh.] You stated that 812 animals were diseased?—Eight hundred and twelve had become diseased during that time, but the restrictions could not be removed until 10 days after the last case had recovered, and out of the total number 473 escaped the disease, and out of the animals that were affected 16 died.

5324. Chairman.] But would you imagine that any of those 4,700 animals would be likely to communicate the disease afterwards?—I should think not, because they were cured.

5325. Mr. Dent.] I think I understood you to say, that at the close of the period of restriction, the Curragh was free from the disease altogether?—Yes, it was free from disease.

5326. Mr. Keeneagh.] Then by restricting the movement upon the Curragh during three months and six days, you stamped out the disease altogether?—Yes.

5327. Is not that very much in favour of Professor Baldwin's suggestion, although the time is somewhat longer than he suggested?—Those are the facts, and the Committee can draw their own conclusions from them.

5328. But you are a gentleman of great experience, and I want to arrive at the truth if I can?—I have given Professor Baldwin's proposition very careful consideration, and I must admit that it is the only feasible remedy of a heroic nature, and it is very heroic, which has of late been as yet proposed; but at the same time I distinctly decline to recommend its adoption by the Government in Ireland abstractedly. It would have an excellent effect, but I would not like to take the responsibility of recommending it. There is not the slightest doubt but that it would have a manifest effect, but with reference to stopping the movement of cattle and of fairs and markets, I have come to the conclusion that it is not a desirable thing to do, for the reasons which I stated to the Committee upon the last occasion when I was examined here, namely, that I think it would interfere very seriously with the interests, not alone of the large graziers and farmers, but also of the small farmers. I do not know how they would pay their rent, neither do I know how the people could be fed, because any movement, whether of fat stock or of any other kind, would be injurious to the experiment. In conclusion, I must say that it is my strong impression, that this disease, like the generality of other epizootic or epidemic diseases, will disappear with time, and

038.

as far as regards the great work which has been made about it, I regard it, in a great measure, to be like a tempest in a teapot.

5329. Therefore your objection to it, in fact, is more on account of the inconvenience it would occasion to the inhabitants of Ireland, than from the difficulty of carrying it out?—Solely, and if the Government decide upon having it carried out, I shall have it carried out; I am not like the English Veterinary Department, for although the system is admirable, in the office they have not the machinery for carrying it out; they have the money and the office staff, and we have neither the money nor the office staff, but we have good machinery, the police.

5330. If Professor Baldwin's plan were adopted in Ireland, would it not be absolutely necessary that it should be adopted here?—You would require that it should be adopted in Great Britain and in Ireland simultaneously, and exactly similarly, but I fancy that its adoption would be of very little avail as long as cattle were allowed to be landed from foreign countries affected with foot and mouth disease.

5331. Chairman.] Why would that system require to be carried out simultaneously in England and Ireland?—Because if it were not carried out in England, you would still have the disease in England, and so surely as you have the disease in England, so surely would we have it brought to Ireland.

5332. Unless the importation of cattle into Ireland from England was prohibited?—It is not at all necessary that there should be importation in order to convey the disease, because one of the worst outbreaks of foot and mouth distemper that I am aware of occurred in the City of Dublin by a drover's boy, or a dealer's boy, bringing the disease over upon his boots or by clothing into a dairy in Dublin from England.

5333. If you think that that would imply the great danger of its being brought into Ireland, would not that make it useless to attempt to stop the spread of disease, either in England or in Ireland, because as long as there was foot and mouth disease in any country upon the Continent, with which there was communication it might be brought over by human beings?—Decidedly; there is not the slightest doubt of that; all that can, under such circumstances, be done is to keep the malady as much as possible in check.

5334. Mr. Keeneagh.] I do not think that you agree with Professor Baldwin, with reference to the slaughter of all cattle affected?—If you treat the thing abstractly and superficially, merely for the purpose of getting rid of the disease, it would decidedly facilitate the matter very much, but at the same time, I do not think it would be desirable to adopt the measure; I think it would be exceedingly expensive, and that it would lead to great abuse.

5335. Do you think that if that system were adopted, you could possibly discover every single instance of an outbreak in Ireland in time enough to check the spread of the disease?—I think many people would find it desirable when they had got a few animals comfortably affected, to report those cases for the purpose of getting compensation.

5336. Do you think that the farmers would give information in order to get compensation?—Yes, I think they would be very glad to do so.

5337. Do you think that the farmers would

G o

give

Professor
Ferguson.

5 May 1873.

Professor
Ferguson.
5 May 1873.

give more information than there was disease?—I think, that in many cases, they would get their animals diseased on purpose.

5538. With regard to the importation of calves from England, is it the fact that that is an important trade?—It is far more extensive than it is generally thought to be; I have got some returns of the importation, which were collected two or three years ago; I got them collected, and I think Dr. Hancock collected them from the different vessels by examining the manifests; the importation of calves is really a considerable item, and has caused disease to be frequently imported into Ireland from England.

5539. Could you give those returns to the Committee?—I will apply for returns to be collected of the importation of calves into Ireland.

5540. Is it not the fact that the foot and mouth disease appears generally upon the East Coast somewhere near the three great shipping ports?—Yes, the foot of it is, it is generally in the course of the cattle traffic.

5541. In working its course, does it not appear to travel west from east rather than the other way?—Decidedly.

5542. It always appears to be more prevalent in the cattle track?—Yes.

5543. In all the counties in the east, Dublin, Drogheda, and Dundalk, the disease, as Mr. Jenkins says, varies from 23 to 11 per cent.?—I have read Mr. Jenkins' report two or three times over very carefully, and I think that anything that he states as a fact you will find it very difficult to controvert. I may not be able to agree with him with reference to his suggestions, but if he stated it as a fact you may rely upon it as a *bona fide* statement.

5544. Mr. Dodson.] What is the apthous disease which is coupled with foot and mouth disease in the Irish Order in Council?—It is identically the same. It is another name for the same thing. The professional gentlemen over here have given it that high-sounding name.

5545. *Chairman.* In your answer to the honourable Member for Belfast, you stated that if you had more staff you would make short work with contagious disease; do you mean that you could stamp out the disease?—I do not mean that I could stamp it out, but I would bring it down to a minimum in a very short time.

5546. You also stated that if you were told to carry out an order for the stoppage of movement, you would have no difficulty in doing so?—No.

5547. As regards the present Order of the 3d November 1870, is the 13th section of that Order carried out; it is an Order which declares that no animal affected with foot and mouth disease shall be moved alive from any farm, lands, premises, or places so affected, and that no animal which has been in contact, or herded with an animal so affected, shall be moved from such place except for immediate slaughter?—Not in every instance; but as I stated before, when I stated that I would make short work of it, it was with the understood condition that I had got a sufficient staff.

5548. But that is an order which the police in Ireland have to carry out now, is it carried out at this moment to any extent whatever?—It is most decidedly, the people are afraid of being what they call "fairly found out" by the police; they are greatly afraid that an animal may be seen limping along the road, but unless there is an

inspector to refer to to decide whether it really is foot and mouth distemper, or what is called apthous disease, the police are naturally timid about seising, being afraid of incurring responsibility.

5549. But this is a question of preventing the movement of any animal which has the disease or which has been herded with diseased animals from a farm, is that order carried out throughout Ireland?—Fairly as regards farms; but where the disease breaks out amongst cattle in transit or at fairs it is not carried out, for we find it impracticable.

5550. As regards fairs it is a dead letter?—It is practically in fact a dead letter.

5551. But you think that in a very large proportion of the 16,000 centres of infection which there were not long ago in Ireland, there was a stoppage of the infection?—Yes, I would not call them centres of infection, I would call them 15,000 infected places.

5552. I understood you to state, that notwithstanding everything that has been done, the foot and mouth disease has not been checked?—It has been checked very considerably, but certainly it has not been stamped out.

5553. That statement is contrary to the answer you gave to my questions previously; at Question 4975, you were asked "In fact, the result seems to show that nothing which has been done in Ireland has seriously checked the spread of the disease," and the reply I have here is "That is so"?—The spread of the disease has certainly been arrested, but not checked to anything like the extent that is desirable.

5554. In spite of restrictions the last epidemic has been as bad as any previous epidemic, has it not?—I think it has been worse.

5555. But you state that you do consider that pleuro-pneumonia has been checked?—I do, considerably checked.

5556. Do you think that the restrictions under the Act have checked that disease?—I do, most decidedly.

5557. I understand you to say that you thought the diminution of pleuro-pneumonia was in some respect owing to the increase of foot and mouth disease?—I only stated that, generally speaking, it has been found, from past experience, that yet very seldom have pleuro-pneumonia so rife during the existence of the foot and mouth distemper as you have when foot and mouth distemper does not exist. I should not be at all surprised that after this foot and mouth disease waned or declined away if we were visited with an outbreak of pleuro-pneumonia, unless extra precautions are adopted.

5558. Pleuro-pneumonia is very much more mortal than foot and mouth disease, is it not?—Very much more so.

5559. Then if you be right in the supposition that the spread of foot and mouth disease is accompanied by a diminution of pleuro-pneumonia, such diminution ought to be put to the credit side of the loss for foot and mouth disease?—I cannot say that; it is a fact, but I cannot explain it, and it is also a fact that animals, when they are suffering from one disease are not so susceptible of becoming affected with another.

5560. Then if the fact that they are affected by a disease which is not mortal makes them less susceptible to a disease which is mortal, that ought to be considered as some counterbalance to the loss from the lesser disease?—I do not think

Professor
Ferguson.

5 May 1873.

on, because although foot and mouth disease is not at all a fatal disease yet the losses from it must be very great; I know a great number of people who would prefer pleuro-pneumonia to break out upon their farms rather than foot and mouth disease, as they would lose a great deal less, and it would be much easier checked.

5561. I think, on the previous day on which you were examined, I asked you with regard to the Order in Council for disinfecting railways, and you said that it is the case that there is still an Order in force for the disinfection of railway trucks?—It is the case.

5562. The alteration that was made was not that the Order was altogether revoked, but that that part of the Order which ordered the use of chloride of lime was modified by the permission to use something else?—Yes; carbolic acid.

5563. Mr. *Clare Read*.] Who appointed the Honourable Mr. Moysten as Veterinary Commissioner?—The Lord Lieutenant. He is a gentleman who is a veterinary surgeon of very great experience.

5564. Was he the gentleman who said that there was no foot and mouth disease among the

sheep at Ballinasloe Fair?—He did not say that there was none; if you read his Report you will see what he states.

5565. His Report says, "As far as I can see there were no sheep affected with the acute form of foot and mouth disease"?—He is the person who reported that.

5566. That does not seem to have been the fact, does it?—I am inclined to believe that the amount of foot and mouth disease which appeared in Ballinasloe Fair, particularly among sheep, was greatly exaggerated; I think it was foot rot. I saw thousands of animals which came from Ballinasloe Fair, down upon their knees, and not able to stand. It was said to be foot and mouth disease, but I felt thoroughly convinced from an examination of the animals that it was foot rot.

5567. *Chamberlain*.] I think you stated that you got no salary for two years, is that so?—I do not think I was paid from early in 1867 to late in 1869, but I will furnish the Committee with a return upon that point; I am really not at all clear on the point, as I did not anticipate being examined on such matters.

Thursday, 8th May 1873.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mr. James Barclay.
Mr. Jacob Beight.
Mr. Cawley.
Mr. Clay.
Mr. Dent.
Mr. William Edward Forster.
Mr. William Johnston.

Mr. Kavanagh.
Mr. Lusk.
Mr. Monnell.
Mr. O'Connor.
Mr. Clare Read.
Mr. Ridley.
Mr. Tipping.

THE RIGHT HONOURABLE WILLIAM EDWARD FORSTER, IN THE CHAIR.

Mr. ROBERT MORROW, called in; and Examined.

Mr.
E. Morrow.
8 May 1873.

5566. Mr. W. Johnston.] I RELIEVE you are an extensive farmer and grazer, and exporter of cattle?—Yes, rather so; and reside at Legacurry, County Down, near Lisburn.

5569. And you have been so for a considerable time, have you not?—I have.

5570. For about how long?—It is about 40 years since I commenced first.

5571. Can you tell the Committee what extent of land you farm?—Nine hundred acres.

5572. Are those statute acres?—Unfortunately they are the little acres.

5573. You were selected, were you not, by the Council of the North-East Agricultural Association to come over here and give evidence as representing the opinions of the farmers in the north of Ireland?—I was.

5574. Will you tell the Committee the quantity of cattle you have exported in the last six years?—I have exported 2,400, and some odd.

5575. Could you give the Committee any idea of the gross value of that cattle?—I referred to my cattle book, and I saw that it was some twenty-one thousand, and some odd pounds; they were store beasts.

5576. Amongst that large number of cattle, had you many cases of foot and mouth disease?—In only one lot.

5577. To what port do you principally send your cattle?—Literally, for shipping, I have gone to Belfast.

5578. You ship principally to Glasgow, do you not?—To Glasgow.

5579. In what way are the cattle conveyed in the steamers, from Belfast to Glasgow?—On deck generally.

5580. Can you form any idea, generally, with reference to whether that is a better mode of conveyance than in the hold of a ship?—I would prefer the deck.

5581. Can you tell us any instance of the disease breaking out in cattle that you exported, which were apparently perfectly free from it when shipped at Belfast?—Yes; in September 1871 I selected 56 cattle out of nearly 300; I carried them by rail from within a mile of the park to Belfast, a distance of 15 miles, and then by steamer to Glasgow, and afterwards 18 miles, to Falkirk.

5582. How did they go from Glasgow to Falkirk?—By rail.

5583. When did the disease break out in this lot?—Part of them showed symptoms upon the fourth day.

5584. On what part of the journey did they show symptoms of disease?—They went to their destination in four days; they had only to cross the sea and go 18 miles by rail; they were very little more than an hour going out by train.

5585. Mr. Dent.] Did those cattle go to a private byre in Falkirk, or did they go to Falkirk Fair?—Those animals went to a park to wait for Falkirk Fair.

5586. Did the disease break out in this park before the animals went into the fair?—The disease broke out in the park previously to their going into the fair.

5587. What distance was the park from Falkirk?—About a mile.

5588. Mr. W. Johnston.] To what did you attribute the disease breaking out in these cattle?—To disease being prevalent in the locality.

5589. Were they in contact with any other cattle?—Only in going across in the boat.

5590. Was there any foot and mouth disease in the cattle on board?—I saw nothing of the sort in them.

5591. This was foot and mouth disease that broke out in your cattle?—Yes.

5592. Mr. Dent.] There were other cattle on board the boat besides your own, were there not?—Yes, there were.

5593. Mr. W. Johnston.] Have you known Irish cattle break out with foot and mouth disease before reaching Scotland?—Frequently.

5594. To what do you attribute that?—I attribute that to the disease being in the locality, or perhaps there might have been diseased cattle carried in some of the trucks.

5595. Do you think there is any danger of cattle becoming infected by being detained in the cattle markets when consigned to the salesman?—I think there is always danger in a large fair of the animals getting contagion.

5596. Have you any suggestions to make to the Committee with reference to the best means of prevention, either at the port of exportation or debarkation?

debarcation?—Yes, I have some few suggestions to make.

5697. Will you give the Committee any suggestions which you would wish to make?—I would recommend that at the port of shipping a proper veterinary inspector be appointed, and that he examine all stock in a yard provided for the purpose, before sunset, and that on the inspector finding them all in good health he should grant a certificate, and that no cattle be taken on board unless a certificate be given. On the other hand, if the inspector found any of them diseased, I would recommend the whole lot to be left at home; they have got plenty to themselves in England and Scotland, and if we send our diseased cattle there they make more of it.

5698. Can you give the Committee the number of cattle exported from Belfast in the year 1878?—According to the Export Returns from the Harbour Commissioners' office there were 100,396.

5699. What was the number of sheep exported during that time?—The number of sheep was 31,854.

5700. Can you tell us the number of horses?—The number was 6,908.

5701. Can you give the Committee any idea of what the per-centage of store cattle and fat cattle shipped from Belfast was?—I have calculated that from 70 to 80 per cent. are store cattle.

5702. Can you give any idea what proportion of these cattle go to England, and what proportion of them go to Scotland?—I should think one-half go. There are two ports, and sometimes three, that they go to. Some of the boats carry by Ardara, but there is Fleetwood and Morumbie; the boats go every night, and two boats go generally to Glasgow.

5703. In what year did you first discover foot and mouth disease in your stock?—The first time I ever discovered it was in the year 1843.

5704. Could you trace its origin among your stock?—I could not. I was at that time exporting to England, to Carlisle, and, unfortunately, I saw a lot of what we call Craven cows coming in; they were long-horns, and it was reported that the Craven cows had brought the disease to the market. At that time we had upon thousands the Irish, Scotch, and English gonnals, and the Craven cattle got placed upon the Irish ground, and we thought that we ought to have our own ground, and we put them off it; but at that time it was thought nothing of.

5705. Have you had much loss by death from foot and mouth disease among your stock?—In all my transactions, I think I never had ten animals die with foot and mouth disease.

5706. What deterioration in value do you think a beast sustains when suffering from foot and mouth disease?—That very much depends upon the season of the year and the condition of the animal. For instance, an animal at this time is worth 20 £, and I would say that he would not be more than 1 £ the loser, because he has time to get it over; there is time before winter. In a store animal of the value of 12 £, he has time to get it over; and in his case the loss would not be more than 1 £; and in a store animal of a year and a-half old, I think we should not lose more than 10 s.; but when it comes on to the season, when they have to sell as fat cattle, I should say that an animal worth 20 £ would lose 2 £, and a store of 12 £ would be reduced 1 £, and a year and a-half store 10 s. I think that that is as near as I can come to it.

Q 53.

5697. Mr. Dent.] With respect to the loss in breeding cows and milch cows, what would you put the loss down to those animals after they were attacked with foot and mouth disease?—It depends upon the locality. If you are in a locality where you sell milk very high, you must put it higher. In our locality we give away a portion, more of it we sell, and I do not put as much value upon it as some do.

5698. But do not you rear calves?—I do.

5699. Is there not a considerable loss in rearing calves if you have foot and mouth disease among your milking animals?—It depends upon the time of year at which they take it. If they take it at the time the calves are very young, there might be a little loss, but I never had a calf die yet; and if it is after August, then the milk is taken off the calves.

5700. Have you ever had abortion among your cows as an after-effect of foot and mouth disease?—I had three out of twelve abort.

5701. Mr. W. Johnston.] Had you ever pleuropneumonia amongst your stock?—I had.

5702. In what year?—In 1846.

5703. What were the circumstances of that outbreak?—I had three cases, and when I saw the first case I removed the animal, and I saw another case, and I moved that, and another, and the three died. I have never had another case that I am aware of.

5704. Have you ever had any other disease?—I have had all the diseases that ever were among cattle, I think, in my time.

5705. Have you had cattle plague among your cattle?—Unfortunately I had.

5706. In what year had you cattle plague amongst your cattle?—In the year 1865, in Scotland.

5707. Are you aware of its being in any locality in Ireland at the same time?—Not at the same time.

5708. At what time?—In the following year, in April and May, it was in a locality called Drumagh.

5709. In what neighbourhood?—In the neighbourhood of Lishnu; within four miles of Lishnu.

5710. Have you had more than one case?—Unfortunately I lost 267 £ in Scotland.

5711. Have you had cattle plague amongst your stock in Ireland?—Never.

5712. With regard to sheep, have you had the foot and mouth disease amongst your stock?—I have.

5713. When was that?—Last October. I purchased 300 at Falkirk October Tryst, and I sent them to the salesman's field for two days. When they arrived at Belfast I met the host, and I saw that they were diseased. I then sent them by rail to a farm that I had adjoining a large park, and in a few days there were about 200 of them on their knees. I then thought it wise to inform the police at the nearest station, and in about three weeks I removed them into a large park.

5714. Did you lose many of them by that disease?—I lost just three; one of them was injured just before in Glasgow by a cart.

5715. It has been given in evidence before this Committee that foot and mouth disease has been supposed to have been propagated by deer, hares and rabbits, and wood pigeons; have you any deer, or hares and rabbits, and wood pigeons in your park?—I have some hundreds too many.

Q 53

5626. Have

Mr.
R. Morrow.
8 May 1879.

Mr.
R. Morris.
—
8 May 1873.

5626. Have you any knowledge with reference to the existence of foot and mouth disease among them?—No. I would be very glad if it had got among a few of the hares and rabbits in November to rid them up. The landlord was not at home during the shooting season, but he happened to call with a party one day, and he killed 151; that made a little difference, and next day he caught 50.

5627. Were those hares?—Yes. As regards rabbits I cannot tell much about them; I do not see anything of them; they soon get into their burrows.

5628. What is your opinion as regards the relative proportion of the existence of foot and mouth disease in 1872 and 1873 as compared with 1871?—I know nothing of it in 1873 in my locality, and I had not a single case in 1873. Out of all my cattle which I sent to Edinburgh only two got injured somehow or other by the passage, which was rough, and I did not take them to market. The next day I thought to sell them in the fat market, and I drove them in; it was a general inspection, and I was very well aware of what was the matter with them, or I would not have taken them, as I would have been liable to a fine, so I left them, and got them put into a stable, and they both got foot and mouth disease.

5629. Have you any knowledge of the health of cattle in the counties of Down and Antrim?—I had not a single case of foot and mouth disease, and as to pleuro-pneumonia I know nothing of it; if there be any I am not aware of it.

5630. Mr. Kewenagh.] You say that you took 56 cattle out of the 300 to send to Falkirk?—Yes.

5631. Were any of those 300 diseased afterwards?—Not a single one of the remainder was diseased.

5632. I suppose they had not had any disease before?—They had not; I have had this park six years, and I have never had a single animal which had foot and mouth disease upon it; it is walled in.

5633. Do you recommend veterinary inspection at the port of shipping?—I do.

5634. You recommend that a certificate should be given that an animal was sound, without which it should not be shipped?—That is so.

5635. In the case of a diseased lot you think they should be left at home?—Yes.

5636. Would you have them given back to the owner?—I would rather have them taken back to my own land where I had the grass for nothing, than take them to England or Scotland where I have dear grass, and where the cattle would have to be sold at a disadvantage.

5637. You would recommend a diseased lot to be sent back to their owner?—I certainly would.

5638. You would not agree with Professor Ferguson that they should be looked upon as contraband and confiscated?—Professor Ferguson and I very often agree; but I would say that cattle should be returned to the owner in a case of foot and mouth disease, because it is not fatal.

5639. Do not you think it would be rather a salutary sort of punishment to a man sending diseased cattle, to have the animals confiscated?—I would think he was better off than sending the animals to England, and getting fined for moving them about perhaps.

5640. But do not you think that it would be a salutary sort of restitution if it were well known that cattle belonging to any man which were found diseased at the port of shipment should be confiscated?—There is no doubt that it would, but if the owner of the cattle knew that they were diseased he would not attempt to send the cattle there. He would not attempt to send cattle that there had been disease amongst, because he would know that the disease would soon break out.

5641. Do you think that it would be too severe a punishment?—I do not; I should look at their going forward, and getting into a worse place.

5642. You think it would not be too severe?—You would not find it too severe a punishment to be told, "You must take those cattle back," because I might bring them back to their value again.

5643. I do not think you understand my question; Professor Ferguson recommended that any cattle found diseased at the port should be confiscated, not sent back?—I would be very sorry to kill an animal affected with foot and mouth disease; I would give it a trial unless you gave me full value for the animal, and then you might do as you chose.

5644. But I am examining you rather as to whether it would be a good plan to put some sort of punishment on the farmer for sending stock away diseased, in order to make him careful about sending stock away that were diseased. Do you think, looking at it in that light, that making diseased cattle contraband would be a good plan?—I would rather give him a chance with the animal and let him take it back, unless you give him the full price. There is no doubt that in three or four weeks the farmer would have the animal up to the mark again.

5645. In sending a diseased animal back again would not there be a risk of infecting railway trucks or anything else in which it was sent back?—Certainly; but we could take it in our own country, and it would be better than to send it to another country.

5646. You would not object to the disease being disseminated in that way?—I am not so frightened as many of them. I have been long used to it, and I think that there is more said about the disease than there should be.

5647. You think that there is more said made about it than there should be?—A great deal more.

5648. You mentioned the case of some Cornish cows, where were they from?—From Leamshire.

5649. Were they imported into Ireland?—No, they were brought to Carlisle at the time I was importing into Carlisle.

5650. There was no intention of exporting them to Ireland?—Not the least.

5651. You mentioned the case of your having pleuro-pneumonia on your farm, and you removed the stock, what do you mean by that?—I kept them in a house in an isolated part.

5652. You did not kill them?—I did not. At that time there was no killing, but they died. There was one young bull, rather a favourite bull, and he died in 14 days.

5653. I do not know whether you have heard the suggestion which has been made to this Committee by Professor Baldwin, that it would be advisable to stop all fairs and markets in the months of June and July, and the movement of all

all store cattle during that time, in the hope that that would be effectual in reducing foot and mouth disease to a minimum, and that after that had been done all cases of foot and mouth disease which occurred should be dealt with as cattle plagues, would you agree with that suggestion?—I would not; I am against all restrictions except upon cattle plagues.

5654. Do you think that if that recommendation was thought to be advisable it could be carried out?—I am afraid it would not take very well in Ireland. Last year the graziers of store stock got 2½ a head more in June and July than what was got for the same sort of animal in October, and there are a great many prepared to sell store animals in June and July I know this season, in the north of Ireland.

5655. What would they get in June and July as compared with the month of May?—That would depend upon the state the animals were in; if they thrived well in July, two months upon the grass makes a great improvement. I would not be willing to sell an animal off in July unless I had got full grass on it.

5656. You think that, upon the whole, it would be very detrimental to those engaged in the cattle trade?—I am certain it would, and to the farmers and graziers too.

5657. Do you think that if this restriction were carried out, it would be possible to discover a case of outbreak afterwards?—That depends upon the means which you would take. If you had the police well arranged in every district, perhaps you might, but still there would be some cases which they would not find out, because the people are not very willing to bring anything down upon themselves.

5658. You think you could not depend upon discovering every single outbreak of disease?—I would not depend upon it.

5659. Is your district very thickly populated?—It is pretty thickly populated. I am within nine miles of Belfast. Our farms, taking them all over the County Down, I suppose, do not average 30 acres.

5660. Have you a sufficient number of police in your district to visit every field in which cattle are?—I could not answer that question.

5661. Do you think it would be desirable to have more?—They have a great deal of duty to do; they are very often called away to fairs, and I am afraid there would not be sufficient of them at present.

5662. Have you not sufficient police to keep up an efficient inspection at present?—I can only give my opinion. I think not. I do not know the number of police in County Down.

5663. You think it would be almost impossible to discover every fresh outbreak of disease?—Very nearly so, I should say.

5664. Can you tell me anything about the importation of calves from England into Ireland?—I am not aware of any in the north of Ireland.

5665. [Chairman.] How long have you been in the trade?—I have been in the trade for 40 years.

5666. And pretty largely engaged in it, I suppose, for some time?—Yes, you would call it large in some counties, and in some counties you would not; in the south and west of Ireland you would not call it large.

5667. I call it large with regard to the quantity you have exported; you have been in the habit of exporting this quantity for some time, I suppose?
o. 58.

—I did a great deal more up to 1865; it was double the number for six years.

5668. You farm a good deal yourself, do you not; 800 acres?—I graze part, but I have a tillage farm of 120 acres apart from that grazing farm.

5669. But how many beasts do you generally own as a farmer, independently of what you buy to export?—I only keep about 20 on the bone farm. I send all my young ones away to this out-farm.

5670. About how long do you keep the cattle you buy for the purpose of exporting?—I begin to buy in January, and generally finish about the 1st of June.

5671. Then you will hold a heavy stock in May and April?—Formerly I commenced my export the first Wednesday in June. I had a connection formed in Scotland, and commenced on the first Wednesday in June, and kept it up for three weeks.

5672. Then if the Irish Privy Council were to issue an order telling you not to move your cattle in the months of June and July, they would pick out the most awkward months for you?—But I have dropped that; I do not send until September now. I am not speaking on my own account; it is for the public interest.

5673. But what do you do with the cattle between June and September?—I keep them upon the grass.

5674. You keep them out until that time?—I keep them up until the second Tuesday in September, and then the second Tuesday in October and the 15th of October, and I have what is called the Hallow Fair, which is a great fair.

5675. Do most men in the trade do like you?—No, they do not.

5676. What do they do?—They just sell whenever they can, and whenever they can get a good profit on the sale.

5677. Having bought these animals in January, they do not keep them longer than they can manage?—But they do not buy them in January, because they have not got winter keep for them; they are beginning to buy now.

5678. What becomes of your beasts in Scotland generally, in the winter?—In Scotland they are generally tied up for turpans, and a small portion of them go into the straw-yard.

5679. Do they go to Falkirk?—They go to Falkirk at the two trysts.

5680. Having been in the trade so long, there must have been a good many years during which there was a good deal of talk about foot and mouth disease?—I have heard of it many times in my journey; it is constantly talked of.

5681. Do you think this attack last year was very much worse than in previous years?—The first time I had it was in 1843, and I never had it so badly; they lost some of their beefs.

5682. But I am not speaking of what you have yourself suffered; but from your knowledge, do you not think that this is a very much worse attack of the disease than previous attacks?—It was more extensive, I think. At least, it was taken up more, and was more thought of since 1845 than ever it was before.

5683. Those animals which you buy in order to sell, you must keep long enough for the foot and mouth disease to develop itself, if it was in them when you bought them?—Yes, quite long enough.

5684. Yet it appears that you have been very fortunate;
o c 4

Mr.
R. Morris.
8 May 1873.

Mr. fortunate; you have not had much disease?—I have been very fortunate.

8 May 1873. 5685. Have you taken great care in your purchases?—I act as particular as possible.

5686. Have you refused many animals because you thought that they would be very likely to have foot and mouth disease?—I have not. If it were not for the restrictions, if I got a lot cheap, I would buy them, and lay them on my grass until the back end.

5687. Whether they had foot and mouth disease or not?—Yes, whether they had foot and mouth disease or not.

5688. When you talk about "cheap," you buy beasts at 6*l* a head, do you not?—No; I never buy any so low as that.

5689. What is your general price?—This year I gave up to 15*l*, and I am very little below 10*l*.

5690. Supposing you would give 10*l* for a beast without the foot and mouth disease; I do not say that if he actually had it, but if you thought there was great danger of his having it; how much less would you offer?—I would try the man to pull him down; if I thought I could have it, I would certainly take advantage, but when I say that, there are very few who could do it, because I should have places where I could keep them by themselves, and no neighbour could get near them.

5691. You stated that you would buy them if they were offered to you cheap; what would you consider a cheap price?—If the seller would give me a pound per head back I would take them.

5692. There are a good many restrictions now, are there not?—I believe there are, but I am not aware of them.

5693. Do you think that these restrictions have done any good towards stopping the spread of the disease?—I do not know; I do not like killing, that is one thing.

5694. With regard to the present restrictions with reference to the foot and mouth disease, there is no order to kill in the case of foot and mouth disease at present, but there is an order to prevent movement; do you think these orders do anything to stop the disease?—I have no doubt that they might; there is no doubt that if diseased animals came into contact with sound animals they must of course catch the contagion.

5695. Are there many small farmers about you?—A great number.

5696. The evidence that has been before us was to this effect, that the large farmers would be willing to support very strong restrictions with regard to foot and mouth disease, such, for instance, as the stoppage of all fairs in June and July, and so much longer as was necessary, and the stoppage of movement; what do you say with regard to the feeling of the large farmers first?—I am not aware of anyone who wishes for restrictions in my locality.

5697. Would that dislike to them be shared by the small farmers?—I should think so; the small farmers would even be worse.

5698. It would be very difficult, would it not, even with your police in Ireland, to carry out this order if the feeling of the farmer were against it?—It would not be very pleasant.

5699. I am not talking about the pleasure of carrying out the order, but the success of carrying it out?—I really could not answer that question, because I could not tell the duty that the police would have to do.

5700. The duty which the police would have

to perform would be to see that there were no fairs held, that would be easy, and secondly, to stop all movement except with licenses; now supposing no movement was allowed except with licenses, do you not imagine that licenses would be given almost indiscriminately?—No, I think not; it all depends upon the parties who give them; if they are given by proper persons they would never attempt to do such a thing.

5701. If the licenses were generally given in cases of immediate slaughter, or in cases of very great necessity, do you imagine the farmers would feel that the restrictions would be very onerous?—If a large farmer wanted to take his fat stock, and could take them in no other way except by going for a certificate, he must submit to the Order.

5702. Have you had much pleuro-pneumonia among your beasts?—I never had but the three cases I have mentioned, in the year 1845.

5703. Have many of your neighbours had pleuro-pneumonia amongst their cattle?—Very few; it is more, I should think, about the large towns, but if I had one animal that showed any symptoms of it I would not keep it very long.

5704. You would sell the animal off as soon as you could?—No; if the animal was fat I would slaughter it.

5705. But if it was not fat?—If the flesh would not pass the inspector I would slaughter it myself; I would not run the risk.

5706. But supposing it was such a beast as was not fit for slaughter, would you not be inclined to sell him?—I would say to a small butcher, "Can you pass this animal? If you think he will pass the inspector I do not think I should be very far wrong in selling him."

5707. Mr. Cove Road.] You would not sell him to a farmer?—I would not; and I would not sell him to a man who would do anything but slaughter him.

5708. Chairmen.] Do you take your beasts yourself to the shipping port?—I generally meet them at the shipping port; I have just nine miles to go from my own place, and I go to meet them; of late I am rather particular about their movements. I go to Belfast to meet them, and I cross over with them; I think I had better do so.

5709. What sort of arrangements are made for those animals?—They are first rate upon the mail boats.

5710. In the mail boats from Belfast to Glasgow?—From Belfast to Glasgow.

5711. Do they go on deck?—They all go on deck in the mail boats.

5712. How long is the voyage?—It will be 12 hours from the time they are shipped until they are unshipped.

5713. Do you have them watered before they go on board?—Mine do not require water, because they have Lough Neagh for a watering-place, and they get a good drink before they leave, and they have just 15 miles to go to the port; I just have to arrange for them to go. I live near the port, and I ship them at eight o'clock in the evening, and I leave at two.

5714. You water and feed them before they leave?—I do.

5715. Let us follow these cattle out; what time do the cattle generally leave Belfast?—They generally leave Belfast at eight in the evening.

5716. And at what time do they get to Glasgow?—They get to Glasgow generally about eight

MR.
R. MORRIS.
8 May 1873.

eight o'clock in the morning; they are up at the quay at eight o'clock in the morning.

5717. Do you think that many of them catch foot and mouth disease on board ship?—I do not think that many of them catch the disease on board the mail boat; she is nicely kept, and they have the hose at work sometimes up the Clyde.

5718. What do you do with them when you get them to Glasgow; how long are you before you put them into the railway?—I go by the first train I can get away by.

5719. Do you water the cattle before you put them on the train?—There are troughs at the stations either of the Caledonian Railway or the North British Railway.

5720. How long have these troughs been there; do you know?—I do not know; but they have large sheds for turning the cattle into with troughs there.

5721. Are the animals watered at those troughs?—Some of the animals will take it, and some will not.

5722. But they have the chance of it?—They have the chance of it.

5723. You take the animals generally to Falkirk, do you not?—In the season of the year, when it suits; in September and October.

5724. And they get to Falkirk at what time?—They are generally turned about four o'clock into the pasture fields; I have pasture fields near Larbert.

5725. Do you attend the large fairs in Ireland?—I do not now; I formerly did, but I was following up the export trade then; I graze more now. Since 1865 I have turned my attention more to sheep.

5726. Have you much to do with sheep now?—A little.

5727. Had you ever foot and mouth disease in sheep, before last year?—I had luncheon, but I did not think it was foot and mouth disease; but this was a general thing when I had 300 of them on their knees.

5728. You are sure it was foot and mouth disease?—I looked at the mouths of them and I could see that there was a little inflammation, but I could see nothing else.

5729. What is your opinion now as to what it was?—I set it down as foot and mouth disease.

5730. We have had evidence given here that there are very few veterinary surgeons in some parts of Ireland; have you got veterinary surgeons about you?—We have; we have had Professor Ferguson, and he cleared our country up at the time of the cattle plague.

5731. Had you that cattle plague near you?—We had.

5732. In answer to my honourable friend, the Member for Carlisle, I think you stated that you would not have the animals confiscated which had the foot and mouth disease, but that you would send them back?—I would.

5733. You think, if I understand you rightly, that it would be a fair thing if at the port of Liverpool or the port of Bristol, an animal was found with foot and mouth disease, that animal should be sent back to the owner in Ireland?—That was not my answer; I did not refer to their landing in England; I would have a veterinary surgeon to inspect them, and if he found a diseased animal among them I would send them back before shipping.

5734. You would send them back to the owner?—

owner?—The owner should take them back, whether he chose or not.

5735. What you mean is this; that if you came to Belfast with a cargo of cattle, if any of them had the foot and mouth disease, you should be told that you could not ship them, and what would you do with them then?—I would be very thankful that they should be allowed to be returned to the grass until I could get them over the distemper.

5736. There was evidence given before this Committee that the probable loss to Ireland by foot and mouth disease last year was one million and a half?—I could not go into such large figures. I work my own little calculations out, but I could not go into these large figures.

5737. Supposing you arrived at Glasgow with your cargo, and then you found that you had some animals affected with foot and mouth disease, what would you do with them?—I would endeavour to get them away to my park; generally a park is taken for me at the Falkirk Trust, when I take them over in November.

5738. I suppose that the export of cattle to England is not only a large trade in Ireland, but is an increasing trade?—It is a large trade, but I really do not know whether it is increasing or not.

5739. Have many fresh people gone into the trade within the last four or five years?—There are plenty going into the trade, and plenty dying out of it, and some failing.

5740. And others making good fortunes?—There are some, no doubt, who make good fortunes.

5741. Mr. Dent.] You generally go with your own cattle into Scotland, do you not?—I had a nephew who always topped them, and I went to market the day previous; but he has gone on his own account now, and I send a man in charge if I do not go over; but I generally go now, since the disease was so prevalent. I thought that would give me a chance of escaping it better.

5742. You expect in good large lots at a time, do you not?—I do in pretty large lots, if you call them large; 100, or as far as 170 sometimes.

5743. You generally go to the sale yourself, do you not?—Yes. There was a year or two when I left them to a salesman, but I generally sold myself; I ran away when I had done, and left it to him to collect the money.

5744. Yours are a first-class sort of cattle, are they not?—No, they are not the first-class; they are bought at 10*l.* or 16*l.*, and you would not get first-class cattle for that; they are the medium class.

5745. What part of Ireland do those wretched animals come from that we see in the Yorkshire markets?—I do not know whether they come from our parts or not. I think they come from Donegal.

5746. We see them there with the bones almost coming through the skin; they have had calves; they are not young?—They do not come from the County Down; we do not keep them so old as that.

5747. Now with regard to those parks you spoke of, they are occupied by different dealers, are they not?—Not those that I take.

5748. But a good many of them are sometimes occupied by one dealer, and sometimes by another at the different fairs, are they not?—They are.

H M

5749. There

M.
R. MORRIS.
—
8 May 1873.

5749. There is a good deal of foot and mouth disease, which is sometimes developed in those parks or paddocks, is there not?—I would beg to say that there is great danger about cattle markets, especially the metropolitan markets; cattle going forward are generally consigned to a salesman, and from the sea voyage and other things there are generally some animals which, upon their arrival, are not fit to be thrown upon the market, and perhaps one or two of these must be left over, and they get into a park where perhaps a diseased heifer has been, or perhaps the animals have got the disease themselves, and then there will be a fresh lot come up the next week, and the animals are taken out, and there is a great opportunity given for the fresh lot which is put into the park to get the disease. I would suggest that upon an inspector finding diseased animals upon any park kept for the accommodation of drover's cattle, the proprietor should be prohibited from taking in any fresh stock for some time.

5750. Do not you think it would be a fair thing to have all those parks registered, and regularly reported to the police?—If we had an inspector he would go round and see to that; my cattle are very often inspected the night before or two nights before; two inspectors go together, and they go to nearly every field.

5751. Are those inspectors the public inspectors, or are they appointed by the cattle dealers to look round, and see whether the cattle are all right?—They are public inspectors.

5752. But they have not the right of entry into those fields?—They go round because they know where the cattle are, and if they find the disease they go to the owner, and say, if you attempt to bring these cattle on to the fair to-morrow you will be liable to a fine, and they tell the same thing to the salesman, and frequently there are lots left out.

5753. Is it not often the case that where there are two or three beasts affected they are left in the parks, and the remainder of the herd is brought into the market?—Yes.

5754. That is a fertile source of spreading the disease, is it not?—Very much so.

5755. I see it is stated that there are something like 6,000 fairs a year held in Ireland alone; do you think there is any advantage in having these small fairs?—Every farmer likes to have a market near himself; he does not like to have to drive 10 or 15 miles with his animal or pig; you have not so much chance of the disease in those fairs as you have in the larger markets.

5756. With respect to railway trucks in Ireland, is there any care or precaution taken about clearing or disinfecting them after they have carried cattle to and from a fair?—I believe generally they are very slovenly about it.

5757. There is not that attention paid to it that there should be?—There is not; there is not that attention paid to it that there is in Scotland.

5758. You stated that you thought very little disease was carried in the mail steamers, and that the accommodation in them was good?—Yes, the accommodation is excellent.

5759. But by your mentioning those steamers, I suppose there are other steamers which go from Belfast?—There are, but passengers go upon the mail steamers and they are kept tidier.

5760. Are the arrangements for cattle upon the other steamers going from Belfast good?—Yes, they are fairish.

5761. Do they carry below or upon the deck?—There is one of them that carries below in a thronged time. Messrs. Burns have a special boat which carries cattle both above and below, but she is in nice order.

5762. Speaking generally, do you consider your cattle vessels from Belfast are kept in good order, and properly cleansed and disinfected?—I should say, as a whole, they are kept in excellent order.

5763. You do not think that much foot and mouth disease is caught on board the boats?—If there is disease in animals you do not know where they will catch it, but out of the boats I should not; they are good hard decks and well washed.

5764. The mail steamers belong to Messrs. Burns, do they not?—Yes, they do, and are very well kept.

5765. Are the holds as well kept as the decks?—I do not know, but they never carry cattle in the holds; there is so much cargo going that they do not carry cattle in the holds.

5766. In none of the steamers that go from Belfast do they ever carry any cattle in the hold?—In the special steamer of Messrs. Burns which comes there in very thronged times they carry them in the hold, but not regularly, they have small pens for them, and they are very well fitted up.

5767. Are the animals well carried as regards room?—Upon a deck passage I would not like mine to have too much room; they have shifting planks put about 20 feet apart and sometimes more.

5768. You say you have no foot and mouth disease in your part of Ireland now?—I am not aware of any.

5769. Has it never occurred to you that foot and mouth disease sometimes comes with a sudden wave and then dies off again?—It has; a few years ago you would not have heard it mentioned.

5770. Have you noticed that since 1843 it has come in periods of years and has died away again?—It has, and I expect it will die out now of its own accord.

5771. You do not attribute the lessening of that disease to the restrictions which have been imposed?—I could not say that, but I would say that where there is a large traffic in cattle the tracks should be well cleansed, and in Scotland they have them regularly well washed with lime.

5772. They do not do that in Ireland, do they?—No.

5773. Would you not put restrictions upon the movement of diseased cattle; if a man had foot and mouth diseased cattle upon his farm, would you not prevent him from putting them into the market or upon a highway?—Yes, there are restrictions now, and if a diseased animal was found in the market it would be taken.

5774. But I understood you to say that the evil of foot and mouth disease were so much exaggerated that you would do away with the restrictions affecting it?—I would examine the cattle at the ports just to get our credit up, so that we should not send it to England, as they have plenty of their own here.

5775. But you would go further than that; you would prevent cattle being moved along a road or placed in a market, would you not?—Yes; if they got to Belfast I would say they must go back by train.

5776. But

5776. But you would not allow a farmer who had foot and mouth diseased animals to move those cattle to fairs and markets, or to move them along a road, would you?—He would be a very foolish man to take them to a fair or market.

5777. If there was no restriction he would do so, would he not?—He might; but I know that if I had animals diseased I would be sorry to sell them in that state, as they show to disadvantage.

5778. But it is not everybody that is so shrewd as you are; there are many people who think that if they had a diseased animal the sooner they got rid of it the better?—There are, no doubt.

5779. Mr. Kewenig. Would it not be almost impossible to move a beast that was badly affected with foot and mouth disease?—Not altogether, because when they get warm they look better.

5780. They would be able to move?—Yes; but there is nothing like resting for them; they soon get better.

5781. Mr. Clere Read. Would you have any restrictions upon animals affected with pleuro-pneumonia?—Yes; if I had an animal affected with pleuro-pneumonia I would kill him myself. If he had only been in contact you should pay me the whole value, and if I had a beast badly affected pay me half.

5782. Would you give the whole value in the case of compulsory slaughter?—If I had the disease in a herd I would say, kill that one, and pay me half, and if you kill a sound animal pay me the whole value.

5783. Chairman. You mean by that answer that you think that not only the animal that has pleuro-pneumonia, but the animals which are in the same lot should be killed?—If you wish to kill them you may do so upon paying me.

5784. But you think the fair thing would be to pay you half the previous value of the animal which had the disease, and the whole value of the others?—If I had one animal affected with pleuro-pneumonia I would take half the value for it, but I would not like that all the animals that had been in contact should be paid for at half the value, or taken at less than first cost.

5785. Mr. Maxwell. But would you make the killing of those animals which had been in contact compulsory?—No; I would expect that if you killed them you should pay me the full value, or let them prove themselves.

5786. But I understand you are not in favour of compulsorily killing those animals which have been in contact?—No; I would kill those that had been diseased, and then you should pay me the half value, and then, if I was compelled to kill those which had been in contact, but were sound, then you should pay me the full price.

5787. Mr. Clere Read. I understand you to say that it would be a good thing, if they were killed by order of the inspector, that half the value of those actually diseased should be given to the farmer?—Of those actually diseased, certainly.

5788. If you had a bullock worth 20*l.* just attacked with the disease, if he had plenty of flesh upon him, he would be worth more than half?—Yes; but I would say if you would leave me to myself, and the animal was not attacked as to be injurious, I could get nearly the full value for him.

5789. Supposing a man was compensated for his loss in this way, that is to say, if you had a bullock worth 20*l.*, and you killed him and lost 10*l.* by it, and then there was, say, 7*l.* 10*s.* sold.

5790. Do not you think that pleuro-pneumonia is so fatal a disease, even from your own limited experience of it, that it would be a very good thing to have all animals affected with pleuro-pneumonia killed at once?—With pleasure, on paying compensation.

5790^a. Do not you think it would be a good thing for the stock owners of Ireland to get rid of the disease?—It would prevent the spread of the disease.

5791. Do you think that there is a good deal of pleuro-pneumonia in the town dairies?—There generally is.

5792. But in the rural districts of Ireland there is not much?—There is very little there.

5793. May I ask why you have kept more sheep in preference to cattle since the year 1865?—It has been rather risky to keep a whole stock of cattle; I think it is better to divide the stock.

5794. You mean risky, because cattle are more subject to disease than sheep?—From 1865 we did not know that the cattle plague was going to stop, and in 1866 we had it in Ireland.

5795. You thought you might have another visitation?—Yes, we thought so; and very likely we might have had, if it had not been that Professor Ferguson got it stamped out.

5796. It was the fear of that that made you alter your system of husbandry?—That and the fact that I was advised to do it; and I have found it to my advantage.

5797. You found that sheep paid better than cattle?—I found it paid those few years pretty well.

5798. How long did those sheep which you had affected with foot and mouth disease last year take to get over it?—They were all upon their legs in a month.

5799. Would that have been the case if it had not been foot-rot?—I cannot tell; in the course of a month they were all upon their feet again, and served; the run was put to them.

5800. You had foot-rot in your sheep, I believe?—Yes; I had something in the way of lameness, and the shepherd pared their feet, and cured them.

5801. I want to know whether you have ever had the foot-rot in sheep cured in the course of a month, without paring and dressing the sheep?—Foot-rot requires a good while to cure, because sometimes they cast the hoof; and you require to pare and pare the hoof until you have a new one making; that sometimes lasts some time.

5802. Although you did not see any disease in in those animals' mouths, you have no hesitation in saying that it was foot and mouth disease?—I think from the number, and the quickness with which they got down, that it was foot and mouth disease.

5803. And the quickness with which they get up?—Yes, no doubt.

5804. Mr. Barclay. Do you find the trucks in Scotland pretty closely kept and disinfected?—I do not know about the disinfection, but they are clean, and they are very particular, and they put in sawdust for your sheep, and that sort of thing.

5805. And with regard to those Scotch railways, the Caledonian, the Glasgow, and South Western, and the North British, do they all keep their trucks pretty clean?—Yes, the Caledonian and the North British Companies carry to Edinburgh,

Mr.
R. Morris.
—
8 May 1873.

Mr.
R. Morrow.
8 May 1873.

burgh, and the Caledonian goes everywhere, and you cannot tell where it stops.

5806. Where do you sell the greater part of the cattle you send over to Scotland?—I sell it at Falkirk Tryse and at Edinburgh. Edinburgh has been my principal market for 28 years.

5807. We find in the north of Scotland the kind of Irish cattle such as was referred to by an honourable Member as yearlings and two-year-olds, in a very poor condition; where do they come from?—I do not know. I have seen some cattle come from I do not know where; we have such queer little spots in Ireland that we can turn out those little things from; one man said, "we just shovel them out of a quarry."

5808. Are those the smaller class of dealers, or what I might call local dealers, or are they the larger class of dealers who have that special trade?—I do not know them, but I would suppose that they would be small dealers, because they want to have a good many heads for their money, and from that I would consider they were small, because you cannot have a great many good heads for the money.

5809. Are you in favour of inspection at the port of shipment?—I am, to please the English, and let them try afterwards how they will get on with their own.

5810. How do you mean with their own?—They have plenty of disease amongst themselves. I meet it at Falkirk, where there are some hundreds of hullocks coming, and you will always see some coming to Falkirk Tryse diseased.

5811. There is a very general complaint in the north of Scotland that these Irish cattle bring across pleuro-pneumonia?—I could not say what the complaint is there, but I hope it is groundless.

5812. Mr. Tipping.] You were saying that when the cattle arrive in the pens of the Scotch railways at Glasgow, some of the cattle drink, and some do not?—Yes; some do, and some do not.

5813. What is the result of your observation; do more drink than do not, or what have you noticed?—Cattle coming from Belfast are not very thirsty; they are not so long in the train; at least, mine are not.

5814. As far as you have seen, do you consider cattle suffer much in travelling by steam and rail from want of water?—I have not noticed that, because mine are short journeys. I have no lengthened journeys.

5815. From what you have seen in Scotland, have you observed much suffering in that way?—No, I have not, because I seldom go any length, except Edinburgh or Falkirk. For the last 28 years I never was further than Stirling that way. I never go north.

5816. I think I heard you state that you were decidedly of opinion that the foot and mouth disease would gradually die out?—I hope so; I live in good faith of that.

5817. And you think that, upon the whole, there is too much fuss made about it?—Yes; a great deal more than there should be.

5818. Mr. Bailey.] I understand you to state that you do not know anything about the kind of Irish cattle which come into the Carlisle market and into the Northumberland market?—I should know it, because there is a great deal of cattle bought in the county Down; dealers go regularly to it, and a very good class of cattle

they do bring; the very best bred cattle in the north go from county Down to Carlisle.

5819. Do you know where they go to from Carlisle?—I do not know; I have not been there for a number of years.

5820. Mr. Jacob Bright.] From what I have heard of your evidence you do not appear to be in favour of increased restrictions upon a farm?—Certainly not.

5821. I judge that you would wish the Government to confine its efforts to what can be done for the improvement of the health of the cattle without fresh restrictions?—I should think that it would be the first thing to try.

5822. You would have the railway trucks and steamers and other vessels, and in fact everything in which cattle are moved about, kept scrupulously clean if you could?—Certainly.

5823. You think a good deal might be done in that way to promote the health of cattle?—Cleanliness is health.

5824. You are against further restrictions?—I am.

5825. Are you in favour of such restrictions as already exist, or would you diminish them?—I would not diminish them until the foot and mouth disease decreases.

5826. I think you stated that those diseases change very much, and may in fact disappear, although nobody may do anything more?—I hope so.

5827. Chairman.] I should gather from your answers to the honourable Member for Norfolk, that foot-and took a much longer time to cure than foot and mouth disease?—I did not express that opinion, but I said that in some instances it took a long time to get the sheep on their feet, but in comparing the two I do not wish to draw any conclusion, as it depends upon the attack.

5828. You said that nobody could expect to keep a lot of stock without having something to master with them in the course of a year?—You cannot keep sheep or anything; you must attend to that.

5829. Then do not you think that if there is a statement made that there is a very large loss from foot and mouth disease, that statement, in order to be fair, ought to be accompanied by a statement of what had been the loss by disease in a previous year from any kind of disease?—We may not have the same another year, and if you commence to kill out I am afraid the loss would be greater in some places or other; I do not know where the money would come from for it; I would give it a trial.

5830. You would give what a trial?—I would try another year with the restrictions which you have.

5831. Mr. Borsley.] But with regard to the question of the Right Honourable Chairman, the other diseases of cattle are no less this year, as they, in consequence of the foot and mouth disease?—I could not say that; I would confine myself to my own locality, as I have not been much in the south or west of Ireland, so that I cannot say what they are; but I consider there has not been so much foot and mouth disease in the year 1872 as there was in the latter end of 1871.

5832. Has your cattle been pretty healthy in other respects?—Yes, very much so.

5833. More healthy than in previous years, excepting as regards foot and mouth disease?—

I had

I had no foot and mouth disease, except the two that took it in Scotland.

5834. Have cattle been more healthy than in previous years?—I take my own locality; I do not go beyond it; I think they are better in health, and I think there is rather less of foot

and mouth disease than there was in 1871. My neighbours were running day and night to me, saying, "Shall I report about my two or three cows?" and I said, "I will give you no advice; you must see the Order;" and last year there were not nearly so many coming to me.

Mr.
R. Merrow.
8 May 1879.

Mr. HENRY MICHAEL JENKINS, called in; and Examined.

5835. Chairman.] I BELIEVE you are Secretary to the Royal Agricultural Society?—Yes.

5836. How long have you been secretary to that society?—Between four and five years.

5837. You were instructed by the Society to make enquiries with regard to disease in animals, and especially with regard to foot and mouth disease, were you not?—Yes, I was.

5838. And you took some journeys in consequence?—Yes, I did.

5839. When were those instructions given to you?—I think it was in July last year, immediately after a deputation from the Council of the Royal Agricultural Society waited upon you.

5840. What journeys did you make in consequence?—I made several journeys in cattle boats to and from Ireland, and some to and from the Continent, also in cattle boats; I went with cattle from Ireland to England, from the ports of Dublin, Drogheda, Waterford, and Cork; and to the ports in England, of Liverpool, Holyhead, Milford, and Bristol; in some cases more than once; and from the continental ports of Hamburg, Rotterdam, and Harlingen, to the English ports of Hull and Harwich. In addition, I have inspected the landing places in London and near London; particularly those at Thames Haven and Deptford Market, Brown's Wharf, and Odessa's Wharf when it was used for the purpose of receiving cattle from scheduled countries, while Deptford Market was being built.

5841. Did you inspect the landing places at Liverpool and Bristol?—Yes.

5842. You sent in a report, of which this is a copy (producing the same)?—Yes, that is a copy of my report, as published.

5843. Were you at many of the Irish fairs?—Yes; I went to three fairs, specially for the purpose of my visit.

5844. Which were they?—Drogheda, Mullingar, and Ballinasloe.

5845. Ballinasloe is a very large fair, is it not?—It is an exceedingly large fair.

5846. Did you see many animals affected with the foot and mouth disease there?—I saw several.

5847. Did there appear to be any attempt to isolate them?—Early in the morning, two lots of cattle, each lot containing some animals affected with foot and mouth disease, were placed separately from all other cattle, and when I first saw the Government Commissioner, he had apparently not long before ordered them to be kept isolated; but those were the only cases of isolation, or attempted isolation, which I saw.

5848. Do you think that any restrictions with regard to the spread of foot and mouth disease were in efficient force at that fair?—The restrictions on paper were very stringent, but they were not enforced.

5849. It is stated that there was an increase of foot and mouth disease after that fair, by its being sent into different localities; do you think that statement is likely to have been true?—From all
Q.58.

the information which I have been able to collect I should consider that it was true.

5850. Did you make any inquiries amongst the farmers as you travelled about in Ireland?—I made inquiries wherever I could.

5851. Did you find much foot and mouth disease?—It was generally acknowledged to be very prevalent all over the country.

5852. You made a similar journey in England, I believe?—Yes, in England I am constantly going about the country.

5853. Would you say there was as much foot and mouth disease in Ireland as in England, or more or less?—That is really a matter of statistics; but making a guess, I should say that there would not be very much difference between the two.

5854. Were you in all the four provinces in Ireland?—No, I did not go to the north of Ireland, to Belfast, for the reason that there is, comparatively speaking, but little foot and mouth disease in that district of Ireland, according to the published returns.

5855. With regard to England, there are many restrictions at present with regard to foot and mouth disease; they vary in different counties, but still there is scarcely a county without some attempt at checking it; do you consider that the regulations which are now in force have any beneficial effect in checking foot and mouth disease?—I do not think they have.

5856. Would you make the same remark as regards Ireland?—Yes, I should say rather more strongly with regard to Ireland, because although the regulations there might have some effect if they were enforced, and if people knew that they would be enforced, or that they would suffer a penalty, at present they are not enforced. I think they have no effect.

5857. Did you ask the farmers in England whether they would support much more stringent regulations with regard to foot and mouth disease than exist at present?—If the regulations were in the proper direction, I feel convinced that the farmers in England would endeavour to carry them out, and to see that they were carried out.

5858. What do you think the farmers would be willing to carry out?—The Council of the Royal Agricultural Society have forwarded to yourself a list of the suggestions that they have made upon this subject; and with regard to England, the chief ones are, I believe, that the Government should appoint inspectors at the different ports in England and Ireland to examine properly every animal previous to shipment or landing, as the case may be. Then they have also suggested various checks to insure that such a regulation should be properly carried out.

5859. But that merely affects the landing of animals, either from the Continent or from Ireland?—That is so; but they give various other suggestions with regard to the inland traffic.

5860. Will you state what regulations you consider would be likely to have the most beneficial

Mr. H. M.
Jenkins.

Mr. H. M.
Jenkins.

8 May 1873.

ficial effect?—The most important thing I should consider to be the licensing and registration of cattle dealers and salesmen. I should also consider it very important that fairs, and places where fairs are held, should be properly subdivided, so that diseased cattle should not infect a larger number of other cattle than it was possible to prevent them infecting.

5861. We will take, first, the licensing and registering of cattle dealers; why would that be likely to have a good effect?—Because at the present time, although there are a great many very respectable cattle dealers, there are a great many cattle dealers who are more or less unscrupulous, and who traffic to a great extent, I may say, in animals which have been diseased, or in contact with disease.

5862. But the mere licensing of them would do no good of itself, except as affording a facility for bringing some other regulation to bear upon them?—Exactly; you would know who they were to begin with.

5863. Knowing who they were, what would you do?—I would register the premises which belonged to them, and have them inspected, and give the inspector the power of entry whenever he chose.

5864. Does that mean that you would have a constant inspection going on of the premises of every person who sold cattle?—Whenever it was considered requisite, either by the inspector or by the chief constable of the county.

5865. What I want to know is this: in what way do you think you would have stopped, for instance, such an epidemic as there was of foot and mouth disease at the end of last year?—Because your regulations would prevent the movement of animals from those premises; and, therefore, those animals infected, and the other animals with them upon those premises, would not be allowed to go all over the country and infect others.

5866. Then the suggestion is this: that in the first place every cattle seller should be registered?—Yes.

5867. And in the second place, that there should be a power given to the inspectors to enter upon those premises?—Yes.

5868. And, thirdly, that when there was any disease, there should be a constant inspection of all the premises in the neighbourhood of such disease; is that what you mean?—Yes; and in the case of foot and mouth disease, you would not allow other animals to go into those premises until a certain time had elapsed, say 10 days or a fortnight after the inspector had certified that the premises were free from disease.

5869. I suppose you will admit that that inspection would require many more inspectors than are at present at work?—It would require a larger organisation altogether.

5870. Have you formed any idea of what you would require, in the county of Norfolk, for example?—My idea is, that I would make each administrative area of the country directly correspond to the district under the charge of the chief constable, and I would make the police, as is done in most cases, the inspectors; but I would attach to each chief constabulary district one or two veterinary surgeons as consulting inspectors, so that in case of difficulty or dispute they might be called in to settle the question.

5871. Would you leave it to the local authorities to carry out these regulations?—If you

gave the local authority rigid rules, that they might not depart from under any circumstances, it might be as well to work through them, but I would not give them any option.

5872. The suggestion has been made with regard to Ireland, that it would not be sufficient merely to stop the movement of animals which were diseased, or of those which had been in contact with them; but that, in order really to stop the epidemic, all movement must be stopped, as it was in the case of the cattle plague; do you recommend that?—May I ask whether that is as regards Ireland only?

5873. As regards England also; should you recommend the adoption of that course?—There is no doubt that such a measure would reduce the proportions of the epidemic, but I very much doubt whether it would be practicable to carry it out to such an extent as to cut off foot and mouth disease altogether. It seems to me that, for a disease like foot and mouth disease, other measures much less oppressive might have almost as good an effect.

5874. Then you do not recommend the same restriction on movement as was in force during the time of the cattle plague?—Not for foot and mouth disease.

5875. Do you think that restriction merely upon the movement of those which were diseased, or of those which had been in contact with those who were diseased, would be sufficient?—With regard to those animals which had been in contact with diseased animals, I would not object to allow them to be removed direct from a farm to a slaughter-house, if they did not exhibit the disease at the time, when the movement was being effected.

5876. Have you considered this difficulty, that it would not be easy to ascertain the farms upon which foot and mouth disease existed?—It would be no more difficult then, I imagine, than it is now.

5877. But you do not imagine that any officials have information of it now, do you?—I think in certain counties, where the orders issued by the local authority have been fairly put into operation, there is not very much left to desire.

5878. You do not apprehend that the fact that an owner would suffer the inconvenience of the movement of his cattle being stopped would induce him to keep as quiet as he well could about the existence of the disease?—I do, if the movement were stopped.

5879. It is because it has been supposed that there would be that feeling, that it has been stated by some witnesses that, if we are to have any increase of restrictions at all, there must be a restriction upon all movement?—I cannot agree with that suggestion.

5880. You think that the other suggestion would be sufficient to be efficient?—The other is a better plan of dealing with it, in my opinion.

5881. You are aware, I suppose, that what you propose is exactly what is contained in the Order for Ireland?—I have the Irish Order before me for foot and mouth disease; I presume you refer to the one dated November 3rd; the one relating to Ireland prohibits the movement, not only of animals affected, but of any animals which have been in contact.

5882. Precisely so, except with a license for slaughter, which I understand to be your suggestion?—But I do not think that in Ireland they allow the animals to be removed except for slaughter;

slaughter; they may be slaughtered; it is Order No. 13, "except for immediate slaughter, and under license obtained in that behalf."

5888. I therefore gather that, generally speaking, the Irish Order is what you would recommend for England?—I think that is a very good section.

5889. You are aware, I suppose, that there is a power in Ireland which is not possessed in England, that the Veterinary Department of Ireland can put into motion all the police throughout the country?—I understand so.

5890. But you have acknowledged that, notwithstanding that power, and notwithstanding the existence of this Order, foot and mouth disease was not checked?—The fact is, that although the Irish Department can put the police in motion, and so forth, yet the farmers in many districts feel so confident that if they disregard the orders they receive from the police, they will only be visited by a nominal fine, that they take but very little notice of the orders they receive.

5891. And you think that the same failure with regard to these stringent Orders would not occur in England; why do you think so?—The particular section of the Order which has just been referred to is not so stringent, I think, as our own existing Order, which prohibits a man not only from moving from his farm diseased animals, but those which have been in contact.

5892. Mr. Dent.] That entirely depends upon the local authority putting that Order in force?—Yes, it does, but that is the principle of the Order.

5893. Chairman.] The Order says that no animal affected with the disease shall be moved while so affected, and that no animal which has been herded with animals so affected shall be moved from any premises except under a license for slaughter; that is the Irish Order?—That I understand to be an exceedingly good regulation.

5894. Then the question I want to ask you is, upon what grounds you think that that Order would be successful in England, it being acknowledged that it has failed in Ireland?—Because in Ireland if a man has foot and mouth disease on his farm, and has reason to apprehend that the remainder of his stock, in addition to those already affected, will get it, and that their value will be seriously deteriorated, he immediately sets to work (I do not say that it is always the case, but it is so in many instances) to see whether he cannot sell his animals, and the easiest way is to send them to a distance, that is to England; in fact the great difference between England and Ireland is that Ireland is almost entirely an exporting country, and that England is almost entirely an importing country; therefore, whatever Ireland has, she sends to us, whereas what we have, we do not send to Ireland.

5895. Is England a greater market for Ireland than the metropolitan market is for a large portion of England?—I should think very much more so indeed.

5896. You think that there are very many more animals belonging to Irish owners, which would come over to England, than there would be of English owners going up to the Ballington market, in London?—I do not think it possible to get exact figures with regard to the quantity of live stock and dead meat which comes into London, and it would be very dangerous to make a guess upon a subject of such magnitude.

Q.48.

5897. But what I mean is this: do not you think that there would be the same inducement to an English owner, in many parts of England, to send off his diseased animal to the Metropolitan market in London, as you say induces an Irishman to try to send his off to England?—The difference depends entirely upon the liability to punishment in case of the detection of the offence; now the punishment, as several witnesses whom I have heard acknowledge, is in Ireland frequently a mere trifle; it is no punishment at all.

5898. You think that the failure of this Order, in Ireland, has been due to the fact the punishment has not been carried out sufficiently?—I think so.

5899. And you think that if the local authorities in England were to carry it out, it would succeed?—I think so.

5900. Have you at all examined the effect of the stringent Orders which have been put in force by some counties in England with regard to the foot and mouth disease?—Not particularly; I know that some counties have issued Orders that animals found affected shall be isolated, and that any person found offending against, or neglecting to comply with any of the regulations, shall be liable to a penalty not exceeding 20*l*. I do not know of anything much more stringent than that.

5901. Do you know whether that has had effect?—It has had effect in districts, and at times when there has been no fresh importation; but as soon as you get a new importation of cattle into those districts, they bring with them foot and mouth disease, and those regulations are therefore rendered imperative.

5902. Could you give an illustration of that, and mention a county in which the disease had been checked by the action of the local authorities, in which it had been renewed by fresh importations?—I believe that as well regulated a county as any in England is the county of Chester. The returns will show that during the period of the year when the immigration of stock into the districts is small, or next to nothing, then foot and mouth disease decreases.

5903. What is that period of the year?—About the present time the disease is at a minimum, but soon after this time, when the animals are brought in to be summer-grazed, the returns begin to increase. I think the same is true of the West Riding of Yorkshire. I have selected those two counties, or county and riding, as examples, and have published returns from them in my report, which was published in the "Journal of the Royal Agricultural Society."

5904. Have you studied the statistics with regard to foot and mouth disease for many years past?—I do not know that there have been any statistics of foot and mouth disease for many years past.

5905. Have you endeavoured to obtain information with regard to the progress of foot and mouth disease?—Yes; I have obtained all the information I possibly could.

5906. Is it not the case, generally speaking, that foot and mouth disease appears to diminish about this time of the year, and appears to get worse in the autumn?—That is the case all over the kingdom, so far as we know by the published statistics.

5907. That is the case in foreign countries also, is it not?—I think it is the same in foreign countries.

5908. Then the fact that there has been that falling

Mr. H. M.
Jenkins.
8 May 1873.

Mr. H. M.
Jenkins.
8 May 1873.

falling off in Cheshire in the spring, and that increase in the autumn, appears to be a fact which also occurs in other districts?—To a greater or lesser extent, but when you come to look at the great extent of the increase of the disease in Cheshire it is very remarkable; for instance, in 1871, upon the 8th of June, there were but 31 new cases during the previous month, and in October of the same year there were 12,458. Of course that is a very different matter from contrasting figures, which would be very much more even, as in the case where things were left to themselves.

5904. We have had the same thing in Ireland, a great falling off at this time of the year and a great increase afterwards?—Yes, that is so; but at the same time, as I said before, Ireland is an exporting country, and you have not the same reliability upon the statistics.

5905. You do not think that you have the same reliability upon statistics which are obtained from the Veterinary Department in Ireland, as upon those in England?—No, I do not.

5906. Why do you think so?—Because a great many cases have not been returned to the Veterinary Department.

5907. Do you think that they have been generally returned to the Veterinary Department in England?—Very much more so than in Ireland.

5908. Are you not aware that the Veterinary Department in England were obliged to give up obtaining returns of the foot and mouth disease, because so many counties did not furnish them?—Quite so, but then I do not see that that affects the validity of the returns issued by counties which have a proper organization and an earnest desire to get at the truth with regard to this matter.

5909. I suppose, however, you would admit that this diminution in Cheshire, and this consequent increase, is not a conclusive proof, because the decrease occurred at the time of year at which the disease does generally diminish, and the increase was at the time of year at which an increase does generally occur?—Yes, but I say it is more the extent of the difference which I rely upon.

5910. Can you instance any other county except Cheshire?—The West Riding of Yorkshire is very much the same, about the same time.

5911. Are you yourself a veterinary surgeon?—No, I am not.

5912. Before you were engaged as secretary to the Royal Agricultural Society, had you studied the question of the diseases of animals?—I had studied physiology in previous years under Professor Huxley, at the Royal School of Mines, and Chemistry, and the various natural sciences for several years.

5913. Now, with regard to pleuro-pneumonia, have you any special suggestion to make to the Committee?—Pleuro-pneumonia is a disease which requires a veterinary surgeon to deal with it to ascertain its existence, therefore I would rather not say much about pleuro-pneumonia.

5914. You have not made inquiries about pleuro-pneumonia?—No; I consider it requires a veterinary surgeon to deal with it.

5915. Did the Royal Agricultural Society make any special suggestion in regard to pleuro-pneumonia?—Not that I am aware of; chiefly foot and mouth disease and cattle plague. I think their opinion is generally that the existing regu-

lations have been to a great extent successful with pleuro-pneumonia.

5916. The Royal Agricultural Society gave no special opinion with reference to whether there should be compulsory slaughter of animals affected with that disease?—No.

5917. You went to Hamburg, did you not?—I did.

5918. I see you describe the very rigorous measures which were taken there to stamp out the cattle plague?—Yes; I describe them as having been narrated to me, I think.

5919. We have been informed that, notwithstanding the rigorous measures taken by the German authorities to prevent cattle plague, yet that the information to the Government of the strong probability of their having the cattle plague, was from an intimation given to them from here, rather than from what they received themselves?—Yes; I believe that the weakest part of their arrangement consists in the regulations with regard to obtaining information. In the first instance, there are so many persons through whom information must go before it reaches the authorities who can put their regulations with regard to stamping out in force.

5920. Did you hear much about the foot and mouth disease when you were in Germany?—I heard a little about it.

5921. Did you learn whether the authorities tried to stop it or not?—No; I think they do not.

5922. Have they ever tried to stop it?—I am not aware that they have.

5923. Do you know any part of the Continent in which they have tried to stop it?—No; except that I believe they have tried something in Belgium; I am not quite certain as to what their regulations were, but I do not think that they have done so either in Germany or in Holland.

5924. Did you examine the state of Holland?—Yes; I have been through a great part of Holland.

5925. Did you find much foot and mouth disease there?—Yes, there is a great deal of foot and mouth disease there, but the Dutch Government is very particular with regard to animals exported from that country.

5926. They are more particular with regard to the animals exported, than they are with regard to the movement of animals at home, are they not?—Very much more so.

5927. There is a passage in your report in which you state that you think that the loss taken in the exportation of animals from unscheduled countries is greater than from scheduled countries?—I think so.

5928. Why do you imagine that that is the case?—Because I think that animals sent here from scheduled countries are sent here simply for the purpose of slaughter. Those sent here from unscheduled countries may be either milk cows, or in fact any other kind of animal, the slaughter of which might involve a very considerable loss.

5929. Then what I must understand you to mean is this, that inasmuch as all the animals from scheduled countries must be slaughtered at the port of landing, the exporters have not that inducement to keep them free from disease which applies to the animals from unscheduled countries, where if one be found diseased, the whole of the cargo are slaughtered?—Certainly.

5930. Now I will ask you upon another branch of the question; have you inspected the vessels which

which ply between England and Ireland?—Yes, in many cases.

5931. And what do you think of their arrangements for the cattle traffic?—The chief thing that struck me was that there were too many cattle in a confined space for the ventilating powers which were available.

5932. Are they generally carried in the hold of the ship?—Yes, generally.

5933. What time of the year did you inspect the traffic?—In August, September, and October.

5934. How far do you think the disinfecting was carried out?—It varies in different cases, but, generally speaking, I think that disinfection is not paid much attention to. The vessels that go to Bristol are disinfected there under the personal superintendence of the Government Inspector at that port, but in other cases I could not see that there was any great care taken to disinfect.

5935. There was more care taken altogether at Bristol than at Liverpool, was there not?—Yes, there was more care taken at Bristol.

5936. Both as regards the arrangements for the cattle, and for disinfecting?—Yes.

5937. I have heard it stated that a good deal of the foot and mouth disease which is imported from Ireland may reasonably be supposed to be caught on board the vessels, rather than to have been existing in the animals before they left Ireland; what is your opinion upon that point?—I should think it is very likely that in many cases the disease was caught by the animals in the railway trucks, or, if not in the railway trucks, on board the steamboats, but I think it is also certain that in many cases animals have been sent from berths which contained diseased animals besides.

5938. The Cheshire animals which are imported from Ireland come by Liverpool mainly, do they not?—And Holyhead.

5939. And those into Somersetshire, and Gloucestershire, and Wiltshire, by Bristol?—Yes.

5940. Is it not the case that there has been quite as much complaint in the southern counties, with regard to the import of foot and mouth disease, as there has been in the North, into Cheshire?—Quite, I should say.

5941. That would seem to show that the better arrangements with regard to the vessels at Bristol have not, so far, had much to do with it?—I think that, with regard to Bristol, a great many more animals come into Bristol, and the market being only once a week, they go to places which are in the occupation of the dealers until the market day. The authorities at Bristol are very strict in carrying out the Orders of the Privy Council in every particular, and if men express in their market diseased animals they are fined very heavily, and the consequence is, that those dealers get even veterinary surgeons to examine their beasts before they send them to market. Those that are found affected they leave behind; so that they not only have infected those that are sent into the market, but will probably infect the next lot which come into the premises, and so the disease is kept up.

5942. You think that those paddocks, as they are called, are not free from disease?—I do.

5943. In so far as that is the case, that is not the fault of the Irish exporters?—No; once you have got those places free, or put under restriction, it would not be; and then you would give the Irish exporter a more fair chance, no doubt.

5944. Does not that fact, to some extent, show the difficulty of stopping the foot and mouth disease?

case by restrictions, in England?—No, I do not think there would be much difficulty in preventing the spread of that disease to a great extent.

5945. What would you do to prevent this disease?—We will suppose a dealer is licensed; his paddocks are registered, and the inspector has a power of entry; he takes care to go and inspect the animals in this paddock, say the day before the market day; he sees that, out of a hundred beasts, there are five or six suffering badly from the foot and mouth disease, and then he restricts the movement of the animals from that place, except to the slaughter-house of the town, for immediate slaughter; and if this man is found offending against the law, not only will he be fined according to our suggestion, but his license will be taken away from him, and he will not be allowed for a certain time to pursue his calling.

5946. Whom would you compel to take out licenses?—The dealers.

5947. How would you define a dealer?—I should say a dealer was a man who either sold animals on commission, or who sold animals habitually which had not been in his possession more than a fortnight.

5948. Therefore you would include amongst dealers, and therefore amongst those persons who were to have licenses, every farmer who was in the habit of buying animals to sell them within a short time?—Yes, I would.

5949. That would be a large class; there would be both farmers and dealers included, would there not?—I do not think that there are many farmers who habitually sell animals which have been only in their possession for about a fortnight.

5950. What do you mean by "habitually"?—The word is used, I think, with reference to horse dealing.

5951. But what would it be your intention to carry out by using the word "habitual"?—It would show that a man who does it made it a considerable source of profit; a source of income, in fact; not that he does it once because circumstances require him to do it, but constantly.

5952. You have also inspected vessels between England and the continent, have you not?—Yes, some of them.

5953. Have you inspected those that carry on the cattle trade into London?—I have inspected some of them.

5954. It has been stated in evidence, that with regard to those that are intended mainly for the purpose of the cattle trade, their arrangements are much better than those in which cattle is a chance cargo; is that your experience?—I do not know that. I never observed anything of that kind.

5955. What would be your opinion with regard to vessels that come into London?—Some of them are very good, and some of them are not so good, just the same as with other places. There are some companies which furnish their boats perhaps rather better than others; some of the North German Lloyd's boats are exceedingly well fitted with ventilating apparatus, and so are some of the boats of the Dublin Steam Packet Company; some of the boats are very small and utterly unfitted for the traffic.

5956. You went to Hull, did you not?—Yes.

5957. I think in your report you object to some of the arrangements at the port of Hull with regard to the markets?—Yes.

5958. Will you just state what your objection is?

Mr. H. M. Jenkins.
8 May 1873.

Mr. H. M.
Leslies.
8 May 1873.

is?—My objection with regard to the market is this, that it is separated only by a comparatively narrow street from the boundary of the defined area as laid down upon the map; it is not a wall, or anything of that kind, but it is, so to speak, an imaginary boundary. There is only a narrow street between that and the ordinary cattle market of the town, and that market also is not more, I should say, than 100 yards from the depot in which cattle from the scheduled countries are placed previous to their slaughter.

5959. You are of opinion, I suppose, that the cattle plague was imported into England by that cargo of the "Joseph Soames"?—Yes, I think there is no doubt about that.

5960. Mr. Kavanagh.] With regard to your proposition of licensing cattle dealers, would you call a dealer, the man whom you propose to license, a man who deals in cattle without having land of his own?—If he had not land of his own, and simply bought and sold cattle, he would be a dealer.

5961. You propose to license and register all those persons?—Yes.

5962. Do you think that in Ireland that would be easily done?—If they do not take out a license, I see no practical difficulty in bringing them to book for not doing so.

5963. Do you know very much about how matters are carried on in Ireland?—Yes; they are carried on, of course, in a rather loose way in some respects.

5964. You are intimately acquainted with how they are carried on?—I have seen a vast deal of it, certainly.

5965. From what has your experience been derived?—From visiting fairs and markets, and talking with the dealers, and so forth, in the ordinary way in which a man gets experience.

5966. Have you been all over the whole country?—No; I have not been in the north-east of Ireland.

5967. But you have been into every county in the south and west of Ireland?—I have been in a great many counties, but I would not quite say into every county, because I do not quite recollect.

5968. How long a time did you spend in Ireland?—I dare say I may have spent altogether six weeks, or something of that kind, in this particular business.

5969. But altogether in your life; what time have you spent there to give you this experience?—I should say six weeks were spent upon this special investigation; I would base my opinions upon that.

5970. You say that in those six weeks you became intimately acquainted with the different ways in which business is carried on in all the south and west of Ireland?—I do not think I said that I was "intimately acquainted"; I said I was, to a certain extent, acquainted; it requires a man to be in the trade to be intimately acquainted with it.

5971. But with regard to the way in which farmers manage their farms, you think that in six weeks you could derive sufficient experience of that?—I have been over a great many farms in Ireland.

5972. Did it ever come to your knowledge that farmers' sons, who are living on the farms with their fathers, often buy cattle, although they have to take grass for the purpose?—Yes, it has.

5973. And that servant boys, as we call them, although they may be very often up to the age of 40 or 50, may also take cattle in the same way?—Yes; I believe cattle dealing generally is a favourite pastime in Ireland.

5974. Do you think that it would be easy to register all those men?—Yes, I do not see any difficulty about it; of course it would throw some work upon the people who would have to do it.

5975. Who would be the people who would have to do it?—I should say the magistrates in each locality, or their clerks.

5976. Would you propose that a fine should be put upon any man who did not have a license?—Certainly.

5977. So that they would be obliged to come in and register themselves?—Yes; I should not propose that the amount charged for the license should be very great.

5978. I should take it that your object would be merely to get the names of the men?—Quite so.

5979. I do not suppose that you want to put a tax upon them?—No.

5980. Merely to secure that you have the man's name?—Yes.

5981. And you think that that might be done easily?—I should think it might be done.

5982. You stated in your evidence that you thought fairs should be subdivided; how did you mean that they should be subdivided?—I do not know whether you know the fairs belonging to the London and North Western Company, at North Wall.

5983. I do not.—Take any of the landing-places for cattle in or near London, such as Bower's Wharf or Thames Haven, or I will take the Dublin Cattle Market, for instance; those will furnish examples of what I mean.

5984. But would it not be impossible to subdivide all the cattle fairs in Ireland?—I consider this, that one great advantage of such a regulation would be that about half the fairs in Ireland not being able to stand the expense, would be abolished.

5985. You recommend the subdivision of fairs as an indirect way of abolishing them?—That is one of the reasons, but the direct reason is, that it would prevent a diseased animal from infecting more than a limited number of animals which were not diseased.

5986. Do you know how many fairs there are in Ireland?—Yes; there are about 6,000, in round numbers.

5987. And how many do you think would stand the expense of this subdivision?—I could not say; it would require one to attend every fair, and it would require some years to do it, to enable one to answer that question; but to doubt the magistrates could give you an idea of that.

5988. Chairman.] Do you mean that there are 6,000 fairs, or 6,000 cattle markets?—I believe there are 6,000 fairs, as they are properly called, I believe Professor Ferguson, in his evidence, put them down as 5,900. I think the distinction could be got at in this way: that a fair is held in a little country place, which is not of sufficient importance to be a market town, and is solely and simply for the sale of live stock; whereas markets held in corporate towns are not properly fairs.

5989. Would not they be included in the 6,000?

6,000?—I think not. I think the 6,000 would be independent of them.

5990. Mr. Kessingh. Do you know that these cattle markets which you have mentioned are not called fairs?—No, I do not know that; but if I had thought of being asked the question, I would have brought my list with me. I do not believe you call the cattle market of Cork a fair.

5991. Nor Smithfield?—No; and you do not call the cattle market at Waterford a fair; it is not a special market-place, but there is a place at the top of the hill which is used for the purpose.

5992. How often is the cattle market held at Waterford?—I believe it is once a week.

5993. But all the markets in the country are called fairs, whether there is cattle sold in them or not?—That is so.

5994. These markets are not restricted solely to the sale of cattle?—Certainly not.

5995. Do you think, from your knowledge of the district, that it would be no inconvenience to the inhabitants to have all those markets shut up which could not afford the expense of the subdivision you propose?—The regulation with regard to subdivision would only apply to live stock; it would not prevent people selling vegetables and fruit, even if the market could not be subdivided.

5996. What you suggest is, that all fairs which could not afford the expense of subdivision should be shut up, so far as cattle are concerned?—Quite so.

5997. Do you think that that would occasion no inconvenience to the inhabitants?—I think not. Of course when these fairs were first instituted there were not the means of communication from place to place which now exist.

5998. Do you know much about the West of Ireland, Mayo, and Connacht?—I do not know much about the West of Ireland.

5999. Do you not think that it would be rather unwise, considering the large distances that the inhabitants would have to send their stock then, to shut up these local fairs?—Of course if the fair were a large one it would pay for the expense, although it might be rather a serious matter at first; but if it were a small one, the expense would be next to nothing. I cannot see any hardship in compelling those greens to be subdivided.

6000. Then in the case of a place where there is no green, there would be a difficulty?—In the case of a place where there is no green, where the fair is held in the street, you might adopt the Dutch plan, which is simply having posts and rails, with a series of rings at proper distances; that would have the same effect; it would prevent a diseased animal rushing all round the fair and infecting a large number of others.

6001. That is, in fact, to have them in pens?—Yes.

6002. With regard to the fair at Ballinacree, what course would you recommend to prevent the great danger of disease that you mention in your report?—Ballinacree fair is an immense fair, and if that green were properly subdivided as I have suggested, it would very much lessen the difficulty of the animals being inspected. You might subdivide the enormous number of animals which come there into small lots of a convenient number each, and you would know, to a certain limit, how many animals you had got diseased, and how many probably had been infected in the fair, and you could deal with them accordingly.

606.

6003. When you found animals diseased in the fair at Ballinacree, what would you do with them?—The only thing to do would be to let them remain where they are until the fair is over, because if you remove them you only increase the danger.

6004. Would there be no difficulty in doing that?—No, you could impound them on the spot.

6005. And after the fair was over what would you do with them?—My impression is, that after the fair I should have them slaughtered, and let the owner have the proceeds, whatever they might be, less the expenses; and of course punish him for sending a diseased animal into the fair, and punish him adequately.

6006. You would slaughter them whether they were store or fat cattle, or anything else?—Yes, store or fat, or anything else.

6007. Breeding ewes for example?—Yes.

6008. You go on in your report to mention a report of foot and mouth disease, which I think you took from the "Irish Farmers' Gazette;" you state that foot and mouth disease has appeared in different parts of the county of Longford; that a farmer lost 50 cattle, and in one night alone 13 of them died?—Yes, I quoted that from the "Irish Farmers' Gazette."

6009. Have you reason to believe that that is true?—I do not express any opinion about it; it was published by the "Irish Farmers' Gazette;" no doubt the editor of the paper, whom I know very well, must have believed it to be true, or he would not have published it.

6010. Will you kindly read this; "Cattle Disease, County of Longford, Newtownards, 12th April 1873. I beg to state that the accompanying extract from a pamphlet, 'page 208,' being submitted to me by nearest magistrate, Captain H. O. F. Gregory, J.R., to whom I reported all cases of foot and mouth disease in my sub-district, for my statement as to its accuracy, the lands referred to therein being in my sub-district, I certify that its contents are untrue, no cattle having died on those lands, or on any other in my sub-district, from foot and mouth disease since or before the 1st of October 1872, (signed) Patrick Smyth, Constable." Therefore you see that whoever put the statement in the "Farmers' Gazette" has made a mistake?—Yes, but this is a very vague document, allow me to say.

6011. It is a statement made by a police constable before a police magistrate?—The constable says that no cattle died in his sub-district during that time; it may possibly have occurred that there may be a mistake in this report; that the man's name may be wrong, or the locality may not be quite accurate, but I think the statement is at any rate quite as likely to be accurate as this one, which says, "no cattle having died on those lands, or on any other in my sub-district, from foot and mouth disease since or before the 1st of October 1872."

6012. Is that impossible?—I think it is very improbable that no cattle ever died in that sub-district.

6013. You think that it is improbable that no cattle ever died in that sub-district?—I think it is very improbable that no cattle died in that sub-district.

6014. Do you think it is necessary that cattle should die of the foot and mouth disease?—I do not say it is necessary, but I say it is probable that, I I 2

† during

Mr. H. M.
Jenkins.
8 May 1873.

Mr. H. M.
Jenkins.
8 May 1873.

during the last 30 years that we have had foot and mouth disease in the country, cattle have died in that district.

6016. Do you think the constable's statement would be likely to be untrue, if he stated that no cattle had died in his sub-district within that time?—I think it is vague.

6016. *Chairman.* The statement is not that no cattle had died, but that no cattle had died from foot and mouth disease?—Yes; since or before the 1st of October 1872, there is no limitation.

6017. Do you not think it is a very probable thing that there may be some districts in which for two or three years together no cattle would die from foot and mouth disease?—It is possible.

6018. Do you not think it is probable?—I do not think it is probable; but the criticism of the honourable Member refers to this point, and I say the paragraph might be quite right in substance without its being perfectly right with regard to the exact locality or the exact name, and upon that ground I think it is on all fours with the document which the honourable Member has produced.

6019. *Mr. Kewenagh.* You wish to transfer the locality?—No; I do not take any responsibility with reference to the paragraph, except that I quoted it, and I have since received information that after the late fair of Ballinasloe foot and mouth disease prevailed extensively in and about Longford, and that it was brought by cattle purchased at Ballinasloe. I have received that information independently.

6020. But still you firmly believe that 50 animals died between the Ballinasloe fair and the 22nd of October, and that 15 of those animals died in one night?—No, I have expressed no kind of belief one way or the other; I simply quoted it as a paragraph in an Irish agricultural newspaper, and you must take it for what it is worth.

6021. But since you have been under examination you stated that you thought it more likely to be true than the paper which I gave to you?—I stated that it was very improbable that there was any sub-district in which no cattle had ever died from foot and mouth disease.

6022. *Chairman.* Were you ever at the Agricultural Institution in Cirencester?—Not to study there.

6023. But you have been there?—Yes.

6024. Would this statement surprise you, which has been made upon the authority of Professor Brown, that for 13 years no case of foot and mouth disease was known in the neighbourhood of that institution at Cirencester?—I should not be surprised at that, because that is a place exceptionally well kept, and constantly under the supervision of a veterinary surgeon of great ability. I should think it was more likely than not that that statement would be true even if made independently of Professor Brown's authority.

6025. *Mr. Kewenagh.* But still you believe that although it may be true that no animal might die in 13 years in England, yet it could not be possible that in the experience of that sub-constable no animal could have died in that district in Ireland?—That is pushing it further than I put it.

6026. But still that paragraph might not have been true?—It might not have been.

6027. Is it upon the same authority that you

found your statement that dealers purchase diseased animals for the purpose of sending them to England?—I gave the former statement as having been copied out of a particular paper; the other statement I made from actual inquiry amongst the people themselves; when I quote, I say I quote.

6028. From your actual inquiry amongst the people themselves, you have learned that it has been the habit of Irish dealers to purchase diseased cattle for the purpose of exporting them into England?—I do not recollect saying that it is the habit, but I believe it is done, and I have been informed that it is frequently done.

6029. Could you mention any single case in which it has been done?—I have been informed of several, but I doubt if there is any case of which I recollect the details?—I know that when I was in Ireland I heard it on all hands, and I have no doubt you have had the same statement made before this Committee.

6030. Could you point out one case which you could name?—No, I do not think it is at all likely that I can; I do not think it is likely that people would give me names and dates so that I might report it to this Committee, or at all.

6031. Although you do not think that likely, you would still look upon their evidence as trustworthy?—When I have no reason to doubt the evidence of a man I would accept it.

6032. You would accept it as evidence against Ireland?—I do not believe they are at all worse, or much worse, in Ireland, than they are in England; I believe the same sort of thing goes on here.

6033. But is not that a small basis to go upon when you make such a sweeping charge as to say that diseased animals are sold for the purpose of being exported to England?—We know perfectly well that in many cases that is the only explanation of a particular set of circumstances.

6034. You referred to the county of Chester as being particularly well managed?—Yes.

6035. Are you very well acquainted with it?—I have been a good deal about the county of Chester.

6036. You walked through the farms and the farmsteads?—Yes; I have reported upon some of the farms in Cheshire; not in this report, but in other reports.

6037. You consider that it is a pattern county?—I do not know that; there are good farms and bad farms in it, as in all other counties; but when I quoted Chester, I was speaking more particularly with regard to the way in which the provisions of the Act and the special orders issued by the local authorities were carried out, and as to the completeness of the returns issued by the chief constable.

6038. Would you be surprised if a witness was brought here to prove that many of the farms in Cheshire are badly managed, so far as sanitary arrangements are concerned?—As I said, I dare say there are a good many bad farms in the county of Chester, but there are a very great many good ones.

6039-40. *Chairman.* Does your remark with reference to the regulations in Cheshire apply to what was done during the time of the cattle plague?—No; since the passing of the Act in 1869 I published a table which was issued, and from the 4th of September down to the present time the regulations seem to me generally to have been exceedingly well carried out.

6041. *Mr.*

6041. Mr. W. Johnston.] You do not dispute, I suppose, the accuracy of this return handed in by Professor Ferguson, and published in your report as showing the extent to which foot and mouth disease prevailed in the year ending 31st December 1871?—No, I have no doubt that it is perfectly accurate so far as the information at Professor Ferguson's disposal enabled him to make it.

6042. Do not you think Professor Ferguson would have a better opportunity of ascertaining the existence of that disease from the reports of the constabulary in Ireland, than you would have in England?—No doubt.

6043. What do you mean by this paragraph at page 15 in your report: "Unfortunately, with regard to the spread of disease in Ireland, we are inclined to take the facts, even when officially stated, cum grano salis, and to question every conclusion that might be drawn from them, in consequence of the too frequent neglect of Irish gaiders to report the existence of foot and mouth disease on their farms"?—I mean simply this, that it is an under statement in all probability, in consequence of some returns not having been made, and a large number of them probably.

6044. Do you think it would be desirable to make it penal to conceal the existence of disease upon a farm?—I think there should be a substantial fine inflicted for that offence.

6045. Then the report also mentions that "A most trustworthy correspondent in Ireland has informed me of a case in which, just previous to one of the great fairs at Ballinasloe, a man was prosecuted by the Government, not only for neglecting to report the existence of disease on his premises, but also for driving the affected animals through the town of Ballinasloe. The case was proved; the magistrates fined him one penny, and further molested him in the sum of one shilling for costs." Do you think that was a trustworthy correspondent?—I should be inclined to trust him in any matter of this nature.

6046. Would you have any objection to give the Committee his name?—If I had felt at liberty to give his name I should have published it, and I would rather not do so now.

6047. I do not dispute the statement, but I only wish to ascertain its origin?—I would rather not give names, because I have so frequently to depend upon the information I receive from gentlemen, that if they thought they were liable to have their names published, they would not give me information.

6048. Do not you think that there might be other trustworthy correspondents in Ireland, besides this one?—Yes, no doubt there are.

6049. Chairman.] This was a case before the magistrates, was it not?—Yes.

6050. That case was publicly heard, was it not?—Yes.

6051. Mr. W. Johnston.] I have a letter here in which it is stated, "A much more fruitful means of sending over distemper to England is the habit with many farmers of, as soon as they have discovered any disease, or anything of that kind, in their stock, at once to ship the whole lot (except perhaps the animal too far gone to pass) to England. These animals never stand in a fair here at all." Are you in favour of stopping the fairs in Ireland during the months of June and July?—I should not recommend it for England, and I doubt whether it would be worth while to do it for Ireland.

658.

6052. This letter also goes on further to state, "A great deal of the harm done by last Ballinasloe fair was caused by the very imperfect means of getting away the stock by rail after purchase; a friend of mine had to keep his stock huddled up in pens, in filth, hunger, and infected ground for two days; he lost 20 sheep by distemper; a neighbour of his lost 80"?—I have no doubt that is true.

6053. Have you any information concerning the late Ballinasloe fair?—I have published in this report what I saw there myself. I have heard a good deal since, with reference to the influence of the late fair at Ballinasloe, in distributing disease over the country, and especially as to the mortality occasioned by the disease among sheep, but I do not speak to that of my own knowledge; I have not been in Ireland since.

6054. Did you see any cases of disease yourself?—Yes.

6055. Were the police authorities aware of those cases?—Yes, in one case they were, because I was invited to point out a beast which had been examined by the Government Inspector, and I pointed it out, and upon examination it was found to be affected visibly.

6056. What was done in that case?—I inquired of the inspector or sub-inspector, I do not know what his official rank is, and he told me that the magistrates had consulted together, and then ultimately they decided to send the cattle back to the owner's farm. When I went to look for them about noon, they were gone.

6057. Do you think that more stringent measures ought to be adopted in Ireland for the suppression of the disease than would be tolerated in England?—No, I do not think so.

6058. Mr. Clegg.] When you visited Hull, you formed the opinion that its defined area has an imaginary boundary?—That is to say, that it was a boundary which could not be seen by anyone unacquainted with the locality; it was not a wall or anything of that kind; it was a certain line of streets, and you had to go to the Custom House and get the map to see where the boundary was.

6059. But it was a boundary of well-defined streets, was it not?—I have given in my report a woodcut, showing the boundary as I understand it; it took me a long time to find anybody who understood what it was.

6060. Am I to understand that your idea of a properly-defined area would be a district surrounded by a wall, like a prison-yard?—I should think like that at Deptford, that is surrounded by a wall in that way, that would be a perfectly-defined port.

6061. Are you aware of there being any such in England?—At Deptford there is.

6062. But, with that exception, is there anything in the defined area at Hull which differs materially from those in other ports?—The great objection to the defined area at Hull is the proximity of the ordinary cattle market, in addition to its not being surrounded by a wall; if it were surrounded with a wall, the proximity of the ordinary cattle market would not be so serious an objection, although it would still be serious.

6063. But you did not answer my question exactly, whether there was anything in the defined area of Hull different from that of other ports?—I do not know in what its difference

Mr. H. M. Jackson.

8 May 1873.

Mr. H. M.
Jenkins.

8 May 1873.

lies, except in its great proximity to the cattle market.

6064. You are of opinion that the cargo on board the "Joseph Soames" was the cause of the outbreak of which we have heard so much?—From all the information which I could gather, it appeared to me that if the "Joseph Soames" had not come into Hull, cattle plague would not have broken out in the East Riding of Yorkshire.

6065. Are you aware that the beasts were never landed?—I am.

6066. Are you also aware of the strong opinions which have been given by competent authorities, that the cattle plague could not have been propagated by the carcasses which were washed on shore?—Yes.

6067. Then the explanation, I presume, which you would give is that which they have given, namely, that the disease was carried by drovers, slaughtermen, and others, who had been on board the "Joseph Soames"?—Quite so, I should say.

6068. Then, does not it appear from that that the cause was the omission sufficiently to disinfect the parties leaving the "Joseph Soames"?—I should say so. First of all, I should say that it would have been desirable, I think, if the people had been prevented, to the greatest possible extent, from going on board the vessel at all, because there is a certain risk attending that, no matter how much disinfection there was, or how well it might be carried out; but, after they had been allowed to go on board, the cause, to a great extent, was the absence of disinfection of those persons.

6069. It would appear then from that, that this calamity was not owing to the proximity to the depot between the scheduled cattle market and the ordinary cattle market, but that it arose from the neglect to disinfect the people leaving the "Joseph Soames"?—Yes; but if the cattle market had been a mile off, there would have been a far greater chance of the germs of the cattle plague being either, as Professor Simonds would say, consumed by the atmosphere or blown away from the person, or otherwise got rid of; in fact, so many people would not have gone directly from the "Joseph Soames" to the ordinary cattle market if it had been at a greater distance.

6070. Do I understand that your recommendation would be, that the ordinary cattle market should be at a considerable distance from the defined area?—Yes.

6071. Are you aware of there being any facilities, within a reasonable distance from the business part of the town, for placing such a market?—There is a place called Fairfield, or Corporation field, which seems to me to be an excellent site; I do not know whether there may be some difficulty in the way of its being utilised, otherwise I should say that that would be an excellent site.

6072. You are not aware that that has been contemplated?—I am not sure about that, but I know that the cattle market was held there at the time that the ordinary cattle market was placed under restrictions from cattle plague having broken out; I attended a market in the Fairfield.

6073. I suppose that you have not had much veterinary experience yourself?—Not with reference to the cure of disease; I never attempted it.

6074. I do not speak so much as to the cure of

disease as to the best way of treating a diseased cargo, such as there was on board the "Joseph Soames." If you had been there to act upon your own responsibility, what would you have done in that case?—In the first place, it appears that it was impossible to kill and bury the animals on shore. I was not there at the time, and, therefore, in answering your question I am obliged to take the facts as they have been narrated to the Committee. If it was impossible to kill and bury the animals on shore in the port, I do not see what remained to be done, except to take them out to sea and sink them.

6075. The carcasses, I think, are burned not infrequently when such cattle are slaughtered?—I think that has been tried, but for various reasons that is not the usual practice; it has been given up.

6076. Are you aware that it has been done in Hull?—No, I am not aware that it has been done in Hull.

6077. Have you any reason to suppose that that would not have been the best way of treating it?—I should not think, in a place like Hull, it would have been a very safe course to adopt; it is a place crowded with narrow streets around the defined part, and the law would not allow the animals to be removed from the defined part to any other place. I think it would have been much more likely to have propagated the cattle plague than the course which was adopted.

6078. Mr. O'Connor.] Am I right in supposing that you consider the present rules of the Irish Department sufficiently stringent for the suppression of foot and mouth disease, provided they were carried out?—Provided they were carried out.

6079. Do you think that any more stringent regulations would be more likely to be carried out than the present?—No; I should not recommend for Ireland any more stringent regulations than those which now exist.

6080. Do you think our attention should be rather directed to providing means for carrying out the present rules, than to making any fresh restrictions?—So far as regards your inland organisation, I should say yes.

6081. You made some proposition as regards small fairs in the country, will you kindly state that again?—That proposition was, "That all fairs or yards belonging to railway and steamboat companies, and all market-places and places set apart for the holding of fairs for cattle, sheep, and pigs, shall be divided into pens of a convenient size, and furnished with a sufficient number of troughs of clean water; and that these pens shall be cleaned and disinfected in accordance with the existing regulations of the English Privy Council in reference to railway pens and landing-places." That refers to England as well as Ireland.

6082. You would apply these rules to all fairs, and in some of these small country fairs there would be scarcely a sufficient number of cattle to warrant going to the expense of that kind; you would wish to get rid of those fairs altogether?—I think so. I think the opinion of the agricultural community generally would be in favour of that.

6083. Do you not think that in a small country fair, to which no cattle come except those which are held in the neighbourhood, there would be very little chance of diseased cattle being brought there without its being known all round?—I think so many fairs are not wanted; I think that these small

small fairs do harm rather than good; there is always a greater probability of the disease being spread, through the greater number of points of contact between different animals.

6084. Mr. Ridley.] After these regulations were proposed, to which the Council of the Agricultural Society agreed, you did not propose anything with regard to Ireland that you did not propose with regard to England?—Quite so.

6085. It was quite incorrect to represent you as wishing to propose anything with regard to Ireland which you did not propose with regard to England?—Quite so.

6086. I wish to understand about the Irish foot and mouth Order of 3rd November 1870. I understood you to say to-day that you recommended that the English Act should be altered so as to comply with Section 13 of that Order; is that so?—Yes, that is with regard to animals on farms. The objection I take to that section in my report, is with regard to animals being found affected in fairs, because this Order makes no distinction whatever between a farm and a fair as I understand it.

6087. Because you say in your Report that "the provisions of Section 13 are so clearly impracticable, that one is, if possible, even more surprised that it should have been in the first place enacted, and afterwards allowed to remain unrevoked for two years, than that the authorities at Ballinacree declined to carry them out." And then in your subsequent recommendations you suggest that the provisions of that Order should be modified so as to conform with Section 57 of the English Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act?—Yes, that is in reference to fairs; with regard to farms I think it is an excellent Order, but with regard to the animals found in the fair at Ballinacree it was impossible for the authorities to carry the Order out. It would have entailed the slaughter of 17,000 beasts, besides a large number of sheep.

6088. From your experience of Ballinacree, what would be your recommendation in the case of animals being found to be diseased?—I should inspect them for the time being, and then deal with them afterwards.

6089. In what way would you deal with them afterwards?—As a broad general rule I would say the best plan would be to have them slaughtered. The Council of the Society have not expressed any opinion with regard to the slaughter of animals affected with foot and mouth disease, and therefore, with reference to their regulations, it was not competent for me to deal with this Order as if they had, but my individual opinion is that the better plan would be to slaughter them as soon as possible after the fair was over.

6090. Mr. Dent.] That view has not been at all endorsed by the Council of the Royal Agricultural Society, has it?—No; as I said before the Council of the Royal Agricultural Society have not expressed an opinion upon that point.

6091. Mr. Tipping.] Do you not think that cattle dealers would look upon your idea of licensing them as a sort of stigma upon them; would they not rather kick at it?—I think the respectable cattle dealers would be inclined to adopt it; in fact a similar suggestion has been made by an English cattle dealer.

6092. That would not be generally so at all?—I think the large dealers and the respectable dealers would not object to be licensed and registered.

6093. What payment would you expect should

he made for such license; have you considered at all the rate?—I should say about 1*l.* would be sufficient.

6094. You would recommend the smallest sum compatible with licensing?—Yes.

6095. Have you examined much the general railway arrangements as regards the disinfection of trucks in England; are they carried out now systematically and satisfactorily?—By some railway companies it is done much better than by others, and at some stations it is done much better than at others.

6096. I suppose the largest companies carry out the Order in the most systematic way?—Yes, I should say so; it is done exceedingly well by the Bristol and Exeter Railway Company at Bristol; I think that that is the best method I have seen yet.

6097. If I understand you rightly, supposing the tables were turned, and England were to export to Ireland instead of Ireland exporting to England, you mean to imply that certain English dealers would be just as anxious to send their diseased cattle over the Channel as the Irish cattle dealers are to send them to us?—Certainly.

6098. You do not seem to assume any superior morality for this side of the Channel over Ireland?—Not by any means.

6099. Mr. Clare Head.] If a dealer sold diseased cattle after he was licensed, I suppose you would revoke his license?—I should not revoke his license the first time perhaps, but the second time I would suspend it, and if the dealer offended upon a third occasion, that is, after the suspension, I think I would revoke the license; I would not deal with it so stringently at first, because it is always advisable to give people a chance when there is a new regulation.

6100. Would you have this license granted by the magistrates in the district in which the dealer lived?—Yes, the magistrates would be better able to judge of the character of the man.

6101. You would have these licenses act not as a source of revenue, but as a guarantee of the respectability of the persons engaged in the trade?—Yes, I would have the licenses act as a sort of control over the men.

6102. Would you license the drovers as well as the dealers?—Yes, I would; but the Council of the Royal Agricultural Society do not adopt that view; the drovers are licensed at the present time in the metropolitan area, and that system works exceedingly well.

6103. Would you license all fairs in the vicinity of the cattle markets?—I would.

6104. Do you think that those fairs are a fruitful source of disease?—Yes, I do.

6105. Would you have them open at all times to inspection?—Yes.

6106. And kept under strict regulation?—Yes.

6107. Did you see any diseased sheep at Ballinacree Fair?—Yes.

6108. Were they affected with foot and mouth disease?—Yes.

6109. You do not agree with the report of Mr. Mostyn that there was no active disease among sheep?—No, I do not.

6110. The Metropolitan Cattle Market, I believe, is a fat market only as a rule?—Yes.

6111. Whereas the Irish imports consist chiefly of store cattle?—Yes, there is a large proportion of store animals, of course.

Mr. H. M.
Jenkins.

8 May 1873.

6112. So that any disease coming into the metropolitan market would not be likely to do the same amount of mischief that the importation of store stock from Ireland to England would do?—No, but at the same time cattle can now be removed out of the metropolis.

6113. In Liverpool, I think there is no cattle market for Irish store cattle?—There is no store market at Liverpool. The cattle market at West Derby is, practically, a fat stock market. There is no regulation against store stock being sent there, but nobody thinks of going there to buy store stock, and therefore you do not see it in the market.

6114. That is quite contrary to what it is at Bristol, is it not?—Quite contrary.

6115. There is a longer sea voyage to Bristol than there is to Liverpool?—Yes, from the Irish ports, from Drogheda or Dublin to Liverpool, the journey is about 12 hours, but most of the cattle going to Bristol go from Cork and Waterford and Dublin, and the voyage is about 20 hours or 24 hours.

6116. Do you see any difference in the ventilation of a ship in going up the Avon, as compared with the ship when at sea?—In the boats which are not furnished with any mechanical means of ventilation, the quantity of fresh air which goes through the hold altogether, depends to a great extent upon the speed of the vessel, as well as upon the nature of the river. The river Avon is a very narrow winding river, with exceedingly high banks, and the ventilation going up that river at a slow pace is very poor; the consequence is, that when the animals arrive at Bristol, they come out steaming.

6117. Did you go into the cattle holds at all?—Yes, I did.

6118. When they were coming up the Bristol Channel or the River Avon?—Yes.

6119. What was the effect upon yourself?—I cannot stand the atmosphere more than a few seconds at a time, it affects the eyes so much; it makes them smart considerably worse than a London fog, and the smell is very bad; there is a great deal of arsenic and sulphuretted hydrogen in the holds of those ships.

6120. Is that always the case in holds where cattle are?—Yes, to a greater or lesser extent.

6121. So that if there was one diseased bullock in a hold, he would have a good chance in a long voyage of communicating the disease to other cattle?—Yes, I should think so, because the air is not frequently renewed, so that whatever is thrown out by the animals remains for a considerable time in the hold, and therefore there is a much greater chance of the other animals imbibing the infection.

6122. It has to be breathed over and over again?—Yes.

6123. If they were on dock, there would not be the same chance of so extensive an infection?—Not at all.

6124. Did you notice the railway trucks in Ireland?—Yes.

6125. Are they generally cleansed and disinfected?—No, I could not ascertain that they were; they were generally very filthy whenever I saw them.

6126. When you were there, you did not see any attempt to cleanse them or disinfect them?—I never did.

6127. In what state were the lairs at Dublin and elsewhere, where you saw the cattle em-

barked?—With regard to the lairs at Dublin, one is an exceedingly good lair, namely, the one which belongs to the London and North Western Railway Company; that is divided into pens, and kept thoroughly clean and whitewashed; the water troughs are very clean, and everything is managed in an admirable manner there; but the other places are mere yards, so far as I know them.

6128. Did they seem to be specially well cleansed?—The manure is collected, and I suppose that is about all that is done; I could not ascertain that anything else was done.

6129. With regard to the boats themselves, what state were they in?—Some of the boats were very well cleansed, and some were not, but as the boats bring a return cargo they are always made clean enough to bring that cargo, but they are not thoroughly disinfected as they should be; sawdust is generally used to soak up the filth.

6130. Do you think that if there was efficient inspection, both at the landing and at the shipping port, it would greatly tend to diminish the spread of infection?—If the animals were inspected at the shipping port, and those found infected culled from the others, they, at any rate, would not go into the hold to infect the remainder which would then be with them. Of course a certain number of animals might, and probably would, have received the infection from those which would be culled out by inspection, but the period of incubation of the foot and mouth disease being from about 48 to 60 hours, these animals would not be in a condition to give infection until after they had arrived in England.

6131. Then you would have a second inspection?—I would have a second inspection. Of the two I consider inspection in Ireland far more important than inspection in England, but I consider that we should have inspection at both sides.

6132. Who would pay the cost of the inspection?—If you look at the Tables of the exportation of animals from Ireland to Great Britain you will find that there are about a million and a half of animals exported annually, and suppose you levied an inspection fee of, say 3 d. per head, that would give you an income of nearly 50,000 l. a year. I do not think that 3 d. a head would be felt as a very grievous thing by anybody, and 50,000 l. a year would be more than sufficient to pay the cost of all inspection that would be required, and the cost of the larger veterinary department which would in that case be required. I would unko the carrying companies the collectors of the inspection fees, I think.

6133. You stated, with regard to diseased cattle which were seized at markets or fairs, that you would have them kept till the fairs or markets were over?—Yes, I think that would be the safest plan.

6134. And when you had kept them till the fair was over what would you do with the rest of the herd which had been associated with them, supposing there was one bullock seized out of a lot of a score, would you let the other 19 go anywhere?—I would not let them go anywhere, certainly; I would allow the owner the option of removing them to his farm under restriction, or if he liked to slaughter them he might do so.

6135. Would you have the same regulation with regard to those animals which had been associated with the diseased animals, if they were just upon

upon the point of being sent to England, would you stop them?—No, I would not stop them on that side, because, as I say, the period of incubation of foot and mouth disease is such that the animals would arrive in England before they could do any mischief to other animals. I think I heard Professor Siemonds depose that animals which are in a state of incubation do not give off infection, and therefore those animals would arrive in England before they could do any mischief to other animals, so that the owner could elect whether he would take them to his farm and have his farm put under restrictions, or whether he would send them to the slaughter-house to be killed.

6136. With regard to compensation being given for the slaughter of animals affected with cattle plague or pleuro-pneumonia, what are your ideas upon that subject?—It seems to me that at present the amount of compensation is not sufficient to induce farmers to declare the existence of cattle plague, at any rate with sufficient alacrity. The difficulty is that the more you increase the compensation the greater is the liability that you incur, under certain circumstances, of people being careless with reference to getting the disease, and the probability sometimes of their getting rather more money than they ought to. I think the best way of meeting the case would be to take the farmer, so to speak, into a kind of partnership and give him a compensation, say one-half the value of his animals to the butcher before they were attacked with disease for those that were slaughtered diseased; and for those animals that had been in contact I would recommend not only one-half their value to the butcher previously to the disease coming amongst them, but one-half of the net value of the salvage that would be obtained by the sale of the carcasses if they were not diseased. Therefore the owner would get nearly the full value for those which had been in contact and not diseased; and as his compensation would depend to so great an extent upon the value of the salvage, you would, in that way, give a great stimulus to make him declare the existence of the disease as soon as possible.

6137. When those cattle were slaughtered by order of the Government inspector, who should pay the compensation?—I rather think that if the Government undertook the whole regulation of the country with regard to dealing with the contagious diseases of animals, the Government should pay the compensation, at any rate that would be some small relief to local taxation.

6138. You do not suppose that there is much inducement for a man ever to get the cattle plague on his farm, do you?—No.

6139. And then you say the owner would be less careful; it is a thing which he cannot help, is it not?—But then some men would be less careful, simply because they never are careful at all, unless they fear some frightful calamity will happen if they are not careful.

6140. I think the Royal Agricultural Society suggested the compulsory slaughter of all animals which had been herded with animals affected with cattle plague?—Yes; by order of the Government Inspector, I think they said.

6141. Did you make any inquiries when you were upon the Continent, with reference to the probability of our supplies of cattle from those parts of the Continent which were nearer to our shores diminishing, and that our supplies would be drawn more and more from Russia and the

East?—I have read a great deal, and gone a great deal into the statistics of the agriculture of different countries, and I cannot myself see how we are to depend to any great extent upon a supply of cattle from Russia. The fact is, that at present the price of meat in Vienna and Berlin, which are much more accessible from Russia than England, is (that is to say, the cattle-breeding portion of Russia), quite as great as it is in London; at any rate, for the quality of meat that we should get here from Russia. Therefore the inducement would be rather to send the animals to those places where they could be sent for the smallest charge; and I do not think that that place would be England.

6142. Then you do not imagine that the foreign live cattle trade will develop itself much more?—No, I should think not; we have heard often that a very small variation of price is quite sufficient either to send cattle here, or to prevent their being sent here; and it seems that the price of cattle is becoming in Germany and Austria very near what it is in England.

6143. What is your opinion with reference to the consumption of meat in England, as estimated in this last report?—I think it is very much too low. I made an estimate myself, from an estimate made by Mr. H. S. Thompson, similar to that which had been published in his paper, and my estimate comes within 3 lbs. of his. I find that we consume from 95 lbs. to 100 lbs. per head of the population per annum.

6144. That is considerably different from what is stated in that report?—Yes; it is stated as 78 lbs. here.

6145. Have you taken considerable pains to ascertain that?—Yes; the way Mr. Thompson worked it out was to ascertain from people engaged in the trade what was the average number out of a certain herd which would go to market during the course of a year, making a due allowance for deaths and castration. The whole of these details have been published in the *Journals of the Royal Agricultural Society*. Mr. Algernon Clarke made an estimate previously in the *Chamber of Agriculture Journal*, and Messrs. Titterton & Co., of Manchester, have made important estimates since, without having seen Mr. Thompson's paper, and they all come to the same result from different points of view.

6146. The estimates all come to the same thing?—They all make it about 20 lbs. more than is stated in this report.

6147. Do you think that the Veterinary Department should undertake any experiments at all?—I think it would be desirable that they should, just as the Medical Department of the Local Government Board have now an experimental sub-department, in which they investigate the causes of different diseases. Some of those reports have been most instructive of late; and I think that if the Veterinary Department had a similar sub-department, it would be most useful.

6148. They might be able to tell us, without much trouble or expense, whether horses and rabbits were subject to this disease?—I should think so.

6149. We have had a great number of estimates before us about the loss per head upon cattle, which are the subject of foot and mouth disease; have you turned your attention to that subject?—Yes; until recently I could not ascertain that anybody had any definite information upon the subject. Most farmers have an idea

Mr. H. M.
Jenkins.
8 May 1873.

Mr. H. M.
Jenkins.
—
2 May 1873

that, after an animal has been affected with disease, it takes a certain value of food to bring it back again to the same state. I should be inclined to add to the amount of the value of that food if it were definitely known, the increase in condition that might have been reasonably expected in the time, which would make the loss rather more than has been generally estimated; but I do not know that anybody has actually weighed an animal just at the time when it was affected with the disease, and weighed and measured the amount of food which was given to the animal to bring it back to the same weight, or anything like it. Recently, however, a report has been issued by the Joint Committee of Management of the Derbyshire Associated Dairies, and they give the returns of the quantity of milk yielded by 800 and odd cows in 37 different dairies, showing what was the value of the milk for a definite season, namely, the cheese-making season, taking it at the low price of 7d. a gallon. They say here, "The comparatively small quantity of milk supplied by some of the contributors, and the consequently small average shown, is attributable to the foot and mouth disease having prevented the milk of the dairy being sent to the factory." Now the difference between the highest average and the lowest average, taking the milk at 7d. per gallon, is as much as 11l. 0s. 11½d. Then if you take the average value of the milk per cow, for the whole of the 814 cows distributed through the 37 dairies, you will get an average value of 14l. 5s., that is taking diseased and healthy animals together, and calculating the milk at 7d. a gallon. Then suppose we take a dairy with as many as 38 cows in it, where possibly they were all affected, and which shows an average of 104l. 0s. 3½d. per cow, it gives an average loss, as compared with the whole of the cattle, diseased and healthy, of 4l. 4s. 8½d. per cow, the difference between the average and the minimum; then if there be a loss of the calf in many cases, striking the average, and remembering that you are deducting from an average of both diseased and healthy animals, I do not think that you can put the loss at less than 5l. per milch cow, taking these data.

6150. That is with regard to milch cows?—Yes.

6151. And the loss with store cattle would be considerably less?—Yes, it would be considerably less with store cattle.

6152. Are you of opinion that, putting everything together, the average of 2l. per head, which has been estimated, is too much or too little?—It cannot be less than 2l. per head, or one would think not, because the number of cows and heifers in milk or in calf, that is, animals such as these, is very nearly two-fifths of the whole cattle in the kingdom. Then supposing the damage done to the others was nothing, and supposing the animals got the disease in proportion to their total number, two fifths of 5l. is 2l.

6153. Mr. Dent.] You are basing your estimate of loss entirely upon the figures in the Report, and not from any practical experience of your own?—Yes, upon those figures; this table shows really the actual amount of money paid by the factories for the milk.

6154. I quite understand the figures upon which you are basing your calculations of the loss to dairy cows, but when you speak about two-fifths of the stock of the country being heifers and cows in calf, of course we are not to suppose that the whole of those heifers and cows have the

foot and mouth disease?—No; but if out of 100 cows, 10 of them have foot and mouth disease, that is, 10 per cent., and if all the other cattle in the country have the disease in the same proportion as cows have it, the calculation would be fair.

6155. With respect to some of those recommendations, the recommendations were not altogether unanimously agreed upon by the Council of the Royal Agricultural Society; there were upon some points differences of opinion, were there not?—Yes, upon some points.

6156. And especially upon that point with regard to licensing the dealers?—Yes, there was more difference upon that than upon anything else.

6157. There was considerable difficulty felt by the members of the Council, was there not, with reference to the possibility of defining a dealer in such a manner as to demand that he should be registered?—Quite so.

6158. There was some difference of opinion with regard to the necessity of registering him, yards, and fields used for the temporary detention of animals?—There was some difficulty about that.

6159. At the same time it appears to you a very important point that places used for the temporary detention of cattle going to fairs should be inspected?—Quite so; that is a most important point.

6160. In all these suggestions of the Royal Agricultural Society there was no intention to separate Ireland from any other part of the United Kingdom with reference to the rules and regulations which should be carried out?—No, certainly not.

6161. And there was no recommendation made about compulsory slaughter, such as was made by Professor Baldwin?—No, there was not.

6162. Nor any such suggestion as that made by yourself that animals detained at fairs and markets being found diseased should be slaughtered?—No.

6163. A difficulty was felt about working Clause 57 of the present Act with reference to where animals affected with foot and mouth disease at fairs and markets should be detained?—That is a difficulty.

6164. That is not a difficulty easily got over, because unless the local authorities have some place of their own to which those animals can be sent, or are able to hire such a place, Clause 57 could not be easily carried out?—No; and even if they had a place, that place very soon would become a centre of disease.

6165. That is one of the difficulties with regard to increasing the stringency in dealing with foot and mouth disease?—Yes; modification might be made in all cases. If the owner chose to take those animals which had simply been in contact with diseased animals to his own farm, and have that farm placed under restrictions, he might do so.

6166. You have been questioned a great deal with respect to the information which you had furnished you in Ireland as to your personal knowledge; your visit to Ireland on this occasion took place especially for the purpose of making inquiries into the management of the cattle trade, and how far the outbreaks of foot and mouth disease in England could be traced to any want of good regulations in the cattle trade and cattle traffic in Ireland?—Yes.

6167. That

Mr. H. M.
Jenkins.
8 May 1873.

6167. That has arisen from the very general opinion entertained in England that the disease was introduced to a very great extent by Irish cattle?—Quite so.

6168. And that the disease always broke out, and was more prevalent in England at the time of the movement of cattle, particularly at the time of the importation of store cattle from Ireland?—Yes, very much so.

6169. And the lessening of the disease which you have referred to at certain times of the year in Cheshire, and in the West Riding of Yorkshire, where tolerably accurate returns have been made, coincides very much with the cessation of the movement of cattle?—Quite so.

6170. Then when cattle are moved much more frequently, and are bought for the purpose of stocking the fields, whether they be English or Irish cattle, generally speaking, the disease becomes more prevalent?—That is so.

6171. And when the cattle are only bought or sold for the purposes of slaughter, the disease subsides and settles down?—Yes.

6172. Thus disease to a very great extent appears to follow the movement of cattle, and to be aggravated in all cases by the facilities of communication, and the great movement which does take place in the present day, of cattle?—Yes; because there is more chance of a diseased animal coming in contact with another, and infecting it.

6173. At fairs and markets?—Yes.

6174. You do not profess to have any practical knowledge of veterinary science, or any practical knowledge derived from the cultivation of stock yourself?—No; I do not.

6175. You were sent out to make inquiry from the best qualified persons with whom you could come in contact?—Quite so.

6176. And those quotations are put into your

Report as being quotations from sources which you believed to be trustworthy?—Quite so.

6177. And it is quite possible in making a quotation from an Irish agricultural paper that that paper might have been misinformed, and you do not yourself profess to vouch for the accuracy of it?—I do not.

6178. The feeling with regard to the cattle plague was very strong, that all animals which had been in contact should be slaughtered, and that animals which might, in the judgment of the Government veterinary inspector, be liable to propagate the disease should be slaughtered also?—Yes; without their being put to the proof of contact.

6179. But it was felt that that should not be done except upon the authority probably of a central inspector?—Yes; of an inspector of the Government.

6180. And not done merely upon the authority of the local inspector?—No.

6181. Then another failure in the Act which has been felt, has been the want of uniformity of action of the local authorities in England?—Yes; that is so.

6182. It is the fact, is it not, that there is a different practice in almost every local authority?—Yes.

6183. It would be very desirable that one uniform rule, both for the local authorities of boroughs and counties, should be put in force, whatever that rule may be?—Yes.

6184. That, I think, was one of the strongest opinions expressed by the Council of the Royal Agricultural Society?—Yes; the opinion was that the measure should not be optional.

6185. And that it should not vary between a borough and a county?—Quite so.

6186. I think at that time you were endeavouring to ascertain what the result would be?—I was.

Monday, 12th May 1873.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mr. William Edward Forster.
Mr. James Barclay.
Mr. Jacob Bright.
Mr. Callan.
Mr. Clay.
Mr. Dent.

Mr. William Johnston.
Mr. Kavanagh.
Mr. Monsell.
Mr. O'Connor.
Mr. Pell.
Mr. Ridley.

THE RIGHT HONOURABLE WILLIAM EDWARD FORSTER, IN THE CHAIR.

Professor HUGH FERGUSON, re-called; and further Examined.

Professor
H. Ferguson.
—
12 May
1873.

6187. Mr. Dent.] I BELIEVE you wish to give some explanations to the Committee with regard to the course pursued by the Irish Government in dealing with the railway companies; you omitted to mention some points on your last examination, did you not?—Yes.

6188. Those points are supplementary to some questions which were asked you by Mr. Monsell, are they not?—Yes, they are. In reference to the Questions Nos. 4878, 4879, 4880, 4881, and 4882, put to me, on the 1st instant, during my examination before the Committee, may I beg the favour of being permitted to supplement to the answers given thereto the statement that, as far back as the year 1870, the Under Secretary for Ireland, by direction of the Lords Justices of Ireland, issued a circular to the secretaries of the respective railway companies in Ireland, intimating that their Lordships would be happy to receive and take into consideration any suggestions which their different boards might think fit to make generally on the subject, as affected by Council Orders, of "the transit of animals by sea and railway, and their being provided with water when conveyed by railway;" at the same time enclosing, for the information of the different boards, copies of two Orders of the Lords of Her Majesty's Privy Council, dated respectively the 12th day of May 1870, relating to the same subject. This course, I understand, was adopted in consequence of the different companies having so repeatedly assigned, as a reason for their non-compliance with the Irish Council Order of the 6th day of March 1868, that peculiarity of circumstances which they could not be reasonably expected to control, rendered a thorough compliance with the Council Orders quite impracticable. The replies from the different companies to the Government Circular not containing explanations sufficiently satisfactory, a searching official inquiry was instituted with the view of ascertaining to what extent, if any, the objections urged by the railway boards against the proposed and then existing Council Order provisions were valid, or the contrary, and with the result that it was found that in many instances the means

of complying with the Council Order requirements were not at the disposal of the companies; for instance, on most of the lines there was such a deficiency of cattle trucks and waggons, that goods waggons had to be utilised for the purpose of carrying animals; and the freshly applied lime-wash and other matters ordered for the disinfection of such vehicles after their being used for cattle carriage, had too frequently the effect of damaging soft goods and other merchandises carried in them subsequent to such disinfection. It was also ascertained that at many of the cattle delivery and receiving stations, a sufficient supply of water could not be obtained, particularly during the summer months, for the washing out or cleansing of the cattle trucks and waggons, as required by Council Orders. Circulars have been repeatedly issued on the subject, and lengthened correspondence has from time to time taken place relative to it, with the view of inducing a more general compliance with the Orders of Council; but, unfortunately, with but little effect, until lately. By the majority of the public it seems to be considered as unjust to prosecute only in some instances, while refraining from doing so in others, even when the offences committed by the latter are the results of peculiarities of circumstances which may be reasonably regarded as almost unavoidable, such as there being no attainable water supply in the locality for the purposes of such cleansing and disinfection as is required by Council Orders. Notwithstanding which, those Orders are now being rigidly enforced in such localities as afford no reasonable excuse for their evasion; and some prosecutions have been recently ordered for non-compliance with them, but some difficulty has arisen as to who, involved in the offences, are the parties on whom it is most fitting to fix the legal responsibility, it not being deemed desirable to hold a mere railway porter wholly responsible for serious offences, the commission of which, by implication, is ordered by his employers, and is included in his prescribed duties as their servant. The difficulty, however, I have reason to believe, is being solved in a satisfactory manner.

Mr. JEROME JAMES GUIRY, called in; and Examined.

6188. Mr. KERRAGH.] You are a Magistrate of the county of Tipperary, I believe?—I am.

6189. And one of the largest landed proprietors in the county?—I am.

6191. You farm between 2,400 and 2,500 acres, do you not?—I do.

6192. And you keep between 500 and 600 dairy and score cattle upon that farm?—I do.

6193. And something over 1,500 sheep?—About 1,500 sheep.

6194. Consequently you have had practical experience in most kinds of diseases in cattle and sheep?—I have.

6195. And I believe your cattle have been attacked upon your farm some five or six times within the past few years with foot and mouth disease?—About five or six times.

6196. Could you state at what time those attacks have occurred?—I could not state exactly at what time, but they have occurred about four or five times within the last three years. I have had the disease frequently.

6197. You will understand that we have had evidence before us that the foot and mouth disease comes at intermittent times in a sort of wave, and then it is very bad, then it ceases, and then it comes on again?—I never had the foot and mouth disease very badly.

6198. But you stated that you have had that disease four or five times within the last three years; has that been almost continuous?—No; the place would be clear from it, and then I would get home a beast, and then perhaps that beast would give it to the particular farm on which it was put.

6199. Do you believe foot and mouth disease to be a disease of a very contagious and infectious nature?—It is most contagious, I think.

6200. But you regard the losses occasioned by it as very much exaggerated, do you not?—Very much so, I think.

6201. Do you know that when that disease attacks store or young cattle the losses are always trifling?—I think so.

6202. But in dairy cattle and sheep you consider that it is the opposite; that the losses are much more serious?—I consider, in breeding ewes and dairy cattle, the losses to be heavier.

6203. You are of opinion that the entire losses occasioned by foot and mouth disease are not so serious as to call for any such extreme and expensive measures as the slaughtering of all cattle affected by it, or any herds in contact with them?—Quite so; I am sure of it.

6204. You believe that if any vexatious restrictions or severe restrictions were placed upon the exportation of Irish cattle, they would not only have the effect of raising the price of meat, but would also depreciate the price of land?—I think so; they would have the effect of making the price of meat higher here, and of depreciating the price of land in Ireland.

6205. And you think that in the end they would have the effect of seriously injuring both countries?—I do.

6206. You think that the greatest restriction which ought to be placed upon the stockowners would be the closing of all fairs and markets from, say, the 20th of June to the 1st of August in infected districts?—I think that that should be the severest restriction.

Q 58.

6207. Mr. DEVL.] Would you go so far as to advocate that plan?—I would in infected districts, but in infected districts only.

6208. What would you call an infected district?—What I would call an infected district would be one particular townland, or a group of townlands.

6209. Where the disease was?—Where the disease appeared to break out.

6210. Mr. KERRAGH.] But the whole operation of this restriction should be only imposed in a case where a district happened to be infected?—I think it should not be imposed anywhere else.

6211. You would also be in favour of stopping the movement of all score cattle and sheep along the roads through infected districts?—I would.

6212. You also lay some stress upon the importance of the constabulary not allowing trespass on the highways?—I think that is the worst thing of all, because it is the habit of some people who have no lead to let a single cow graze upon the road.

6213. That is a very common thing, is it not?—It is a very common thing, especially in my part of the country.

6214. Mr. DEVL.] Are the people allowed now to let cattle range without anybody to take care of them?—Yes, they are.

6215. But in England there is a fine of 5 s. if cattle are allowed to stray upon the road without some one in charge of them?—I do not know that it is the same particular Act, but I know that there is an Act prohibiting trespass upon the public road in Ireland.

6216. Mr. KERRAGH.] There have been often cases at the petty sessions for that offence, have there not?—Yes, I have frequently fined people for that offence.

6217. What are the fines in your district for that offence?—The first offence is usually a fine of 1 s., and if the offence is repeated in my district, we make a rule of fining the people 5 s., and then if they go on again, we fine them more. I cannot recollect what is the highest penalty.

6218. But still, notwithstanding these fines, you find that it is the habit to let cattle wander upon the public road?—That is the case.

6219. With respect to the shipment of cattle, in your opinion, do not those cattle receive unnecessary bad usage?—I am quite certain that they do; they beat them with sticks, and force them into the ships. I attribute that entirely to the stock not being in time at the port. Generally speaking, the boats have to leave at certain times, and the animals are crushed on board with much cruelty.

6220. And that, I presume, you consider injures them?—Very much so.

6221. And fat stock particularly?—It injures fat stock desperately.

6222. There is no way of preventing that, is there?—Some companies make a rule of having them on their premises an hour before the boat starts from the wharf, but I do not think the companies carry that out. I think they will take the cattle from the wharf at the very last moment.

6223. But is there no inspector or any person present at the shipment of the cattle to prevent that cruelty?—None. I think that foot and mouth

Mr.
J. J. Guiry.
—
12 May
1873.

Mr.
J. J. Guiry.
12 May
1873.

month disease would have been stopped altogether if an inspector had been appointed at the beginning at the port of embarkation.

6224. Your opinion is, as you say, that the appointment of an inspector at the beginning would have put a stop to foot and mouth disease?—Yes, I think so.

6225. Do you mean a veterinary inspector?—I do not know about that. I think some competent inspector should be appointed at the port of embarkation.

6226. You think that if such had been done, it would have had the effect of protecting the English graziers and farmers from the importation of foot and mouth disease from Ireland?—Quite so.

6227. You would also oblige the cattle to be at the port of embarkation some hours before starting?—Yes, that is for the purpose of inspection. I would say from 6 hours to 12 hours.

6228. But would you, or would you not, be in favour of confiscating any animal that was found in an affected state at the shipping port?—No, certainly not. The reason I would give for saying that is, that it would be perhaps hard upon the farmer or the dealer; he may have bought the cattle all sound, and the disease may break out at once, or the seller may have sold the cattle in the same way, without knowing that the animals were infected.

6229. You consider that that would be too severe a punishment?—I consider so.

6230. Do not you think it would have rather a salutary effect in making the dealers careful?—I think so, but I think it would be hard on them.

6231. Do you believe that the exportation of live fat stock is a great risk to the graziers and breeders, in consequence of the loss by transit?—I think so.

6232. If it could be carried out, would you be in favour of a dead meat market?—Yes; I am very glad to say I think it will be carried out by the Great Western Railway Company.

6233. Do you think that that would be an easy thing to carry out?—I believe that it is under the consideration of the directors to carry it out, but I am not quite sure. Mr. Power, the solicitor at Clonmel, was telling me so.

6234. That, of course, would bear no reference to store cattle?—No, of course not; only to fat cattle.

6235. With respect to pleuro-pneumonia, do you regard that as one of the greatest calamities that can happen to a stockowner?—The greatest.

6236. Do you believe that Government ought at once to turn its attention to stamping out that disease?—I am quite certain of it.

6237. You would not be in favour of treating this disease as foot and mouth disease, but you would be for slaughtering all diseased animals, and all herds which had been in contact with them?—I would. I would draw a garden round a district, and slaughter all animals within that district, if it were necessary, that is to say, when it was shown that it existed. Sometimes pleuro-pneumonia is mistaken for some other disease, such as a heavy cold, which may be resting on the lungs of an animal, but I would slaughter all within the district, when it was quite clear that it was pleuro-pneumonia.

6238. And you would slaughter all that could possibly have come in contact with the disease?—I would.

6239. You would, in fact, treat pleuro-pneu-

monia in the same way as cattle plague?—I would; I consider it just as bad.

6240. You are of opinion, I presume, that any law which is passed of that nature could not be effectually carried out if the stockowners were not paid for their slaughtered cattle?—It would not have the desired effect; the disease would be concealed.

6241. You believe, do you not, that unless there is compensation, it would be impossible to discover the outbreaks of disease?—It would be quite impossible. I have known people living next door not know of the existence of the disease.

6242. And the tendency would be for owners to sell their cattle as soon as ever they discovered the disease?—I have known a case where persons sold cattle, and I have no doubt they were sold to six or eight persons; that was before any restrictions were imposed; six or eight years ago.

6243. You think that slaughter without compensation would tend to increase that risk?—Yes, I think it would be a failure.

6244. You would be in favour of paying the owner four-fifths of the value of the slaughtered cattle?—Four-fifths; and the reason I say four-fifths is, that I would not give the entire value, because that would be putting a premium upon the disease, and in that opinion I am borne out by several large graziers around me. I consulted the Lismore Agricultural Society.

6245. You consider that to pay the full value might tend to jobbery?—Exactly so.

6246. And that to pay too much under the value would tend to induce concealment?—It would tend to concealment, I think.

6247. And you regard the proportion of four-fifths as about the nearest fair compensation that you can arrive at?—I regard it as the nearest fair compensation that I can arrive at.

6248. You are of opinion that this money paid for slaughtered cattle should come out of some general fund, and not out of any local one?—I am quite certain of it; everyone is interested in that question.

6249. It is, in fact, a national object?—It is a national object, because, of course, if the cattle are not protected meat will get dearer.

6250. Now with regard to the Irish constabulary, you are of opinion that, although they do all in their power at present, they are not a sufficient body to enforce the restrictions necessary to stamp out foot and mouth disease?—No, they are not.

6251. It is an extra duty, is it not, which has been put upon them?—It is an extra duty put upon them without any payment.

6252. Have you heard the general nature of the evidence which has been given before this Committee?—I read part of it.

6253. Did you read the evidence given by the veterinary professors, and other witnesses, with regard to the insidiously infectious nature of foot and mouth disease?—Yes, I did.

6254. And that the infection can be conveyed by merohandies, by the clothes of herds, by hoes and rabbits, and by woodpigeons, and, as Professor Baldwin also says, by sewers and running streams; do you agree with that?—I do.

6255. If that is so, is it not possible that any amount of inspection or restriction would be powerless to prevent the importation of disease?—I think so.

6256. And

6256. And you have also heard the nature of the prosecution which Professor Baldwin makes to get rid of the disease by stopping all fairs and markets, and the movement of all store stock, for the two months of June and July, and afterwards dealing with every fresh outbreak as with cattle plague?—I have heard that.

6257. Would you recommend to the Committee the adoption of that proposal as one likely to be attended with the beneficial results which Professor Baldwin anticipates?—I would not.

6258. Do you agree with him that the farmers would willingly agree to such restrictions?—I am quite sure they would not.

6259. Are you of opinion that the stoppage of all fairs and markets for two months would occasion great loss and inconvenience to the farmers?—It would occasion great loss.

6260. Allowing, for argument sake, that the restrictions which Professor Baldwin proposes were successful in reducing disease to a minimum, do you consider that it would be possible at once to discover every fresh case of outbreak in the country?—You could not find every fresh outbreak out.

6261. Would not the immediate discovery of every such outbreak be imperatively necessary in order to prevent the disease spreading again?—Yes.

6262. And without such discovery all the loss and inconvenience occasioned by the restrictions upon movement, and by the stoppage of fairs and markets, would go for nothing?—It would go for nothing.

6263. We should be, in fact, as far as the disease was concerned, left where we were?—We should be quite as badly off.

6264. Mr. Dent.] Are you an exporter of cattle yourself?—Yes, sometimes.

6265. Your farm is a breeding farm, I suppose?—I have three dairies; I have about 180 cows milking, and I fatten from 100 to 200 head of cattle every year.

6266. Do you rear the calves from those cows?—I rear the calves and finish them off from the time they are calves until they are fattened off.

6267. Until they go off as fat cattle?—Yes.

6268. Are your farms of 2,500 acres all contiguous, or in separate farms?—They are in separate farms.

6269. So that you are enabled to isolate the cattle in case of disease breaking out?—I am enabled to stop up any particular farm.

6270. I think you stated that foot and mouth disease came upon your farm generally by importation, by buying other cattle?—Yes, I did.

6271. Have you found your own breeding farms keep free from foot and mouth disease when you had foot and mouth disease on other farms?—Yes.

6272. I do not quite understand the restrictions which you propose for foot and mouth disease in Ireland; I do not quite understand if you advocate for two months in the year the closing of fairs and markets in infected districts?—Only in infected districts.

6273. How would you declare those districts to be infected?—We have town lands in Ireland which go according to their order on the Survey Map, and I would declare that farm infected which had the disease upon it. If my opinion were asked, I would say that I am humbly of opinion that the foot and mouth disease ought to

be allowed to run, and that you should clear it out of the Act altogether.

6274. I thought you had given it as your opinion that you advocated this restriction yourself?—It would be the severest restriction that you could impose.

6275. But what we want to know is, what the farmers and graziers of Ireland, men like yourself, who understand the subject, would do with respect to legislation upon foot and mouth disease; I understand you now to say that you would not legislate for that disease, but would strike it out of the Act?—I think I would.

6276. Would you strike foot and mouth disease out of the Act so far as to allow a person to take an animal affected with foot and mouth disease into a public market?—I have known persons buy animals, knowing them to be infected.

6277. Would you be prepared to say that there should be no restriction upon exposing for sale in a market, or driving upon a road, an animal affected with foot and mouth disease?—I would.

6278. You think so little of it?—I think so little of it.

6279. Then we may consider it struck out of the evidence, that you advocate the closing of fairs and markets?—I would wish to correct my evidence in that respect, and to say that the severest restriction I would recommend would be the closing of all fairs and markets within a certain district. I would say that ought to be the severest restriction, but I would not advocate it.

6280. But what the Committee want to have from a man like yourself, with so much land, is, what you consider would be the best way of dealing with the disease?—I would leave it out of the Act.

6281. And not impose any restrictions with respect to foot and mouth disease?—No; I consider the loss from foot and mouth disease very much exaggerated.

6282. And those statements which had been made in this Committee-room, of a million and a half being lost in Ireland last year from foot and mouth disease, you do not agree with?—I do not.

6283. You do not agree with the statement as to the loss to animals, taking one with another, being anything like 2*l*. a head?—I do not.

6284. There is a considerable loss in cows from abortion, is there not?—Yes, there is.

6285. Is there not sometimes a heavy loss in young calves, when they have had milk given them from an infected animal?—I have known the disease upon one of my farms; the herdman never reported it to me, as he made so light of it; it was so slight upon the calves.

6286. But from your experience, have you found your calves die which have had milk from infected cows?—I do not farm in that way; the way I farm is that I make butter from the milk, and give the buttermilk to the calves.

6287. But can you bring up calves on buttermilk in Ireland?—Sometimes.

6288. That perhaps accounts for their being such wretched-looking animals when they come to England?—I mean when the cream has been taken from the milk; it is skim milk.

6289. But you have not found a loss from the calves taking the milk of diseased animals?—I have not.

6290. Now with respect to the ports of embarkation; would you wish to have an inspector there

Mr.
J. J. Gaird.
12 May
1873.

Mr.
J. J. Guiry.
12 May
1873.

there to examine all the animals that were to be shipped, or would you merely have that done for the satisfaction of the English people?—I would have it done for the satisfaction of the English people.

6291. And not that you believe in its efficacy?—Not that I believe in it; I do not mind it.

6292. Supposing an inspector found a herd in which there were two or three diseased animals, how would you deal with those diseased animals?—I would put them aside; I would have some farms taken for them, and charge the owner with the keep of them until they were quite recovered.

6293. Those lairs which the diseased animals were sent to, or those grazing farms which they were sent to, would become nests of disease, would they not?—I would recommend that they should be sent to some place, but I would not slaughter them.

6294. That would be like an hospital?—It would be like an hospital.

6295. In the case of pleuro-pneumonia, would you be inclined to slaughter the animals which had been in contact with animals so diseased; do you think it is so infectious as to require that course being pursued?—I do; I give that as my opinion, but others differ from me.

6296. You have had pleuro-pneumonia amongst your stock, I suppose?—Only once.

6297. You do not speak from practical experience of it in that way?—No, I do not; I saw it once in my herd.

6298. How many of your cattle had it then?—Six.

6299. Did you try the process of isolating them and keeping them entirely apart?—I put them aside, and snow came on at the time, and I think that for stopping it.

6300. Did those infected animals all die, or did you slaughter them?—I think I ordered them to be killed and buried.

6301. It has been stated here that infection from pleuro-pneumonia can only arise from the breath of diseased animals, and that it is not conveyed by contact with the skin or anything of that kind, but only from the breath; do you agree with that statement?—I think it is conveyed by the breath; but I am not sufficiently able to judge of that matter.

6302. Your experience of pleuro-pneumonia is not very large; but what you come here to say is, that your opinion as a large grazier and feeder is, that foot and mouth disease is not of that importance that it ought to be kept in the list of the contagious diseases of animals?—Quite so.

6303. Mr. Barclay.] Do you breed largely?—I breed from the 180 cows which I mentioned.

6304. Are you not afraid of foot and mouth disease getting amongst the breeding cows?—No, I am not.

6305. Have you had foot and mouth disease amongst your breeding cows?—Yes.

6306. Did it do any damage?—I keep an account of it. Upon one farm I made, I think, in one year 133 firkins of butter, and on that same farm, though the summer was the same, the firkins of butter were only two short, notwithstanding those cattle having the foot and mouth disease.

6307. Were you any calves short?—No.

6308. You think that the owners of such animals as are slaughtered for being in contact with animals affected with pleuro-pneumonia, should be compensated to the extent of four-fifths of the value of each animal?—Four-fifths, I should say.

6309. What should be done with the carcasses of the animals?—Those which were not affected should be sold, I think, after inspection.

6310. Would there not be a considerable amount of salvage in slaughtering those animals which had been in contact?—I would slaughter all the animals and sell them.

6311. But not if they were seriously affected with the disease?—Not if they were seriously affected with the disease; in that case I would slaughter them and have them buried.

6312. Mr. Ridley.] Are there many cattle sent over to England from your district?—Yes, thousands.

6313. I suppose it is within your knowledge whether they start in a healthy state?—Yes, I think so, except that some of them may have foot and mouth disease. I do not live near a port of embarkation; I live, say, 20 miles from one.

6314. Have you formed any opinion with reference to whether those cattle which come from Ireland contract the disease in transit, either in the railway trucks or on steamboats, before they come into English markets?—I am not able to give evidence to that effect.

6315. Mr. O'Connor.] You stated that, as a rule, the general opinion in your district was pretty much the same as yours?—I have consulted with two or three gentlemen, and I asked their opinion. I have asked Mr. Cooke, who is a very large breeder, and I have asked Lord Lonsdale, of the Agricultural Society, and they both of them agree with me.

6316. That is with regard to the foot and mouth disease?—Yes.

6317. Now, with regard to what you stated about the stoppage of fairs in an infected district, and so on; you thought that that was about the outside that would be borne by the farmers?—Yes.

6318. Not that you recommended it?—Quite so. I thought that was the outside that the farmers would bear.

6319. Nothing more stringent than that would be tolerated at all?—Not at all.

6320. Mr. J. J. Guiry.] To what parts in England and Scotland do cattle from your district go?—I only know one man that takes a large lot from Glendal, and he brings them to Glasgow. I think all the rest go from Waterford to Bristol and Liverpool.

6321. What large fairs are there in your locality?—Chennel, Carrick, and Waterford.

6322. Have you seen any instances of foot and mouth disease in those fairs?—No.

6323. Are there any imports of cattle to your neighbourhood?—There are no imports whatever that I am aware of.

6324. Have you seen foot and mouth disease among sheep at all?—I have.

6325. Will you tell us in what instances you have seen it?—I saw it in some breeding cows of mine.

6326. Did you suffer any loss by death?—Yes, I lost some lambs by it.

6327. Have you been in the habit at all of visiting Ballinacree fair?—Yes, I was there once or twice, I think.

6328. How lately was that?—I was there in 1867, I think it was, or in 1866.

6329. Have you not been there more recently than that?—No, I have not.

6330. Are you prepared to recommend any steps to the Committee which would be desirable to prevent the spread of contagious diseases generally?

generally in Ireland?—Yes, I am prepared to recommend the slaughter of all animals, both those affected and those in contact with them in the case of pleuro-pneumonia. I am firmly convinced of that, and it is the opinion of every single person to whom I have spoken.

6331. Have you any other suggestions to make to the Committee?—None whatever.

6332. Mr. Kavanagh.] Before you came over to England, did you not consult with the Agricultural Society and with Lord Lismore?—No, I met Lord Lismore, and I asked him to read your letter to the Agricultural Society, and he did so.

6333. But the evidence you have given now expresses the opinions of the Agricultural Society from your neighbourhood, I think, does it not?—Yes, I think so, but they passed no resolution authorising me to give that evidence.

6334. Chairman.] You stated that you had had the foot and mouth disease among your cattle five or six times during the last four or five years?—Yes.

6335. And amongst your sheep also?—Yes.

6336. When did you have the foot and mouth disease last?—I think I have it now.

6337. And how many animals do you think you have affected by it?—It is sheep that are affected with it now.

6338. Last time when you had the foot and mouth disease amongst cattle, how many were affected by it?—I had 20 in one lot, and I think it is another. I think it was one of the 11 which first showed the disease the morning after the fair at Clonmel, and I think in a week afterwards the entire herd had it to the number of 31.

6339. Were the animals ill long?—I think about a fortnight.

6340. What sort of cattle were they?—They were two year old heifers.

6341. Have you ever had the disease worse amongst your herds than that?—No; when it got into the dairy cows I thought I would suffer

a very serious loss at the end of the year, and I found the loss was only very trifling.

6342. With regard to sheep, have many got the disease now?—I think that out of 120, 80 have got it.

6343. What is your time mainly for shipment to England?—I have them fit about the 1st of July down to the 1st of December.

6344. You begin in July to sell fat cattle?—I do up to about the 1st of December, or the end of the year.

6345. You do not sell store cattle much, I suppose?—No, I never sell store cattle; I buy store cattle.

6346. Do the farmers in your neighbourhood sell store cattle?—They do.

6347. They sell store cattle more than fat cattle perhaps for England?—The tillage farmers sell their stock coming on in the spring, and the graziers buy them, generally speaking.

6348. From your part of the country the animals generally leave fat for England?—Yes, but a great deal of store cattle goes from my part of the country.

6349. At what time do store cattle go generally?—I think they are commencing now; they commence about this time of year.

6350. And go on till when?—They go on till the end of the bullock season, about the 1st of December.

6351. Then the stoppage of all movement of cattle in Ireland from the 1st of May to July, and if necessary to the 1st of September, would be a great inconvenience?—It would be a great inconvenience.

6352. It would interfere with the export trade to England as much as you could interfere with it, would it not?—It would entirely interfere with it. The season which you have mentioned is the season for putting cows to the bull, and it would be a very serious inconvenience.

6353. Mr. Berkeley.] In what particular month do you serve the cows?—From the 20th of June to the 1st of August.

Mr. SAMUEL GARNETT, called in; and Examined.

6354. Mr. Kavanagh.] You are a Magistrate, I believe, for the counties of Meath and Galway?—I am.

6355. You hold a considerable quantity of land in your own hands?—I do.

6356. About how many acres?—About 1,400 Irish acres of grazing land, and I manage for my neighbours something equal to that, and a large mountain district in the county of Galway, for my mother-in-law.

6357. Altogether perhaps between 3,000 and 4,000 acres?—Altogether about that.

6358. These lands are principally grazing lands, are they not?—They are principally grazing lands.

6359. You have been actively engaged in the Irish cattle trade during the last 50 years, have you not?—Yes, and upwards. I have been 52 years going to Ballinasloe fair without missing a year.

6360. In round numbers, what is about the average number of cattle and sheep which pass through your hands annually?—Taking my own actual cattle, and my neighbour's cattle, and my mother-in-law's cattle, I should say that the number would be about 1,500 in a year.

6361. You must have had consequently con-

siderable experience in the different contagious diseases to which cattle are liable, such as lung distemper and foot and mouth disease?—Yes, and since its first appearance I have watched it closely and guarded against it whenever I could.

6362. Are you of opinion that they are both of a highly infectious and contagious nature?—I think so, certainly.

6363. First, with respect to pleuro-pneumonia, although it is not so highly infectious and easily spread as foot and mouth disease, do you not consider it much more fatal than foot and mouth disease?—I think so. When that disease attacks a herd there is a much more considerable loss; but I think that that is owing to the want of facilities given to the graziers to have the animals slaughtered upon the first appearance of the disease. There are two diseases, lung disease, and what they call dry murrain, and if dry murrain is not taken in its very first stage it becomes almost as injurious to graziers as lung disease, and if facilities were given to have those animals slaughtered upon the very first appearance of the disease, we would take advantage of that. Now the best gentleman who has been examined has mentioned the great difference between dairy and grazing farms, and that dairy cows are in a less

Mr.
J. J. Guiry,
12 May
1873.

Mr.
S. Garnett.
—

Mr.
S. Garnett.
12 May
1873.

saleable state than the feeding cattle, and therefore he looks for compensation, but in grazing cattle, if allowed to slaughter at once, we would do it at once, without keeping the animals amongst our herds, and they would be good saleable meat.

6364. *Chairman.*] Then your inclination as a grazier would be, if you saw any danger of pleuro-pneumonia, to sell the animal as soon as possible?—Yes, of course to get rid of it at once.

6365. To sell it or slaughter it?—To sell it. I think in 1847 there was regular trade when the disease first appeared. Men came over from Liverpool and bought up all those cattle when any were supposed to be affected with the disease; I have seen 100 taken off a farm in one day, and the consequence was that the disease disappeared altogether in a short time.

6366. *Mr. Kewenagh.*] You stated to me that you were in favour of a regulation that all cases of pleuro-pneumonia should be at once slaughtered?—That is so, I mean that they should be sold for slaughter.

6367. *Chairman.*] I think I gathered rightly from your evidence that you being a grazier, your practice has been, when you thought that any of your animals was likely to have pleuro-pneumonia, to sell them?—To sell them at once, and I think if facilities were given for that, it would be adopted by all, and the cattle would be sent off at once.

6368. Would not the sending off of the cattle be likely to spread the disease?—No; because they would be sent off before they could spread the infection; they would be sent off in a state before they would be infectious. I cannot give you the details as Professor Ferguson could, but that is the case.

6369. When an animal becomes affected with pleuro-pneumonia the disease remains in it for some time, does it not?—My idea of pleuro-pneumonia is this, that it remains for months upon an animal before it develops itself.

6370. You mentioned a case in which a Liverpool man came over and bought a large quantity of such animals?—Yes; it was a regular trade at one time.

6371. Do not you think that those animals when they arrived in Liverpool would spread the disease to the neighbouring farms?—No; they were taken to the slaughterhouses in Liverpool, and would be all consumed in two or three days; but I have known cattle shipped for England when it was supposed they had lung disease or pleuro-pneumonia upon them. In the first stage it is impossible to ascertain whether it is dry murrain or lung disease, and therefore in the first stage we give them medicine to ascertain what it is, and those animals, when they got the medicine, did not yield to it; but when they were shipped, for the purpose of sale as being unsound, then, upon the voyage, and from the shaking of the train, the medicine took effect upon them, and when they got to Liverpool they were perfectly sound.

6372. You think that the voyage and the journey did them good?—They had the dry murrain upon them; it is a sort of indigestion; they are not able to digest the food they eat, and it sticks in the back-tripe, and it takes a great deal of medicine to affect it. I have had a good deal of dry murrain in the mountain districts among my mother-in-law's cattle.

6373. *Mr. Kewenagh.*] We are not inquiring into that now?—But I say that it is impossible to distinguish lung disease from pleuro-pneumonia in its first stage. I may say that the juice of hoon is the best purgative you can get.

6374. What you now recommend to this Committee is that all animals affected with pleuro-pneumonia should be at once slaughtered?—I say that facilities should be given to the owners of cattle to dispose of them for slaughter; that is the way I would put it.

6375. That is what I wanted to understand. You would recommend that facilities should be given to the owners of cattle to sell them?—Yes, to sell them for immediate slaughter.

6376. You mean that facilities should be given to sell animals for slaughter?—Yes, I would recommend that facilities should be given for that purpose.

6377. How are you going to secure the slaughter of the animal afterwards?—The animal would be sent to a slaughtering market. Liverpool is a slaughtering market, Manchester is a slaughtering market, and Dublin is a slaughtering market; there is a slaughtering market there.

6378. You think it is quite a mistake to say that the carcasses of animals affected with the foot and mouth disease are unfit for human food?—I know from facts, which I can state to the Committee, that in 1847, when I did conceive that the disease would yield to treatment, I had then treated, and they died, five or six in a day, and they were all eaten by people in the neighbourhood, and they were never in such a healthy state in their lives before, for they had animal food to eat, which they have not got generally.

6379. You think that foot and mouth disease, although it is not by any means of so fatal and dangerous a character as pleuro-pneumonia, is more infectious and easily spread?—It is more easily spread.

6380. You witnessed the disease first in 1844, did you not?—That is the first case which I can call to remembrance.

6381. And you have reason to believe that the disease was imported from this country, have you not?—I think the disease was in England before it was in Ireland. There was a large importation of calves about that time, and it is natural to suppose that the disease did come from England.

6382. At the time of this outbreak which you referred to in 1844, you did not suffer much from the disease in your part of the country, I believe?—No, we suffered very little.

6383. The foot and mouth disease disappeared without any Government interference, did it not?—It did.

6384. You have heard the nature of the evidence which we have received in this Committee from the veterinary professors, and other witnesses, with regard to the highly infectious nature of foot and mouth disease, that the infection can be conveyed by merchandise, by the clothes of a herdsmen, by harness and rabbits, by woodpigeons, and by running streams and rivers?—I have.

6385. Generally do you agree with that?—Certainly not, and I was quite astonished, from facts which I can state to the Committee, on reading Professor Baldwin's evidence in reference to running streams carrying the disease, and of all herds drinking below becoming affected.

affected. It so happened that in 1871 I had one division of my land upon which I fed 35 bullocks, and the only supply of water which those animals had was from a well, which rises in my neighbourhood, Mr. Gerard's land. The fence between us is a double fence, and there is a gullet under the fence which takes the water from the well into my farm, and in winter that is a very strong stream. At this time of the year as the well fills the water falls, but by guarding the water, that is, fencing it round, the animals can drink without walking into the water; there is always a supply of clean water for the animals to drink. In 1870, every beast in Mr. Gerard's farm was affected with foot and mouth disease, and on my farm I had 35 animals, 25 of them from the time they were weaning calves, and the remainder brought from people around, and not one of those animals, although they drank, not from the stream, but from the well where the affected cattle drank, ever had the distemper; and I never had the distemper at any time during their stay with me, from the time of weaning, until they were sold.

6386. You do not think the disease is conveyed by running streams?—I think not, and that is a strong case to the contrary.

6387. Do you think it can be conveyed by the herdsman's clothes, in going from one herd to another?—I cannot say whether it is so or not.

6388. Do you believe that hares and rabbits convey the disease?—It is very difficult to prove whether they do or not.

6389. You will give no opinion about that, as to whether the disease is of an infectious nature is that way?—The only thing that I can compare it with is the wind, which "bloweth where it listeth." I cannot tell you anything more about it.

6390. I suppose you have heard the recommendation which Professor Baldwin submitted to the Committee, that all markets and fairs should be stopped in the months of June and July, and also the movement of all store stock; would you recommend that that plan should be adopted?—It would be a most injurious plan; it could not be carried out, in fact. You would have to pay the rent of the small farmers, I am certain, if you did; because although our trade is principally carried on up to the end of May, yet in the later parts of Ireland the time for selling store stock is from June to August; store stock is not fit to be sold in May.

6391. You do not agree with the statement that farmers would willingly agree to such treatment?—As far as my experience goes of the farmers of Ireland, they would all, to a man, oppose the adoption of any such plan; they would be shut up, and they would not be able to keep their land.

6392. Allowing, for argument's sake, that these restrictions were carried out, and that they proved successful in reducing the disease to a minimum, would it be possible, in your opinion, afterwards to discover every fresh outbreak in the country?—Certainly not; what security would you have that the next stock you brought in would not be infected; there is no security for it.

6393. Professor Baldwin further recommends, that after the stoppage of fairs and markets for two months, all cattle afterwards found should be slaughtered and treated as if they were affected with cattle plague; but in order to carry out that

plan, it would be imperatively necessary, would it not, to discover every fresh outbreak?—We never had any experience of cattle plague, thank God, in Ireland.

6394. But I am not now speaking of cattle plague?—But it is cattle plague which has been the cause of all this legislation with reference to foot and mouth disease and lung distemper, which we are perfectly capable to manage for ourselves without any legislation at all. I think that legislation has done a great deal of injury, and that it has not done any good.

6395. In the case of any outbreak of foot and mouth disease occurring upon a farmer's land, is not any movement very detrimental to the animals themselves?—No one would move an animal affected with foot and mouth disease off his land; it would be to his own injury to do so. After the animal has become recovered, he might move it off his land, but not while the animal was affected.

6396. Do you think it is possible for cattle to be sent away from Ireland perfectly sound, and to be found affected upon their landing in England?—I have not only heard of it, but I have seen it from my own experience. I have seen cattle driven away from a farmer's close by me when they were as healthy as ever they were, and the next morning they have begun to show symptoms of the disease in the mouth.

6397. The animals were sound when they were sent away from the land?—They were perfectly sound, as far as I could judge.

6398. Would you recommend that any fat cattle found affected in a market with foot and mouth disease should be slaughtered?—Certainly, I would recommend that.

6399. I think you are not in favour of any quarantine restrictions?—Certainly not.

6400. You consider that keeping a lot of animals penned up together in a close place would be only likely to form a sort of hotbed of disease?—Most decidedly, I should say.

6401. And calculated more to spread it than anything else?—Certainly, I should say so.

6402. From your extensive dealings in the cattle trade, you have had great experience in all the large cattle fairs in Ireland; and the manner in which they are regulated, have you not?—Yes, I attend all these fairs in the west of Ireland.

6403. Are you of opinion that all cattle fairs should be held in large well-drained fields?—Yes; that certainly would be a great advantage.

6404. And that the tolls or customs levied off such animals should be paid upon their entry, and not upon their leaving?—I think that would be a great advantage to both buyer and seller, and the cattle would receive less abuse, which is most detrimental to cattle, because, after an attack of foot and mouth disease, everyone knows that the feet of cattle are more or less tender, and they suffer more or less standing upon a street than they would from standing in a well drained park.

6405. Do you think that the inspection of store stock at fairs is any advantage?—Not the slightest.

6406. Or at the ports of shipment?—I do not think it would be of the slightest advantage.

6407. You would not be in favour of having inspection at the port of embarkation?—Certainly not. Supposing a man had 400 or 500 beasts standing upon the quay, it would be impossible for the smartest man on earth to discover the disease in the first stage, but if the animal

Mr.
S. Garrett.
12 May
1873.

Mr.
S. Garrett.

15 May
1873.

were badly affected anyone could see it; there could not be any mistake about that.

6408. With reference to railway trucks; are you satisfied with the manner in which the cleansing of railway trucks is now carried out?—I think it might be very much improved; but I think in such a great fair as Ballinasloe or Meate, where there are thousands and thousands of cattle sent off by train, it is very hard to remove the cattle from the fair, and to have the trucks sufficiently cleansed and purified.

6409. Do you not think that some improvement might be made in the manner in which cattle are put into those trucks?—There has been a very great improvement within the last 12 months, particularly at Ballinasloe, where there is a large space. The Midland Railway Company have taken a large tract of land near to the railway, and they have there made pens; and all the pens are so regulated that the cattle for each district are arranged. It is just like the luggage going to different parts here. They have now arranged large portions of land for the cattle for each particular district.

6410. Do the cattle receive great abuse?—Of course they do. Where there are thousands of cattle all rushing to get forward by train they are very much abused, but that has been very much improved by the plan adopted by the Midland Railway Company. Instead of going to sidings they go to the lairs which they have put up for them.

6411. I believe you wish to give an instance of that, namely, that you, last November twelve-months, bought a lot of store cattle in Mullingar fair for the honourable Member for Norfolk?—I did.

6412. Could you give the Committee any instance of the treatment which they received?—I sent those cattle to the Mullingar Railway with a very intelligent drover, at 10 o'clock in the day, in order to have them trained for Dublin to be forwarded on to Norwich; and I went at two o'clock, and I found the cattle penned up in a very bad sort of place for them, standing there still. I had to stay with the cattle from two o'clock until eight o'clock, when I got them put into the trucks. They did not arrive until three o'clock the next morning at Dublin. I saw them myself at 10 o'clock, and of course they looked very much the worse for their detention. Instead of shipping them that day I kept them in Dublin and had them attended to, and hayed well, and then I shipped them to Mr. Bead, and the cattle arrived safely with the exception of one, which died immediately upon its arrival at Norwich, and when skinned it was all a mass of corruption from the blows and the beating of sticks in getting it into the trucks.

6413. (Cheerless.) When were they sent to the railway station at Mullingar?—I sent them down about 10 in the day, but they were not boxed until eight in the evening, and they were not at Dublin till three in the morning.

6414. Did they get any water?—They got nothing until they arrived at Dublin.

6415. You then had to take them out?—I saw them myself well cared for at the lair in Dublin.

6416. Mr. Monell.] When was that?—That was in November twelve-months, but there is a great improvement in the Midland system since then.

6417. Mr. Keownagh.] You also, I believe, wish to mention another instance which occurred

at Kilkenny fair?—Some friends of mine bought some very valuable cattle at Kilkenny fair. They were sent down early, but they were not put in the trucks till eight or nine at night.

6418. Do you think that that state of things is one which should be remedied?—They cannot take more cattle than their trucks will hold, but there should be accommodation at these large fairs for the railway companies to keep the cattle until they can be sent by rail.

6419. Would you recommend that all cattle dealers should be obliged to take out a license?—No, I think it would be most ridiculous. I think you could no more expect it to be carried out between buyer and seller than you could expect a licensed publican not to evade the law if he could; and I think it would be giving a sort of license almost to deal in infected stock, because when a man had this license he would run no risk; because between his license, and being able to slip a few shillings to the man at the quay, he would get his infected cattle off. But what I would propose is, that as long as England is under the impression that we are not so honest as we ought to be, and that we deceive, I would have the Government appoint an inspector, a man of character, at each port, and I would compel the cattle dealer to produce a certificate describing the number of cattle intended for shipment, the port he shipped them for, and the market he intended them for, either Norwich or St. Ives, or some of these great cattle fairs; and I would let him give the certificate first at the Irish ports, and when he landed in England or Scotland he should give a duplicate to the inspector there, and then let him give a certificate of soundness to the purchaser. Then it could be easily traced where the disease originated; but, with reference to inspection, I do not care how clever a man may be, to go and say that he will inspect the number of cattle that are shipped on Wednesdays and Thursdays at Dublin or Drogheda, it is impossible that the inspector could give satisfaction in the way of detecting any animal that was not in the very last stage of disease, either of foot and mouth disease or pleuro-pneumonia.

6420. Mr. Monell.] Your plan is merely for the purpose of tracing the animals?—I would give a certificate instead of giving the dealer a license, as he would evade it, just as publicans evade it in every way they possibly can.

6421. You say that you would have no inspection of the animals at the different ports?—No, I would have no inspection, I would have a certificate.

6422. Mr. Keownagh.] In the case of an animal being found affected at a port by these inspectors, would you have that animal confiscated?—It must necessarily be in the very first stage of the disease, and I would have the animal slaughtered at either side of the Channel at once.

6423. Whether it were a store or a fat animal?—Yes, whether it was store or fat.

6424. Do you agree with Professor Ferguson that all affected animals should be confiscated and looked upon as contraband goods?—No; because I know perfectly well, I have seen it frequently myself, that fat beasts in the first stage either of pleuro-pneumonia or foot and mouth disease are as good beef and as wholesome food as ever were eaten.

6425. Professor Ferguson proposed it as a penal restriction; do you agree with him there?—But

—But then it would be a very great hardship if I sold cattle from my farm which were perfectly healthy, and upon transit, from some cause unperceived and unknown to me, one of these beasts (worth 25*l.* or 30*l.*, as they are now) should become affected and should be confiscated and become lost to me, and that when, although it was not fit to go travelling farther, it was perfectly fit for food.

6426. If a farmer sent a diseased animal knowingly, he would deserve to be punished, would he not?—Certainly, but I say no grazer in Ireland would send an animal suffering from foot and mouth disease or pleuro-pneumonia; it would be an injury to himself; he might send an animal out of a field in which the infection existed; I could not say with reference to that.

6427. What restrictions would you recommend to the Committee; would you recommend any?—I would recommend the Committee to place confidence in the graziers and remove all restrictions, and if they adopt the certificate plan they would bring the dealers to be a more respectable class of persons, and upon investigation I would recommend that you should punish them severely by imprisonment if you found deception practised, but I would place confidence in the graziers. Our all depends upon the health of our cattle, and you may depend upon it that every means we can use we will use to keep our stock healthy. What I would suggest is this, that instead of having restrictions, if a grazer purchased in a fair or a market, from the grover of the stock, or the feeder, or from a jobber, animals which, immediately upon their arrival at home, were found infected, I would facilitate his prosecuting the man he bought the stock from. I would not have the onus of the prosecution lie upon the buyer. I would have it like all other prosecutions of a criminal nature, that is to say, a Crown prosecution, and that would very soon stamp it out; but the annoyance and expense of a private prosecution very often deters individuals from undertaking it.

6428. Mr. W. Johnston.] You have had experience of Ballinasloe fair for 50 years, I believe?—Yes, for 52 years.

6429. Have you seen many cases of animals in a bad state with foot and mouth disease?—I never saw animals in a diseased state at Ballinasloe fair until last October, and if the Committee will allow me just to explain that case, I would say this, to show you the use of inspection. Last October my cousin, the evening before the fair, bought 80 cattle from a person he had been in the habit of buying from for years; they were in Lord Clancarty's park, and some of his friends went out to see the stock, and we saw them and passed our opinion upon them, and he went home quite satisfied with his bargain; and the next morning, as those cattle were coming into the fair (they were to be delivered about 8 or 9 o'clock in the morning in the fair), they were discovered to be affected with the foot and mouth disease. Now no closer inspection could have been passed upon those cattle than we passed upon them the evening before, and in the morning they were down, as I say, with the foot and mouth disease.

6430. You have been in the last two great fairs of Ballinasloe, have you not?—I have.

6431. Have you seen the foot and mouth disease in sheep?—I have seen the foot and mouth disease in sheep upon two occasions.

6432. I have a letter from a trustworthy correspondent, in which he says that a vast number of infected sheep were driven through the towns, and a number of them were found infected upon the ground?—A great number of them could not be driven, they had to be taken upon canal boats and railway; of course they were suffering a little at the time, but they had to be put upon canal boats, and I believe the purchaser lost 70 or 80 of them.

6433. Was it manifest to any person looking on, that the animals were suffering from the disease?—There was no question about it, and I supposed that they were in the first stage of the disease; but I did not think that they would suffer so much from it.

6434. Did the police know of that?—They were there, and no doubt they saw the sheep.

6435. They did not attempt to remove the sheep?—No, they did not.

6436. Is it the common practice of the police in Ireland to stop the movement of sheep in such a case as that?—It would be very hard to interfere at Ballinasloe fair.

6437. Are you a member of the Royal Dublin Society?—I am.

6438. Have you seen the Paper which was handed in, which contained the resolutions of that society?—I made my remarks upon that Paper.

6439. Do you generally agree with the recommendations of the Royal Dublin Society?—There is one statement by Lord de Vesci which exactly bears out what I say; he mentioned that at the time of the cattle plague he was staying with a friend in Scotland.

6440. We must not go into that. Do you agree with the Council when they state, at the conclusion of the Report, that they "feel coerced to advise the rigid enforcement of the regulations already existing for the prevention of disease, supplemented by the above amended suggestions from which jointly they confidently anticipated consequences alike satisfactory to the Irish producer and the British purchaser"?—I strongly feel opposed to that statement.

6441. You think it a great evil, do you not, the permission to send cattle that are suffering from disease to England?—I never dreamt of doing such a thing.

6442. Do you think that no cattle affected with foot and mouth disease ought to be allowed to be shipped from Ireland to England?—Certainly no one would send cattle suffering from foot and mouth disease from Ireland to England.

6443. It has been stated to me that "A fruitful means of sending over distemper to England is the habit with many farmers of, as soon as they have discovered lung disease, or anything of that kind, in their stock, at once to ship the whole lot (except perhaps the animal too far gone to pass) to England; these animals never stand in a fair here at all"; is that your opinion?—It is not.

6444. You think that no farmer sends diseased cattle off his farm for transit to England, knowing them to be diseased?—I would not say that; but if you had the certificate plan in operation, it would very soon put a stop to that.

6445. Do you think that a system of police inspection could not be adopted to prevent the transit from farms to fairs or to England, of diseased cattle?—I think that such a system would

Mr.
S. Gurnett.
12 May
1871.

Mr.
S. Gersert.
12 May
1873.

would cause a great deal of annoyance, without doing a particle of good.

6446. Would you let every disease take its natural course, without any interference from Government at all?—I would let the trade be managed by those whose all depended upon it, and they would do it.

6447. Of course it is the interest of the Irish dealer to send his cattle to England for the purpose of sale?—It is.

6448. And it is the interest of the English buyer to see that the cattle he purchases are sound?—Of course it is; and if Mr. Read were here, I think he would hear me out in saying that there are some cattle dealers that he can take the word of, who would never dream of such a thing; he employs them to buy cattle for himself.

6449. Then how would you secure that cattle should be shipped from Ireland in order that they might be sent in the best state to England, and purchased, if possible, free from disease?—The only way in which I can suggest it, that a man should give a certificate of the fact that they were sound.

6450. Do you think that cattle are ever free from disease when they leave Ireland, and become diseased during the transit, before they are sold in England?—I am certain that the animals may become diseased in transit.

6451. From what cause do they become diseased?—I cannot tell the cause of it.

6452. Do you think it is impossible that the animals become infected in the holds of the steamers?—Mr. Baldwin is a professor, and he says that it is impossible that the animals should become infected in the holds of ships.

6453. Mr. Pell? You know something, I believe, of the Dublin boats, in which the cattle are brought over?—I do.

6454. Do you consider those boats properly fitted up for the cattle traffic?—They carry them very safely; my cattle are shipped from Drogheda.

6455. Are those boats better fitted up than the Dublin boats?—No, but they are very good boats.

6456. Is the ventilation of them as good as you would wish to see it?—I have heard it said that it might be improved, but I have never suffered any loss.

6457. Do you think that imperfect ventilation conduces in any way to spread the disease amongst the animals, which are penned up on board ship?—I should say that bad air will injure an animal as much as a human being, but I have frequently crossed in the boats myself, and stood over the hold and found nothing more than the reasonable effluvia from cattle.

6458. You have never seen sheep die from overheating on board ship?—I have never seen them die, but I have known sheep to smother each other by lying upon the top of each other; every one is anxious when he brings his animals to a seaport to have them shipped, and he will use force to have them shipped, beyond what is right.

6459. In such a case as that, would you leave the shipper of those animals at liberty to load to any extent he likes?—Certainly not; I think there is in all the ports overcrowding at certain times.

6460. Have you anything to suggest to the Committee as a means of remedying that over-

crowding?—Of course there should be a regulation; the authorities should ascertain what a ship could conveniently carry, and it should be kept to that.

6461. You think that a ship should not be allowed to carry stock above the capacity the ship is fitted for?—No. The Southern Railway has a most extraordinary regulation with regard to shipping cattle; they will allow you to put any amount of cattle you please into a truck, and the jobbers will sometimes put small mountain cattle to the number of 13 or 14 in a truck; but the Southern Railway Company, if you only want half a box, will then only allow you to send three, but they do not care how many you beat in if only you take a whole box, so that if a farmer had 12 fat beasts and could only get eight of them properly into the truck, he would have to pay an extra rate for the fourth beast or send it home.

6462. The Drogheda shippers you say sometimes overload their vessels?—They do sometimes overload their vessels.

6463. That overcrowding is accompanied by loss of life, is it not?—Sometimes it is, but as a rule they carry the cattle safely, and the cattle leave their boats in very fair condition, and I have seen them after very severe weather come out well, and able to stand the market.

6464. The breeders do not permit cattle to be shipped in that way, I believe?—I should say not; they put them in horse boxes, or something of that sort.

6465. When do you recollect the first attack of foot and mouth disease in Ireland?—I have already stated that my own recollection was that it was first known in 1844, but I knew a case of it happened on my uncle's land in 1841.

6466. Supposing 1841 was the year in which there was the first example of it in your memory, between then and now there have been many ups and downs of the disease?—Yes, but the disease disappeared for a very long period.

6467. When did it recur?—It reappeared from about 1858 to 1870, but last year was the severest that I can recollect, and that was when we had been under restrictions for a considerable time.

6468. What is the state of the disease now; is it at all checked?—I have bought upwards of 1,200 of cattle this month of May, and with the exception of four cows which I bought in the month of February, I have not had a case of it, and those cows have got well, and are pretty nearly fat now.

6469. Do you believe that there is a natural decline in the severity of the disease just now, and that we are likely to lose it altogether?—I should think so. Until last year we were always under the impression that those diseases were like whooping cough or measles, or those diseases which children get, and which they cannot get twice; but last year it was proved that they did get it twice over.

6470. You are awaiting the natural dying out of the disease?—Yes, and I would place confidence in the graziers. I think that I am as much capable of giving sound advice to those in authority as any veterinary surgeon, or anybody else. It is my interest that the disease should be got rid of some way or other, but not by restrictions; that is evidently proved to be of no use, because the disease has increased.

6471. Mr. Jacob Bright.] You think that the Government interferes too much with regard to cattle diseases?—I think so, and I think is the worst

wrong direction, because, we being the people who depend upon the cattle trade, are worthy of some consideration. We were never consulted in the least degree. A most powerful deputation went before Lord Spencer, and no man could be more anxious than he is in every possible way for the welfare of the country, and they got very little redress from him.

6472. You say that the Government never consulted gentlemen like yourself?—They never did.

6473. Did they consult anybody?—Never, that I heard of.

6474. Did not the Government consult the professors of the country?—That they did. I do not want to insinuate anything, but I say that we are as capable of giving information to the Government as they are. I think that my herdsmen, although he may not be able to express himself in technical terms, is just as able to understand this subject as Professor Ferguson.

6475. The Government consulted the professors, you say, and so far as I can judge from what I have seen in this Committee, the professors of Ireland have one opinion, and the farmers another; is that so?—That may be so, but our idea is this, that we should do everything in our power to keep healthy cattle upon our land.

6476. The professors, as I understand you, have not any special interest in cattle, and the farmers have?—No; of course the professors are merely paid for their professional duty, and if we had not legislation upon the foot and mouth disease we would have no occasion for professors.

6477. You would probably think that as farmers have a very great interest in the health of cattle, their opinion would be worth nearly as much as that of the professors?—I think their opinion would be worth a very great deal more; I value mine a great deal more; I would be very sorry to have my land regulated by professors; I would have a very short balance sheet at the end of the year.

6478. You think that if this matter of cattle disease were left to the self-interest and the good sense of the farmers, that that would be the best means of dealing with it?—I am quite satisfied of it; that has been proved to be the fact, because when it originated at first, we got rid of it without any loss, and the Government then took it up with very restrictive laws and very annoying laws, and there never was such loss in any year from 1842 up to 1871 until 1872 when there were all these restrictions. That fact proves itself.

6479. The interference of Government with regard to the lading of trucks and cleansing of vessels has done good, has it not?—Decidedly.

6480. That does not embarrass the farmers, but assists them?—Yes, there is no question of that.

6481. That kind of interference, you think, is of great use?—I think it is of the greatest use.

6482. I think you stated that you have had 52 years' experience in Ireland with regard to cattle?—I have been 52 years to the fair at Ballinasloe from the time I was 16 years old.

6483. Then for about 44 years out of those 52 years of which you have had experience, the farmers of Ireland have been left to themselves with regard to these diseases?—Until the last few years we were left to ourselves.

6484. During that long period of 52 years is it true that there were many years in which you had at different times the cattle disease?—Certain-
0.28.

tainly; but until the cattle plague visited England, and until after the cattle plague disappeared from the country and when this foot and mouth disease and lung distemper appeared then the veterinary surgeons and the professors, as you call them, wrote up to the Government and poisoned the minds of the people, and made it appear that one was as bad as the other, and they sent out figures showing how Cheshire and the other places suffered from the rinderpest, and the Government appointed inspectors and created legislation, and went into it.

6485. But for some 40 years of your experience, Government did not assist you in these matters, and there was no legislation?—No, and there was no loss on either side of the water.

6486. And you think that there has been no more need of legislation during the last eight or nine years than there was during the previous 44?—I think decidedly not. If we had been left to ourselves, you would have found the country in a much better state.

6487. Are you in favour of legislating with regard to cattle plague or rinderpest?—I think that is a very different thing altogether. I have not had that disease, but I have known friends who have suffered very severely from it in England.

6488. You draw a strong line between that and other diseases?—I do, and I think that in the case of the lung distemper an immediate facility should be given for the slaughter of the animals, and depend upon it that if there was no restriction put in the way, every feeder in Ireland, if he suspected the existence of lung disease, would send the animal away and have it slaughtered.

6489. You say that the foot and mouth disease was worse in 1872 than in any previous year?—Decidedly.

6490. And that there were very vexatious restrictions imposed by Government in order to assist the farmers in getting rid of the disease?—There were.

6491. Might it not have happened that, if the Government had not imposed these restrictions, the disease might have been still worse in 1872 than it was?—I cannot at all speak to that, and I cannot think that any man born could speak to what would have been if that had not been done, but I know that we suffered very little without Government interference, and that we have suffered very great loss with Government interference.

6492. Mr. Monell.] What are the restrictions now existing with regard to the slaughter of cattle?—They have been mitigated to a very great extent; but the restriction now is, that if an animal is taken up upon a farm suffering from foot and mouth disease, you are not allowed to remove him.

6493. But are you not allowed to slaughter an animal that is diseased?—Yes, you may slaughter him yourself.

6494. I thought you stated, in answer to the honourable Member for Manchester, that there were certain restrictions now upon slaughtering animals affected with pleuro-pneumonia?—In sending cattle to slaughter, in a case of pleuro-pneumonia, I would say that I would send the animal off the instant that it developed the disease.

6495. But the cattle now may be sent away dead, and you would propose that they might be sent away living?—Yes; if you send them away dead, you get very little for them.

6496. Mr.

L 14

Mr.
A. Gornett.
12 May
1875.

Mr.
S. Garnett.
12 May
1873.

6496. Mr. Jacob Bright.] I understand you to say, that the professors and the veterinary surgeons, and men of that sort, have an interest, and rather a strong interest, in the building up a great establishment to look after the diseases of cattle; is that so?—It is natural to suppose that it is so.

6497. Do you think that, in fact, it is partly owing to that that we have these strong recommendations made to the Government to interfere with the trade?—That is my opinion.

6498. You stated that no farmer would move a case of foot and mouth disease from his farm, did you not?—I said that it would be very unwise to do so.

6499. I understood you to say that it would be an injury to himself?—Decidedly, it would.

6500. In what way would it be an injury to himself?—Because the animals would be deteriorated very much in value; but I should add that there are men who, if they had an idea that an animal was in that state, would sell it; they would lay themselves out to get rid of it.

6501. Mr. Kewenau.] If the Committee recommended the compulsory slaughter upon the farm of beasts affected with lung distemper, do you agree with the last witness that the owner should be paid four-fifths of the value?—I should say if they determine to prevent the animal being sent to market, where the owner would get a fair value for the animal, the Government ought to pay you under those circumstances.

6502. Do you think that four-fifths would be the fair value?—I have not gone into a calculation of that kind, because there is a great difference between dairy farms and breeding farms.

6503. Mr. Callan.] Do you always ship by Drogheda?—Yes.

6504. Have you had any case of overcrowding on board steamers?—On one or two occasions I had.

6505. Have you ever had any loss arising from that?—Never, but once.

6506. Was that since the steam packets commenced running from Drogheda?—No; there cannot be better cattle boats than those.

6507. Nor better managed?—No.

6508. You do not think them to be a nucleus, or hot-bed of disease?—I do not.

6509. Would you consider it rather a reckless assertion if it had been said that they were so?—I would.

6510. The Right Honourable Chairman asked you with reference to the restrictions upon foot and mouth disease in Ireland; is it not the fact that when carried out in their strictness, if two or three cases break out on a farm, you are prevented from moving them off?—That is so.

6511. Do you think that restriction is harsh and useless?—I think so.

6512. Do not you think that when it breaks out upon one part of a farm, you should have power to remove the animal to a distant part of that farm?—I think that the power should be left to us to judge what we would do with our cattle.

6513. I suppose that you would consider that persons such as yourself are much more interested in the soundness of stock than any of the professors?—That is what I state, decidedly; self-interest is the ruling power of the present day, I think.

6514. You have no suggestion to make with reference to any additional ventilation upon board

the vessels of any of the steam packet companies with which you are acquainted?—I can only say that the better ventilation and the less overcrowding the better.

6515. You have no complaint to make with regard to that?—I can make no complaint against the Drogheda Steam Packet Company whatever.

6516. Mr. Barclay.] You depend a good deal, do you not, upon a system of licences for putting down the disease?—I said certificates; I say that a dealer who comes to attend the fairs of Norwich, or any of those great English fairs, should be obliged to give to the Government Inspector a certificate with reference to the number of his cattle, and a description of the brand with which they were branded, and also with reference to the soundness of the cattle.

6517. How could you identify the cattle with those specified in the certificate?—By the brand, in the same way as wine in bond would be identified by a wine merchant.

6518. Is there any way to prevent a dealer from exchanging the cattle when he brands them?—That could be very easily traced; the dealers very often do that. When you come to brand cattle, if you are not very sharp they will put cattle upon you that you have never bought or never saw; no doubt they would do that if they dared.

6519. Supposing it suited a cattle dealer to substitute one lot instead of another, is there anything to prevent his branding other cattle instead of those in the certificate?—Each man must take care of his own cattle and look after them.

6520. Then what is the advantage of your certificates in that case?—The advantage of my certificate is this, that if a man brings 50 beasts to a seaport he gives a certificate that he has shipped so many cattle, describing their age, branded so-and-so, saying in effect, "I vouch for the soundness of these cattle," and he takes these cattle, say to Glasgow, Holyhead, Liverpool, or Bristol, and at these ports there is another officer to take the duplicate certificate from him, and he goes on with his cattle, stating where he is going; and when he sells them to anybody, then let him give to the buyer a certificate of their soundness. If he makes a sale of course he guarantees that they are sound cattle.

6521. Suppose I buy a lot of 10 animals, and out of that lot five of them have got the disease when I get them home, how am I to identify those animals by means of the certificate?—You would write to the dealer and ask him to take them back.

6522. But the dealer would probably have bought the cattle off a dozen farms?—But you have only to deal with the dealer.

6523. What redress am I going to get under your plan?—You must prosecute him; that is the only way that you can come at the right of it.

6524. Is it possible that these cattle could have got the disease travelling across from Ireland to this country?—Yes, I think so.

6525. How should the dealers be made responsible for that?—If they leave Dublin sound and arrive in Holyhead sound, and then go across the country, you can easily come at them in that way.

6526. Supposing the disease breaks out between Holyhead and Norwich Hill, what would you say then?—I am only giving this as a better plan than if these cattle were brought to the seaport and inspected there. Formerly the animals were

were always inspected, and the inspector put a mark upon the cattle with a brush of paint.

6337. I want to know what advantage is to be got out of that plan; I shall altogether to see it?—I think it is the easiest plan that could be adopted.

6338. But what I want to know is what there is to be got out of it?—It brings the matter nearer, and you can find out where the cattle come from, but by inspection you never can.

6339. But supposing I happen to know the dealer of whom I buy the cattle upon Norwich Hill, do I not know quite as much, and does not he know quite as much, about the cattle as if I had a certificate?—The dealer would not know; Mr. Reed would know the dealer that I introduced him to, because he gets him to buy cattle for him in Ireland, and bring them on to Norwich, but you must guard against people that you do not know.

6340. You should guard against dealers whom you do not know?—I know most of those I buy from.

6341. To go to another point; you complain of over-crowding in trucks in Ireland, do you not?—Very much so.

6342. Have you any remedy to suggest for that evil?—I would not allow the railway companies to carry more than a certain number of animals in a truck, say eight fat or nine store animals.

6343. But the store animals differ very much in size, do they not?—Yes, very much.

6344. You cannot put more than eight fat cattle into a truck, do you say?—No.

6345. How many store animals can you put into a truck?—You might put nine. Eight good store animals, when you get 20 l. each for them; you will find eight will be quite enough in a truck then.

6346. Suppose you give 5 l., or 6 l., or 7 l. for them, how many could you carry then?—You might carry 12 then, perhaps.

6347. How would you lay down a hard and fast rule with reference to the number which you would put into a truck?—I would say 12, 8, and 8, as the case might be.

6348. Supposing we were going to lay down a hard and fast rule with reference to the number of cattle that should be carried in a truck, of course it would depend almost entirely upon the size of the animals?—You may force an animal in by bending it and that sort of thing, but you cannot put in more than a truck can conveniently hold. I should say that 12, 8, and 8 would be about the number.

6349. Right fat cattle is the number you would propose to put into a truck?—Yes, but seven is what I generally put in.

6350. What sort of animals would the nine consist of?—Good store beasts.

6351. And the 12 lot?—If you buy 100 heifers from a man, you might put 12, 8, and 8, according to the size, in a truck.

6352. I wish to know how we are going to determine the kind of cattle of which you can put 12 into a truck?—I should think the safest thing would be for a sender of cattle by railway not to allow more than 12 of any kind to be placed in a truck; that the number should never be more than 12, no matter what they were.

6353. You say that there is one description of animal of which a railway truck would not hold more than nine?—It would not hold more than nine store animals conveniently; dealers would put 10 in.

6354.

6344. We want rather to prevent the dealers from putting in 10; how could we do that?—I would say about the truck up at nine.

6345. What line would you draw between the 12 and the 9?—I would not allow 12 at all, I think. I would say, about the truck up at nine. The Midland Railway Company have increased the size of their trucks; some of the trucks which run through are much larger than others; they have increased, some of them, a couple of feet, but, as a rule, I never rail my cattle. I walk them all.

6346. But I want to know how you are going to arrange the cattle, so as to have sufficient room in each truck; is it not an advantage to have the truck filled?—Yes, it is an advantage to have the truck fairly filled; it is better than having the truck half filled, as the cattle are liable to do themselves harm in that case.

6347. If you had less than nine in a truck, would it not be found that the animals would get knocked about in the truck?—To a certain extent you must give a discretionary power.

6348. Then it comes to this, that it is impossible to lay down a hard and fast rule as to the number of animals which should be put into a truck?—We graziers will not overload trucks, but jobbers, who get rid of the animals the next day, in order to save three or four shillings, might do it.

6349. I can quite understand that you can leave it to the discretion of the grazer who is going to keep the animals two or three months afterwards, but with a dealer who sells them the next day, it is quite a different thing, is it not?—Precisely.

6350. You cannot suggest any rule with regard to the number of animals which ought to be put into one truck?—No, but I know this, that upon the Midland Railway they will not allow the trucks to be overcrowded.

6351. That is a considerable advantage to the railway company, is it not?—Quite so; they do not charge per head, but per wagon load.

6352. I think you stated that in 1847 you got clear very easily of pleuro-pneumonia?—Pleuro-pneumonia was very bad in that year with me. I lost more in that year than ever I lost in my life.

6353. Even since the Government have been interfering with the cattle disease?—I have had nothing at all of pleuro-pneumonia of late; there might be an odd animal here and there, but nothing to speak of.

6354. The remark you made respecting disease being worse since Government interfered than previously, referred strictly to foot and mouth disease, did it not?—It did.

6355. Did pleuro-pneumonia rage in your district in 1847?—It raged in my neighbourhood very extensively.

6356. Did it remain for long?—Yes, for two or three months, but at that time we were under the impression that it could be cured, and I for one attempted to do so, and I did cure a good number, but I found it a very losing game, so I gave it up.

6357. You found that it was better to kill than to cure?—Certainly.

6358. You stated that cattle were largely sent to Liverpool at that time alive?—Yes, there was no restriction upon them, and there were two or three large firms in Liverpool, what they call wholesale butchers, who came over and bought those

Mr.
S. Garnett.
10 May
1873.

Mr.
S. Garnett.

12 May
1877.

those diseased cattle; they would buy 10 or 20 from a single man, and send the animals off to be slaughtered at once.

6559. The wholesale butchers bought these animals at a reduced price, did they not?—Of course.

6560. There was no necessity for those animals to be slaughtered at Liverpool, I suppose?—I presume they were bought to be slaughtered at Liverpool.

6561. Was there anything to prevent their being re-sold at Liverpool as store cattle?—They never dreamt of such a thing.

6562. What was there to prevent animals, not showing symptoms of pleuro-pneumonia, being sold in England?—It would interfere with a man's trade altogether.

6563. Why would it interfere with his trade?—Because he is a butcher, and he buys these animals for slaughter.

6564. Do not you think that the butchers in Liverpool, if they bought these infected animals, would be ready to sell them as store cattle if they could make a pound or two a head more out of them?—I do not think that such an idea ever entered their heads.

6565. You have a good opinion of the butchers apparently?—Yes, I think they are a respectable class of men.

6566. You spoke of giving facilities for slaughtering animals affected with pleuro-pneumonia; what would you recommend with regard to that?—To send them to the slaughter-house for sale.

6567. You would recommend that cattle affected with pleuro-pneumonia should be sold for slaughter?—Yes, I would.

6568. Have you any market in Ireland which is confined to fat cattle?—Yes, the Dublin market is confined to fat cattle.

6569. Are there no store cattle taken out from the Dublin market?—Not from the fat cattle market; there is a separate market there for store cattle. The fat cattle are all sold for home consumption, for Liverpool and the North of England.

6570. What is the regulation regarding the exposing of infected fat cattle in the Dublin cattle market; is it in the option of the seller to slaughter them?—No, he would send them to the butchers.

6571. But might not an exporter, and not a butcher, buy such an animal in the market?—It is a free market, and anybody might buy there.

6572. But there is nothing to prevent this animal from being sold again?—Nobody in his senses would come and buy these cattle for the purpose of selling them again, except for slaughter.

6573. Is there anything to prevent a man buying these fat cattle in the Dublin market and sending them to England?—Nobody in his senses would buy a fat animal in this market to send to Liverpool or Norwich, or St. Ives; they would not suit the market.

6574. Would not a half fat animal be suitable to send over to England to sell as a store beast?—I should say not.

6575. Why?—Because generally the price they sell at for slaughter is over store price. The cattle that go to Dublin are not adapted for store cattle; they are quite a different sort of animal altogether.

6576. I quite agree with you as to the gene-

rality of animals, but there are perhaps some animals three-fourths fat in the Dublin fat cattle market?—Of course there are a great number.

6577. Is there anything to prevent these animals from being sold, and brought to England as store cattle?—I cannot answer that question, but it is not the trade; it is not the custom to do so.

6578. I quite agree with you that it is not the custom to do so, but is there anything to prevent its being done, supposing anybody chose to do it?—I should say not.

6579. Then your proposition was, that these pleuro-pneumonia cattle should be sent to the Dublin fat cattle market?—Yes, I should say so.

6580. Of course it would be assumed that a good many of those would be in a condition for slaughter?—They would be sent dead for slaughter.

6581. You would send these cattle dead for slaughter, and they would be sent, no doubt, for slaughter, but it would not depend upon the buyer that they were slaughtered?—I can only answer that by saying, that I know that no butcher would run the risk of buying these infected animals, and of bringing them as sound animals to England.

6582. Would you propose that those animals which had been affected with pleuro-pneumonia, and which you propose to send to market, should have some certain mark put upon them before they were sent to market?—I would give the option to the owner to send them, and let a part of the market be set aside for such animals. I would never allow an animal to be kept on the premises which had been once quacked or doctored.

6583. The safety of your proposal turns upon this, that the animal should be slaughtered within a very short period after having been shown in the Dublin market?—Yes, in the case of pleuro-pneumonia.

6584. How do you propose that it shall be made really effective, that the animals shall be slaughtered, say, within three days after having been shown in the Dublin market; would you propose to trust to the honesty of the dealers and butchers?—I would trust more to the honesty of the sender of the beast.

6585. I quite agree with you that the seller of a beast might be trusted, but it is the buyer of the animal that you have to trust?—Then I say yes, that if you do not do it by confidence and trust, you will never do it by legislation.

6586. Is the honesty of those dealers in Ireland sufficient to resist the temptation of making one or two pounds a head extra upon a diseased animal?—You may succeed in one or two instances, but you would never succeed in the third.

6587. Mr. Dent.] I gather from your evidence that you are in favour of doing away with all restrictive measures with regard to foot and mouth disease?—Yes, I am.

6588. You say that that is the general impression of the farmers in Ireland apart from the dealers?—Yes; dealers and all.

6589. Every farmer and grazer is a dealer, more or less, is he not?—Every man is a dealer if you come to that.

6590. By a dealer we understand a man who buys, not to keep upon his farm, but to make a profit of?—Our trade is to buy the animals as store, and to keep them until they are fat.

6591. B

6391. It is only a limited number of Irish farmers who do that, is it?—The majority of them do.

6392. But the majority of animals which come from Ireland to England are store animals and not fat?—There are men in Ireland who rear cattle for the English market, young steers and bullocks.

6393. Where do these men live?—In the west of Ireland chiefly.

6394. You have to do with a large farm in the west of Ireland, as well as in Meath, have you not?—Yes, I have.

6395. In Meath you buy animals to fatten as well as to breed?—Yes.

6396. What is the system pursued in Galway?—I buy store cattle, the very best store beasts I can get, and we have a large shed upon the mountain in which these cattle are put every winter, and fed with plenty of hay, and I sell the best of them as store cattle; I got as high a price last year as 24*l.* for three-year-old beasts, and 20*l.* I got this year, and I still feed the residue which I am not able to sell off.

6397. Do you buy on commission for English people?—No; I buy for my friends, but not on commission.

6398. If you were to remove all restrictions with regard to foot and mouth disease, and also, as I understand you, allow animals affected with pleuro-pneumonia to be sent to market, how would you deal with the foreign importation of cattle?—I do not speak much upon the foreign importations, but I should say that they are *dead safe* cattle which come for a particular purpose, for the feeding of the troops more than anything else, and I should say that there was no doubt that diseases exist in many parts abroad, and that I would have the cattle sent as dead meat to prevent the spreading of disease.

6399. Rinderpest, of course, you would deal with, either in Ireland or England, under the very strongest restrictions?—I know nothing at all about rinderpest.

6400. But you would follow out the most severe restrictions with regard to that?—I would.

6401. But foot and mouth disease you would leave alone, and utterly trust to the honesty of dealers?—I do not think that there was ever a greater mistake made by graziers and people in England than by trying to assimilate foot and mouth disease with rinderpest.

6402. You would leave foot and mouth disease entirely free from any legislative interference?—Decidedly; we are perfectly capable of legislating for ourselves in this matter.

6403. Would you also leave pleuro-pneumonia free from any legislative interference?—Decidedly; and I am satisfied that we should get rid of that disease much quicker by ourselves.

6404. And animals coming from countries where rinderpest had existed you would insist upon being slaughtered either at the port of landing or abroad?—I cannot speak with reference to the foreign trade; I do not understand it.

6405. I do not want to know about rinderpest, but I want to know what you would do with cattle coming from foreign countries in which disease existed?—I might be told that I was giving my opinion from selfish motives.

6406. I do not impute that to you, but will you tell the Committee what you would do with foreign cattle coming from countries where pleuro-

pneumonia and foot and mouth disease existed?—I am unable to speak to that, but I say that the safest way would be to have the animals immediately slaughtered at Deptford or somewhere else, coming as some of them do from the North, and sold as dead meat.

6407. Then you would have entirely different measures with the foreign trade from what you would have with reference to the Irish trade?—Yes, because rinderpest does exist there, but, thank God, it does not exist here.

6408. Foot and mouth disease and pleuro-pneumonia do exist in those countries?—I was not speaking about that.

6409. *Chairman.*] The honourable Member is not asking you about rinderpest, but what you would do with animals affected with pleuro-pneumonia and foot and mouth disease coming from foreign countries?—I would not allow them to go about the country as store animals.

6410. *Mr. Dent.*] You would not allow them to come alive from foreign countries in which foot and mouth disease and pleuro-pneumonia existed?—I would not.

6411. *Chairman.*] You think that there should be no interference with cattle on account of foot and mouth disease in Ireland?—I think not.

6412. Would you have any restrictions at all upon the cattle trade between England and Ireland as regards foot and mouth disease?—I would not.

6413. But you would have restrictions as between England and the Continent?—Merely from dreading rinderpest coming again.

6414. But we are not talking about rinderpest?—But foreign cattle are not, in the first place, that I could ever ascertain, suited to be grazed in this country, whereas our Irish cattle are perfectly suited to be grazed in England, which is a broad distinction.

6415. Are you not aware that a very large number of foreign cattle are imported for store purposes?—I am not aware of it.

6416. Have you not heard that Dutch cattle are imported in large quantities as store cattle?—I have heard of that, but I have never seen it.

6417. You would think that those cattle should not be imported as store cattle?—I would not recommend it, I think.

6418. But the Irish should?—Yes, because I think they are better suited to the country.

6419. I understood you at the beginning of your evidence to say that you would approve of compulsory slaughter for pleuro-pneumonia?—Certainly, that is my opinion.

6420. But I also understood you to say, that you think there should be no restrictions at all with regard to pleuro-pneumonia?—What I meant by that was, that if facilities were given for the immediate slaughter of any animal supposed to be affected with pleuro-pneumonia, I think that that would be the most effectual means that could be adopted for getting rid of the disease.

6421. What do you mean by "facilities"?—That is to say, that there should be no hindrance to a man, when he supposed that his animal was affected with pleuro-pneumonia, to have it sold for slaughter in an infected state.

6422. But I have just asked you whether you thought there should be compulsory slaughter, and you say, yes; and now you say that there should be facilities for the slaughter of those animals, but there is a great difference between compulsory

Mr.
S. Gervais.
19 May
1873.

Mr.
S. Garnett.
12 May
1873.

compulsory slaughter and giving a man facilities for slaughter; which do you mean?—I mean that there should be facilities for slaughter.

6623. You do not mean compulsory slaughter?—No, I do not, because there would have to be restrictions in carrying that out.

6624. I was mistaken in understanding you to mean compulsory slaughter?—That is so.

6625. I understood you to say, that there should be facilities, because when a farmer had an animal which he thought had pleuropneumonia, he would try and get rid of it as soon as possible?—Of course, he would not wish to keep the animal about his place.

6626. He would sell it, would he not?—He would sell it.

6627. How would you guarantee that the animal would not spread the infection elsewhere?—He would sell it to the butcher.

6628. Would he be limited to selling it to the butcher?—Yes.

6629. Then your limitation of facilities would be the prevention of sale, except to the butcher?—Certainly.

6630. Mr. Mossell.] Is there not that power existing now?—No, it is done every day of the week, I am confident, but it is contrary to the rules and regulations.

6631. Chairman.] You are a very large cattle breeder and a cattle owner yourself, are you not?—I am rather a cattle feeder.

6632. Have you had the foot and mouth disease amongst your cattle?—Yes, last year I had it very considerably.

6633. I believe you are in favour of no restrictions being imposed with regard to that disease?—I am.

6634. We have had evidence given before this Committee that the loss is very great indeed from foot and mouth disease; have you found it so?—The loss was greater to me in 1872 than in all the other years put together.

6635. One witness stated that he thought the loss to Ireland was about a million and a half sterling last year; do you agree with him?—I could not go into figures like that, but the loss from Ballinasloe was very large.

6636. You do not think that restrictions should be imposed with regard to that disease?—I do not think that they would be any advantage.

6637. The restrictions have not been any advantage hitherto?—No, certainly not.

6638. You would not like to see restrictions imposed with a view to getting rid of the disease?—Certainly not; they have proved of no use.

6639. You think that the present restrictions have proved of no use?—Yes, certainly.

6640. You would not wish to try to stop the foot and mouth disease by restrictions?—No, the restrictions were very strict from 1808 to 1872, and every one will admit that the greatest loss ever suffered in Ireland was in 1872, that is last year, when we were under restrictions.

6641. I cannot quite understand why you think the owners of cattle are not in favour of restrictions with regard to pleuro-pneumonia?—My own private opinion is that I would not have restrictions.

6642. That is the opinion which you come here to give to this Committee?—That is what I have given as honestly as I am capable of giving it.

6643. Are you yourself against restrictions for pleuro-pneumonia?—I am.

6644. Mr. Mossell.] When did the foot and

mouth disease break out upon your farm last year?—About August; there were a few cases in August.

6645. Was there a very great increase of foot and mouth disease in Ireland after Ballinasloe fair?—There was very great.

6646. Do you think that that was attributable at all to Ballinasloe fair?—Very much so.

6647. Were there any restrictions carried out at the Ballinasloe fair?—There were some trifling restrictions.

6648. Were the animals affected with foot and mouth disease which came from Ballinasloe fair prevented from going along the roads, or from going into railway trucks, or from going throughout the whole of Ireland?—The restrictions were carried out in a very moderate way.

6649. If animals affected with foot and mouth disease had been prevented, after Ballinasloe fair from being distributed throughout Ireland, would there have been that great amount of disease distributed throughout the country?—I do not see how any other course could have been adopted than was adopted.

6650. There were hardly any restrictions at the Ballinasloe fair?—Hardly any.

6651. And the result of there being no restrictions was that the disease was spread very much about Ireland; and my question is now, supposing restrictions had existed, if for instance, beasts affected with foot and mouth disease had been prevented from going to Ballinasloe fair, would the great increase of disease, which you say did take place after Ballinasloe fair, have taken place?—With reference to the extent of the disease, I am not able to say; but my notion, if I may be allowed to give an opinion, was this: the disease commenced very late in the western districts of Ireland, and I for one was in hopes of having the fair of Ballinasloe put off for a time, and then it was said that that would interfere with so many other interests that that arrangement could not be carried out. There is no question about it that Ballinasloe fair did increase the disease throughout the country.

6652. At the time of Ballinasloe fair you were in favour of restrictions so stringent that you would have been inclined to put a stop to Ballinasloe fair altogether?—What I want to convey is this, that we graziers are perfectly capable of managing the diseases of cattle upon our own lands; we will do nothing to increase the disease of cattle upon our own lands, and with reference to fairs and markets it is proved that there can be no restrictions passed, as it is felt that the restrictions have failed; therefore I say, the less legislative interference we have with it the better.

6653. What you object to, as I understood, is the failure of restrictive measures; you do not say that if restrictive measures could be efficiently carried out you would not approve of them?—I would not approve of any measures.

6654. With regard to the free movement of Irish animals affected with infectious and contagious diseases, you were asked whether you would allow the same freedom to foreign animals and you say not; but if there is to be no restriction at all in Ireland, while restrictions exist in England, do you not think that the English and Scotch people would fairly insist upon Ireland being treated as a foreign country in this respect?—I believe that the English and Scotch people would have the same regard for Ireland

as we have for England, and we are convinced that the regulations have not improved the trade of either England, Scotland, or Ireland.

6655. But do you think the English people would be content to allow Irish beasts, if there

is no restriction in Ireland, to be brought over to England where restrictions exist?—My idea is that if the restrictions are carried on very long, you will find that both countries will very materially suffer.

Mr.
S. Garnett.
—
12 May
1875.

Professor THOMAS BALDWIN, re-called; and further Examined.

6656. *Chairman.*] We are informed that you wish to make a correction in some of your previous answers; if there is any answer which you made which you do not wish to stand as your final answer, we are quite glad that you should make it, but we can hardly receive from you arguments in favour of what you have previously stated, or any arguments with regard to the evidence of subsequent witnesses; is there any answer which you gave when you were first examined, which you wish to correct?—The explanation which I gave in reference to my own scheme I find has not been understood by the public, if I may judge by the witnesses here to-day.

6657. What correction would you wish to make in your evidence?—I wish to give as an alternative a modification of the scheme, and I am quite sure that you will permit me to explain it as I go along. You can stop me if you object to it, but I think it is very material indeed. The point is this. The Irish cattle trade reduces itself, as regards Ireland, to the sale of store stock by the graziers of them to the graziers. The system may be described thus: One lot of the beasts, varying from one-third to close about one-half the beasts, are bought in October and put upon Ireland; about one-third of the beasts are bought at the great April and May fair, and then put upon the land, and the remainder are bought in the summer. Now the first lot which are put

upon the land in October go out in May and June. The second lot go out during the summer. Then the only difficulty, as far as the Irish agricultural interest is this: how are the farmers to sell the remaining third, and how are the graziers to buy?

6658. You must not enter into a defence of your scheme. You made a certain proposition, and if you wish to replace that by another proposition the Committee will be glad to hear it?—It is an alternative proposition.

6659. What is the proposition which you wish to lay before the Committee?—The proposition is this: originally I proposed to stop all fairs and markets for a period, as I said, of six weeks to begin with. I did not expect that any proposition would receive the support it has from the Committee and from others. I knew that it was a very comprehensive scheme. The alternative proposition I now wish to make is this: that instead of applying the rule to all Ireland, I propose to divide the country into a number of police districts, and to carry out the scheme in each of these which is infected. I have put it into the form of a memorandum which the Committee ordered to be printed.

6660. If you have made that proposition in the form of a memorandum, there is nothing more that we require; you have stated all that in your memorandum?—I have.

Professor
T. Baldwin.

Thursday, 15th May 1873.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mr. James Barclay.
Mr. Jacob Bright.
Mr. Callan.
Mr. Cowley.
Mr. Clay.
Mr. Dent.
Mr. William Edward Forster.
Mr. William Johnston.

Mr. Kavanagh.
Mr. Lusk.
Mr. Messall.
Mr. O'Connor.
Mr. Clare Reel.
Mr. Ridley.
Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson.

THE RIGHT HONOURABLE WILLIAM EDWARD FORSTER, IN THE CHAIR.

Mr. PETER O'NEILL, called in; and Examined.

Mr.
P. O'Neill
—
15 May
1873.

6661. Mr. Callan.] You are the Secretary to the Drogheda Steam Packet Company?—I am.

6662. And you have had large experience as such, extending over what period?—Ten years.

6663. You have had experience in the conduct of the cattle exporting trade?—Yes, I have.

6664. Drogheda, I believe, is a natural outlet for exporting the cattle from the richest portions of Ireland?—Yes, it is.

6665. From Meath, and the eastern and northern portions of Westmeath, and the southern portions of Louth?—Yes, we take the principal part of the cattle from those districts.

6666. Next to the City of Dublin Steam Packet Company, I believe, that the Drogheda Company is the largest cattle carrying company trading to Liverpool?—We are.

6667. You have six vessels, I believe?—We have six vessels.

6668. And the average tonnage is what?—About 300 tons register.

6669. What is the average passage?—The average passage is about 11 hours.

6670. How are the holds of your vessels divided for the conveyance of cattle?—They are divided into pens; we have iron stanchions and shifting boards, by which we can make a pen to hold any number of cattle; pens to hold seven or 10, as the case may be.

6671. With regard to overcrowding, does not it so happen that the spaces occupied by the cattle are invariably the same, whether the cargo be a large or a small one?—We would fill a pen; we would put seven beasts into a pen made for seven beasts, although we had no other cattle in the hold.

6672. I believe, in the last three years, you have carried upwards of 680,000 head of live stock?—Yes, that return is correct.

6673. And carried them without any complaint of the ventilation of the vessel?—We have never had a complaint of defective ventilation.

6674. And in the three years during which you carried upwards of 680,000 head of cattle, you have never had one single case of loss by suffocation, defective ventilation, or overcrowding?—No.

6675. Those figures consist of 3,800 horses, 113,000 pigs, 60,000 store cattle, 126,000 fat cattle, 208,000 sheep, and 110,000 lambs; are those figures correct?—Yes, that is an extract from the books made by our officers. (The Table was handed in, vide Appendix.)

6676. With the competition for the cattle traffic in your district, and the through rates and facilities by railway, is it not your interest to prevent overcrowding, and to ventilate as well as possible, and to afford every accommodation to the dealers?—Yes, we could not otherwise compete with the other companies. The London and North Western and other companies come into every district with us, and we could not compete with them unless we gave the same facilities; in fact, I think, we have to give better facilities.

6677. Your company have a large interest involved in the cattle trade, and therefore you keep the vessels in first-class order?—Yes, we keep them in excellent order.

6678. What is the average depth of each hold?—There are 8 feet between the decks; if that is the depth of the two holds; it would be 8 feet less the thickness of the deck-planks.

6679. From 7 feet 10 inches to 8 feet?—Yes, that would be about the height.

6680. Your advertised sailings are four days a week from January to August?—Yes, four days a week.

6681. And the remainder of the year, five days?—Yes.

6682. Frequently, as pressure occurs, do you not even send out three or four steamers at the same time?—Yes, we often sail four steamers upon the same tide, and we often have a steamer which will come in and go back upon the same tide.

6683. You are obliged frequently, are you not, to send an additional boat upon Sunday mornings for the Manchester market?—Yes; we sometimes run on Sunday mornings, in the months of October and November.

6684. Before those regulations came in, did you not at all times, upon the discharge of cattle at Liverpool, thoroughly cleanse and wash with water

water your vessels, so as to prepare them for the reception of the return traffic?—Yes; we are obliged, the instant the cattle are discharged at Liverpool, to wash and dry up the holds, because we convey very costly merchandise from Liverpool, to Drogheda, which might be damaged by any water which might be left in the hold.

6683. Therefore you thoroughly cleanse your vessels?—Yes, we do.

6684. In addition to cleansing, you also disinfect with commercial carbolic acid?—Yes.

6685. And what you object to in that Order of the Council is whitewashing?—Yes; we object to whitewashing in the busy season when it is impracticable.

6686. You object to it, first, as unnecessary; next, as obstructive; and thirdly, as injurious?—We do.

6687. It is unnecessary, because you consider that washing with water and carbolic acid, and then drying, to be equally efficacious?—Yes; I do.

6688. As having been practically concerned in the cattle trade for the last 10 years, do you consider that washing with saltwater, and thoroughly cleansing the hold with cloths, is as efficacious as whitewashing?—Yes; and in the opinion of Sir Dominic Corrigan, our system of cleansing the vessels was better than the one now in force by Order in Council.

6691. Mr. *Clare Read*.] What Order in Council are you referring to?—It is an Order in Ireland.

6692. Mr. *Collins*.] I believe you are one of the deputation that went to the Chief Secretary for Ireland with regard to this whitewashing order?—I was.

6693. All persons connected with the steam trade in Ireland, were unanimous in objecting to whitewashing upon the same grounds that you object to it?—Nearly all the leading merchants of Dublin were. That deputation consisted of 20 gentlemen, and the two Members for the county and two for the city were there.

6694. If the whitewashing order is strictly carried out, it is obstructive, inasmuch as it would obstruct the traffic; no steamer could sail upon the return tide, and if you got in three steamers in the morning you could not sail the following evening, if you have to disinfect in the way prescribed; we can do it now, because the trade is very slack.

6695. With reference to whitewashing being injurious, all your vessels are iron steamers, are they not?—Yes, they are.

6696. And every practical man connected with your company, all the captains, and mates, and engineers, object to the ironwork being whitewashed, do they not?—Yes.

6697. And do they reconstitute?—Yes, we had the opinion of engineers of great eminence from the Clyde, and they say that it is very injurious, and that a vessel will not live half her time in consequence of it.

6698. That is in consequence of the chemical effects?—Yes, in consequence of the chemical effects.

6699. The fat cattle and sheep which are exported by your vessels are for the Liverpool and Manchester markets exclusively, are they not?—Yes, they are exclusively for the Liverpool and Manchester Markets.

6700. Where are the store cattle principally sent to?—To Peterborough and St. Ives (those are the markets which they are principally sold at); we send a good deal to Lynn.

6701. We have heard a good deal about the cattle dealers overcrowding the trucks with cattle; the owners of store cattle, which go up to Peterborough and St. Ives, generally accompany their cattle, do they not?—Yes, the owners always accompany their cattle.

6702. You have creased with your vessels frequently to Liverpool, have you not?—I have.

6703. Have you remarked that the men are careful in their attendance upon their beasts?—I never saw a more careful set of men in my life. The cattle that the owners take over with them represent their capital, and it is their interest to get them into the market in as good condition as they can.

6704. The cattle arrive at Liverpool in the morning, do they not?—The cattle arrive in Liverpool generally in the morning.

6705. Then they have some hours' rest before they go off by rail?—The average is nine hours.

6706. That would be quite sufficient time for them to be fed and watered. —Quite sufficient.

6707. What are the traffic regulations as regards the loading of the cattle in trucks?—The maximum number of fat cattle allowed in a 12-foot waggon is eight fat and 10 lean cattle, or store cattle, and a proportionate number in the other sized waggons; there are 14, 16, and 18 feet waggons.

6708. With regard to the holds of your vessels; are they considered equal to the deck for the conveyance of cattle?—It is the general opinion of experienced men that the hold is the better place of the two.

6709. You have large yards at Drogheda for the reception of stock before embarkation, have you not?—Yes, we have three large yards; two of them about 300 feet long by 240 feet wide.

6710. As far as this matter goes, you have, I suppose, an equal knowledge of Dundalk; the yard for the reception of cattle at Dundalk is equal to yours, is it not?—They have excellent accommodation at Dundalk; it is their own private property; the quay is their own private property.

6711. Have you seen any cases of pleuropneumonia shipped by your vessels?—Yes, up to about four years ago cattle used to be shipped at Drogheda to Liverpool affected with lung disease.

6712. For the last four years you have not seen any cases of it?—We do not permit them to come near the premises.

6713. Nor would you permit any cattle having foot and mouth disease to come on board ship?—No, our men have strict orders not to allow animals affected with foot and mouth disease to come near the premises.

6714. Would you recommend the precaution which was adopted during the rinderpest, namely, that a duly qualified person should be placed at each port of shipment to examine your animals?—I think it would be very desirable.

6715. Five years ago at Drogheda, when the cattle plague was in existence, you did so?—Yes, a duly qualified surgeon was placed at the port, and no cattle went into the yard without first being examined.

6716. And your official would, as a matter of duty direct his attention to any suspicious case?—Yes, he would.

M X 4

6717. Would

Mr.
P. O'Neill.
15 May
1878.

Mr.
P. O'Neill.
—
15 May
1878

6717. Would you recommend that the police, instead of having the power that they have at present, should be empowered to report to this duly qualified surgeon to direct his attention to any animal which appeared diseased, and request him to examine such animal?—It would be much better for all parties.

6718. I believe the directors of your company were the largest cattle feeders and exporters in the district?—I believe they are some of the largest feeders in Ireland.

6719. With regard to the restrictions, although it does not quite come within the scope of your examination, you are prepared to recommend the immediate slaughter of any beast affected with pleuro-pneumonia, rinderpest, or sheep-pox?—I am. I would recommend the slaughter of cattle at present affected with pleuro-pneumonia.

6720. I believe you would be in favour of giving compensation to the owners who would report cattle so affected?—Yes, I think so.

6721. As an encouragement to them?—It would tend to prevent them concealing the disease.

6722. You would absolutely prevent the exportation of cattle affected with foot and mouth disease?—Yes, I would.

6723. You believe that no grazier or owner of cattle would ship stock knowing it to be so affected?—No grazier having regard to his own interest would ship such stock, because he dare not exhibit them at the market upon the other side of the water.

6724. You have seen the report of Mr. Jenkins, have you not?—I have read it.

6725. In which report he made some cutting allusions to your company. At page 18 of his report he states, "That the evil reputation which Drogheda has recently acquired as a nest of 'dissempers,' would have induced the authorities to send an inspector to the fair there." Now, having had experience during the last 10 years, and more especially during the last five years, are you aware of any reason why such a serious charge should be made against your port?—Not the slightest.

6726. You look upon such a report as this being sent among the English cattle dealing public as being injurious?—Most injurious; I think it is nothing less than a calumny.

6727. At page 47 of Mr. Jenkin's report, he states that, "Although live stock are carried on deck as well as in the holds, the owners much prefer the former method;" is that the case?—The contrary is the fact.

6728. Then he says that, "The preference is generally given to sheep and pigs, except when a very large or liberal consignee secures it for his beasts;" have you ever had an application from a large and liberal consignee to secure the deck for his beasts?—I have never had an application of the kind for the last 10 years.

6729. Therefore it is not advantageous to secure a deck passage for cattle?—It is not advantageous to secure the deck passage for cattle.

6730. Then the report goes on: "The officer of the watch on one of the steamers plying between Drogheda and Liverpool, a passage of about 12 hours, told me that the cattle on the deck would fitch in the market at least 11 per head more than they would have done if they had been in the hold, whereas the charge for conveyance was less than half this sum;" do you think

that this was seriously said, or do you think it was "chaffing"?—I think there must have been some wag playing upon him. I investigated that case. Mr. Jenkins passed over on one of our steamers on the 26th of August, and neither the captain, nor the mate, nor the second officer, had any knowledge of meeting such a man; such inquiries as he states were never made of them; one bullock-man, in charge of the cattle, recollects a man of the appearance of a pig-jockey, grinding down in the hold with a thermometer in his hand; in fact, neither of them knew whether it was a thermometer or not; Mr. Jenkins all this time was in the cabin, and he did not go into the hold during the voyage; that is illustrated by referring to the temperature which he records in the report.

6731. He speaks of the temperature, and also he recommends a new patent ventilating apparatus, capable of injecting 4,500 cubic feet of air. I believe that that vessel is the owner of your vessels?—The "Colleen Bawn" had one of these apparatuses.

6732. How did that work?—It did not work well at all; she is a splendid ship, and we had this ventilating apparatus in her for three months, and we had continual complaints that it was not working right, and we had to throw it out.

6733. And you returned to the old plan?—Yes, we did.

6734. Which plan you find gives perfect satisfaction?—Yes.

6735. Do you think it is a matter seriously affecting shipowners, no matter how perfect disinfecting may be, to be obliged to use whitewash, as being injurious to the iron?—It is injurious to the iron, and utterly impracticable; in fact, if we were sailing four boats which came in this morning, and had to go out in the evening, we could not get men enough in the neighbourhood to comply with that order.

6736. During the last five years, have there been any complaints of bad ventilation by my shipper of cattle?—We, of course, have complaints sometimes; if there were a very bad market in Liverpool, they would complain that the cattle had not arrived in such condition as usual, but then we are in a position to explain the company is not in fault.

6737. Sir H. St John-Babington. Can you give me the date of the Council Order, insisting upon whitewashing; is it a new order?—It was issued to come into operation upon the 1st of January last, and then a deputation waited upon Lord Hartington, and he said that the expropriations upon the part of the Steam Packet Company and the graziers were very reasonable, and that they would be attended to, and that no further steps would be taken in the matter until the deputation was advised of it. The next advice we got was, that four policemen were told off to see the order carried out at the port of Drogheda.

6738. You would infer from that, that Lord Hartington found it necessary to enforce that order?—Lord Hartington said that he was obliged to do so; that he was pressed by the Royal Agricultural Society of England to take some measures to satisfy their applications.

6739. Your objection to whitewashing, I suppose, principally arises to the delays caused by the process?—My objection to whitewashing is, in the first place, because it is injurious to the iron, and in the next place, because we cannot perform

perform the whitewashing. We cannot whitewash all our steamers; we would not get so many men in the neighbourhood as would whitewash four steamers in a day, that is, in the harvest time.

6740. That is to say, that it is a question of expense in doing it?—No, it is not much expense.

6741. What I mean by that is, that if you can get a certain number of men to whitewash one steamer, adding double the number of men, they will whitewash two steamers, and therefore it is only a question of labour to get the work done?—We do not object to the expense; our steamer "Lord Athlumney" came from Liverpool, and the sides of the vessel were varnished and painted like this table, and before a heat was allowed to go on board the vessel, we had to send the whitewashers to put the whitewash over all this varnish. We considered that it would be very much better to have the vessel painted, and to have a smooth surface, from which infectious matter could be easily washed off, instead of whitewashing it.

6742. You do not think there would be a possibility of the seeds of infection attaching themselves to the sides of the varnish which remained for a permanence?—We would rather wash with water, mixed with the necessary acids, which we think sufficient to remove any infection from the surface.

6743. And you think that that is as effective as whitewash?—Yes, and so did Sir Dominic Corrigan, and other chemists.

6744. But Government do not agree with those gentlemen, because they have suggested that this order should be carried out?—I believe that that suggestion emanated from the Veterinary Department; I do not believe that it came from the chemists. I believe Professor Ferguson has recommended that.

6745. You have no record of infected beasts being carried in your ships before and after that order came into force?—We have carried none since that order came into force; we have carried none for the last five years. The directors of the Drogheda Steam Packet Company are very largely interested in the cattle trade, and independently of any order, they are very careful for their own protection.

6746. I want to know simply with regard to what you said just now about the preference given to places in the hold over the deck; we said it in evidence the other day from a large Irish farmer, and also exporter of cattle, who stated a very contrary opinion; he stated that he travelled with his own cattle, and he exported a very large number, and that the deck was an infinitely preferable and more healthy mode of transporting them than if they were put into the hold; that was between Belfast and Glasgow?—The Belfast boats have not such a depth of hold as our boats. Boats which are made to answer the double purpose, passenger and cattle traffic, would not be so comfortable for the conveyance of cattle as boats built exclusively for that purpose; our boats are built for the trade, and when I say that there are eight feet from floor to floor, the ventilation of the hold would be quite satisfactory.

6747. Do you mean to say that it is warmer on deck?—No, I do not mean to say that, but I mean that the lower hold of the vessel is as cool as the main deck.

6748. But by being carried on the main deck the animals have the advantage of any air that

there may be?—I have frequently gone to the hold when the ship was loaded, and the cattle were as cool in the lower hold as on the main deck.

6749. Is your evidence with reference to the preference for the hold, or not objecting to the hold, as against the deck, derived from your own experience, or from the representations of cattle dealers?—I am often applied to for a berth between decks.

6750. By the drovers or the owners of stock?—By the owners of store cattle.

6751. Because that is contrary evidence to what we have had given with regard to the owners who came before us?—The largest exporters of store cattle in Ireland, I think, ship at Drogheda; and I was informed, since I came to London, that reference was made to Mr. Vlascoat, of Norwich, and Mr. Finnan, who buy in Peterborough and St. Ives markets; I believe they regularly buy about a thousand beasts a week, and they stated that the cattle brought from the port of Drogheda are as good as those that come from any part of the country, and generally better than from other Irish ports.

6752. What is the average voyage?—We do it in about 11½ hours; we have vessels which could do it in nine hours, but the tides will not allow them to do it.

6753. Is there any great difference between you, comparing your line with the Belfast and Glasgow line?—The Belfast and Glasgow line, taking the run up the Clyde, I think, is a longer line; I have travelled on the Belfast boats; they are not such good cattle hosts as ours.

6754. Do you suppose that in the hold it would be more difficult to provide a proper amount of air in hot weather for cattle confined there?—But you will understand that the cattle trade is principally carried on from the month of September to the month of January; for instance, take last winter, it was unusually severe; holds were then much safer for cattle.

6755. Do you mean to say that the cattle trade is confined to those months from the port of Drogheda?—Yes; we lay up two of our boats at this time of year, and we have to put on two extra boats in September.

6756. According to your list I see that the exportation of fat cattle is nearly double what it is of store cattle?—Yes.

6757. The consequence is that your trade is principally a fat cattle trade?—Yes; you have the figures there.

6758. That would account for its being slack in this month?—Yes.

6759. Do you know that, with regard to the Orders in Council in Ireland, cattle imported into Ireland are subject to an order that if found to be diseased on landing, they may be seized as contraband by the Customs?—I do not know that, but there was an order made prohibiting the importation of cattle some three or four years since.

6760. But I am alluding to the exportation of cattle from England; there is a power of seizing a diseased animal as contraband upon its arrival in Ireland, are you aware of that?—I am not aware of that, we have not carried any; we issued orders to take no cattle from England, and we have taken none for the last three years.

6761. Would you think that the making of a similar order with regard to cattle landing in

N N

England

Mr.
P. O'Neill.
—
15 May
1873.

Mr.
P. O'Neill.
—
15 May
1873.

England would strengthen the hands of the authorities, and prevent dealers sending diseased cattle for exportation, if they were liable to seizure on landing if they were found to be diseased upon arrival?—That order might be very good, but I do not think that any dealer having knowledge that his cattle were affected with foot and mouth disease would take them across the Channel, because if they were exhibited in the Liverpool Market they would be at once seized, and if they took them up the country they could not exhibit them for sale, and the cost of keeping them until they recovered would be nearly twice the price of the beast.

6762. You do not believe that any cattle, as soon as they exhibit disease, are sent off?—I do not believe that any man, knowing that his cattle were affected with foot and mouth disease, would ship them.

6763. At the same time there would be no objection to assimilating the regulations with regard to exportation in England with those in Ireland, and so give greater security to seize as contumacious cattle found infected on landing?—I think that would be a great hardship, because this disease breaks out very suddenly.

6764. But it is a hardship which exists in favour of Ireland, and I wanted to know whether you thought that that regulation might be applied to the other side of the water?—I do not know; of course if a man shipped cattle on Saturday for the Liverpool Market, and they were discovered to be affected with foot and mouth disease on Monday morning, it would be a great hardship to seize those cattle.

6765. I do not think you quite understand my point; at present a clause in the Act of the 33rd & 34th Vict., chap. 35, exists in Ireland, to enable the Custom House authorities to seize as contumacious cattle landed in Ireland from England which turn out to be diseased. Section 5 says, "If any person lands, or attempts to land, in any port or place in Ireland, or ships, or attempts to ship from any port or place in Ireland to any port of England, Wales, or Scotland, any animal or thing in contravention of any order under this Act, such animal or thing shall be forfeited in like manner as goods the importation whereof is prohibited by the Acts relating to the customs are liable to be forfeited." That power does not exist with regard to landing in England, and what I wanted to know was, whether there would be any objection to making a similar regulation with regard to the landing of cattle sent from Ireland to England, and whether, if it was made, it would not be an additional protection to England against the importation from Ireland of foot and mouth disease?—If you exclude foot and mouth disease, I think there could be no harm in such a regulation.

6766. But the foot and mouth disease exists in this Act with regard to Ireland, and I wanted to know if you saw any objection to giving us the same protection against the importation of those diseases from Ireland as exists by this Act against the importation of diseases into Ireland?—I certainly would not like to give power to seize and slaughter any beast having only foot and mouth disease.

6767. Then you mean to say that Ireland ought to have the preference in legislation, as against England, in this respect?—No; I should say, scratch it out of that Act, and make it even.

6768. Mr. J. Barclay.] Referring to this question about the seizure of diseased cattle, is the case of cattle which are contumacious in Ireland, very different from the case of cattle in the United Kingdom; very few animals required to be imported into Ireland; is not that the case?—Very few; there are only a very few prize cattle imported, respecting which a declaration must be made before a magistrate before they can be taken over.

6769. And with regard to the limited number of those pedigree cattle, special precautions can be taken before they are shipped, and which would be impracticable in carrying on a large trade, such as that which comes from Ireland to England?—I should say so.

6770. You stated that you had not seen any case of pleuro-pneumonia shipped from Ireland of late years?—I have not seen any case of pleuro-pneumonia shipped from Ireland since the prohibition was issued, about five years ago.

6771. Do you know much about pleuro-pneumonia?—No; I do not pretend to have much knowledge of it, but I would know when a beast was sick.

6772. But a beast might be sick of something else besides pleuro-pneumonia?—But we have many experienced persons upon the quay of more than 40 years' experience in the trade, and they would point it out.

6773. Do you know with regard to pleuro-pneumonia, that it is only in an advanced stage of the disease that it will manifest itself visibly, so that a good many cattle labouring under the symptoms of the disease might be shipped without your knowing it at all?—Yes, putting it in that way; but I do not think that any person would run the risk.

6774. What risk would he not run?—The risk of sending a diseased beast to Liverpool.

6775. What risk does the owner run in shipping an animal affected with pleuro-pneumonia in the first stage of disease?—The risk of seizure. The police seized some cattle last year in Liverpool Market.

6776. What were these animals affected with?—They were affected with disease. I could not say what; I believe it was foot and mouth disease.

6777. Foot and mouth disease is visible at a very early stage; but I am speaking of pleuro-pneumonia?—There might be cases in an incipient stage shipped without attracting our notice.

6778. How do you decide the difference between fat and store cattle; what is your test for the fat animal, and what is your test for a store animal?—That is easily known; a store animal is a lean beast; there is no difficulty in distinguishing a fat beast shipped at Drogheda from a store beast, because they are the finest class of cattle in Ireland.

6779. Do you charge different rates of fare for fat and store animals?—Yes.

6780. Are your officials informed whether they are fat or store animals?—Store cattle are always hooked through and sent on at through rates.

6781. Where to?—To their destinations in England; a copy of the rates is furnished to our officials in the office; the cattle are loaded according to a certain scale when they arrive in Liverpool. Take, for instance, a 12-foot waggon; a 12-foot

foot waggon has eight fat beasts allowed to it, or 10 store beasts.

6782. Are there some store beasts so small, that you can put a dozen into one truck?—Those would be small calves.

6783. Do you include calves in this statement of store cattle?—Anything under a year and a half we should say was a calf.

6784. And that is called a store in this list?—Yes, but there are very few with us; I do not believe that we have sent 200 of them from Drogheda.

6785. Those cattle are principally fattened, and sent across as fat, and not as store animals, I believe?—They are sent across as fat; there are some store cattle dealers, and other men, who have farms themselves, although they are called dealers, who go into this trade for about three or four months in the year.

6786. Do you know whether any of these store cattle are consigned to the lairs at Liverpool, or are they generally put into railway waggons and sent to the centre of England?—Those cattle are discharged from the vessel about nine in the morning, and then they are taken to Edgchill, where they are put upon the railway trucks, and before that, they are fed and watered, and prepared for the journey.

6787. Do those cattle go to the lairs between leaving your steamers and being put into the railway trucks?—They go into fields, I think, at Edgchill.

6788. Do you know anything about the condition of the fields or lairs in which those cattle are kept at Liverpool?—I do not.

6789. Mr. Dent. How are they taken from the steamer to Edgchill?—They are driven through the streets.

6790. Mr. (Jore Reed.) How far is that?—It is about three or four miles, I think.

6791. Mr. J. Barclay. Those animals are set down in the market at Liverpool, I believe?—No; store cattle are never exhibited for sale in Liverpool.

6792. Do you never send store cattle to Liverpool?—Never.

6793. Only fat cattle?—We only send fat cattle to Liverpool and Manchester; those are exclusively fat cattle markets.

6794. Do you know anything about the fat cattle market at Liverpool?—I was only in it twice in my life.

6795. What do you whitewash with?—Lime, and we mix it with the required quantity of commercial carbolic acid.

6796. Have you an inside skin in your steamer?—No, we have nothing but the bare iron; we paint our steamers several times a year.

6797. Is that painted with red lead?—Yes.

6798. Does the limewash affect the paint?—Yes, so I have heard; that is the opinion of Messrs. Smith & Leach, the eminent engineers, who built our "Lord Athlumney."

6799. But it would be hardly a matter of opinion, it would be a matter of sight; does it take off the paint from the iron?—Yes, the captain called my attention to it where it was doing so; it is said that a steamer which would have lasted 50 years will not now last 10 since this limewashing has been insisted on.

6800. Does the paint come off sometimes of itself?—Yes, if you do not make it well it will.

6801. How can you determine what damage is done by limewash, and what amount from

careless workmen in the painting?—Before I came here I made inquiries, and the captain pointed out where the places had been whitewashed since February, and the skin was not in the same state at all that it would have been in if it had been painted.

6802. Either the carbolic acid or the whitewash had affected the paint, so as to make the iron different to what it would have been if it had not been whitewashed?—Yes.

6803. Do you whitewash the holds?—Yes, and the bulkheads inside.

6804. What part of the vessel was it that remained unwhitewashed that the captain showed to you, as compared with the part that had been whitewashed?—There was none of it that was not whitewashed, and he scraped off the whitewash to show the effect it had.

6805. But I understood you to say that there was a part which had been whitewashed, and a part which had not been whitewashed?—Yes, there is a different skin; there is about a foot and a half between the floor and the keel, which is painted, the skin of which had a much better appearance than that part which was whitewashed.

6806. Do you carry cattle in your lower hold?—Yes.

6807. Have you ballast, or is it water-ballast?—No, we carry ballast; our vessels have a very broad floor; they are made for the cattle trade.

6808. What depth of ballast do you put into them?—In the vessel we got the other day, the "Lord Athlumney," there is no ballast at all, and she is as steady as a rock.

6809. Not even water-ballast?—Not even water-ballast; we brought home some pig-iron for ballast, but we found it was not necessary and we took it out.

6810. Do the cattle stand upon an iron floor?—No, we have a wooden floor for them. I think if those cattle boats were examined, there would be a different opinion formed of them.

6811. A different opinion from what?—From the opinion which seems to be entertained about these cattle vessels; they are supposed to be of an inferior class.

6812. Are you referring to Mr. Jenkins's opinion?—I am.

6813. You have not heard any opinion expressed here upon the subject?—Mr. Jenkins states that the temperature on board a vessel going 12 knots an hour, was 70 degrees on the deck, and that it was only increased by 10 degrees when the lower hold was full of cattle.

6814. You would have that temperature standing close to the funnel, would you not?—Yes, I think so.

6815. If you have time to disinfect, why have you not time to whitewash?—You have a donkey-engine and hose, by which you can apply the stuff. Sir Dominic Corrigan stated upon the occasion that I have referred to, that whitewashing was not considered so effectual in preventing the spread of disease as it had been previously thought to be. He said that it was discontinued in hospitals and in the Navy.

6816. The whitewashing might appear to cover the infection without removing it, might it not?—That was what Sir Dominic Corrigan stated.

6817. Whereas by applying water and carbolic acid under a considerable pressure, the chances are that all infectious matter would be cleared
x x 2 away?

Mr.
P. O'Neill
15 May
1873.

Mr.
P. O'Neill
15 May
1873.

away?—Yes; when you do that, you take away every chance of a particle of infection being left about.

6818. Have you an abundance of labour to whitewash all your steamers at one time?—No; you would not get them in Drogheda in harvest time.

6819. Even if you were willing to do it?—No; not even if we were willing to do it.

6820. You spoke about the power of policemen as compared with the power which the inspectors were to have?—On Monday last we had a fair in Drogheda, and one of our vessels came in having a very large cargo of grain. We had as many men discharging the grain as could be possibly employed, and then we turned to to whitewash, and a constable came down, and he said he thought the vessel was not sufficiently whitewashed; and he went away and came back again. I said that we would do it no better, and that I would stay the vessel before anything more would be done, and he then permitted us to load the vessel; but that was when we had not time to load the ship, and we lost about 50*l.* by sending the vessel away with half a cargo; we disappointed some men who had come over to buy horses, and who were obliged to wait for two days in Drogheda before they could ship them.

6821. You think the policeman was not right in his statement?—I do; but we dared not put a beast on board until he certified that it had been done sufficiently.

6822. How long did the policeman stop the loading of the vessel?—Three hours.

6823. It is a tidal harbour, is it not?—It is.

6824. How many hours have you to load and unload?—I should think about four hours; that is if we are going to make a pier head run, but we have a 12 hours' in the other case.

6825. You can come in and go out within four hours?—Two hours ebb and two hours flood.

6826. Do you go in and out upon the same tide?—Sometimes, but generally not.

6827. When do you do that?—During October and November, when large quantities of fat cattle are going to Liverpool and Manchester, we frequently had when a vessel arrived in Drogheda on a Sunday morning, to turn her round and send her off with a return cargo.

6828. You unload the vessel and send her back with another cargo?—No; she comes back without a cargo, but with coal for the double journey.

6829. How do you stow the cattle in the hold?—We have pens; we have nice divisions; and all our men know what each division or pen will contain.

6830. How many cattle go together in a pen?—They are put in wings, I think; 12 is the largest pen we have, and then run from 12 down to four.

6831. You put in the cattle, and then you put up the divisions?—Yes, we do.

6832. When the cattle are tied up?—Yes, we have iron stanchions, into which the shifting boards fit.

6833. It would not be possible for you to squeeze the cattle much?—You could not.

6834. There is a difference between the hold of a vessel and a railway truck; you can force them into a railway truck?—You could force them into a railway truck.

6835. But you could not force the cattle into

the hold of a ship?—You could not, as they must be fed in their berths.

6836. It is much more desirable to have them penned up pretty closely than to give them more room?—If you have cattle, and you give them too much room, they are twisting and turning about if you happen to have them tied, and if you do not happen to have them tied, they will gore each other.

6837. Would you tie them by the horns or by the neck?—By the horns.

6838. Have they all got horns?—Yes, generally; we send some of them to Scotland which have no horns.

6839. Have there been many convictions, within your knowledge, of persons contravening the Orders in Council, or the Act in Ireland, relating to contagious diseases?—None that I know of; we were summoned ourselves.

6840. When was that?—The first day that order came into operation.

6841. How long was that age?—About two months; the summons was dated the 6th of March.

6842. What were you summoned for?—We were summoned for not whitewashing and carrying out the order.

6843. What was the result of that?—The case was postponed, to see whether we would infringe the regulations in future, as it was the first case.

6844. You did not suffer very much then, did you?—No.

6845. There was no penalty inflicted upon you, I believe?—No, there was not; the case was postponed.

6846. And the case never came up again, I believe?—Next Monday is the day it is to be brought up again, but I think it will be dismissed, inasmuch as we have carried out the order strictly since; we can do it now, inasmuch as the trade is very slack.

6847. Is that generally the result of these precautions in Ireland?—On the contrary, the magistrates in Ireland are very severe upon public companies.

6848. Are they severe upon individuals; because we have been told here that they have been fined generally 1*l.*?—I saw it in the "Dublin Freeman," that some cattle-dealers had been fined 5*l.*

6849. Could you refer the Committee to any cases in which penalties have been inflicted upon public companies?—No; I think the public companies have been carrying out the regulations, but I think, after the month of August, they will find it very difficult to do so.

6850. In consequence of the pressure of the trade?—Yes; and instead of doing the trade with six boats, we should require 12 to carry out the Orders in Council.

6851. What regulations do you refer to?—To the whitewashing and cleansing regulations.

6852. Does that regulation apply to steamers, or to railway companies as well?—It applies to railway companies also, but I do not think the regulation is so rigidly enforced with regard to railway companies.

6853. Do you think that the railway companies could not carry out that system of disinfection?—No, they could not; the railway company, which conveys most of the cattle to us, is the Dublin and Drogheda Railway.

6854. What is there to prevent the disinfection of a railway truck when it came to Drogheda, before

before you sent it back again?—Sometimes the railway company would have to run two or three specials to Drogheda, with 20 or 30 cattle trucks in each special, and those trucks would be sent three times over the journey.

6855. They would send the trucks back each time?—Yes, they would take them back again and load them; and of course if they had to stop and disinfect those waggons, they could not make more than one run.

6856. Mr. Deas.] Then you do not believe much in the necessity of cleansing or disinfecting either railway trucks or steam packets?—I do; I think that there is every necessity for disinfecting, but I do not think that there is any necessity for linewashing.

6857. Did I understand you that the linewashing had been put in force in consequence of the representations made by the Royal Agricultural Society in England to Lord Hartington?—Yes.

6858. Do you state that upon any authority?—Lord Hartington stated that to the deputation.

6859. That the Royal Agricultural Society had insisted upon having linewashing done?—The deputation went to his Lordship and protested against the washing with lime; and after Sir Dominic Corrigan's expression of opinion, Lord Hartington stated that the Royal Agricultural Society of England were pressing the Government upon this matter, and that something should be done; I do not exactly recollect the words, but the deputation left under the impression that no further steps would be taken until the matter had been more fully investigated.

6860. But I understand you to put it upon the Royal Agricultural Society of England, that this linewashing had been insisted upon. Now, what the Royal Agricultural Society represented to Lord Hartington was, that the precautions for cleansing and disinfecting both steamers and railway trucks, and markets, were frequently very grossly neglected, and they requested him to put in force the regulations for cleansing and disinfecting railway trucks and vessels, but I am not aware whether there was anything said about linewashing, and linewashing, it appears, is your principal objection?—That is our principal objection.

6861. Pray do not put it upon the Royal Agricultural Society, that they insisted upon linewashing; what they wanted to see carried out in railway trucks and in steamers, and also in markets, was a thorough system of cleansing and disinfecting?—I do not think the steam packet companies have any objection thoroughly to cleanse and disinfect the vessels.

6862. You have seen a good deal of the store cattle trade, have you not?—Yes, I have.

6863. And your opinion is, that animals are always brought sound on board?—I believe so.

6864. When the animals leave your steamers have you noticed, or have complaints been made, that they were affected with disease?—I have never noticed that, nor had complaints made.

6865. Your opinion is, that Irish store cattle which are affected with foot and mouth disease catch that disease in the markets of England?—Yes, or the disease must have been in such a latent state when they left Ireland, that they would not develop the disease until they had been in England for some time.

6866. You think that the statements that Irish cattle have brought so much disease into England are true.

are very much exaggerated?—Yes, I think they are very much exaggerated.

6867. If the animals catch the disease they catch it in England, you think?—That is my opinion; I do not think that the disease exists to the extent that is supposed.

6868. With regard to the shipping of store cattle, are they generally brought by railway to your yard at Drogheda?—No; the principal shippers of store cattle (in fact, the trade is in the hands of five or six men) have their farms midway between where they live at Navan, in the heart of the country, and Drogheda; they walk those cattle to Drogheda.

6869. They are driven on board?—Yes, they are driven on board; they walk there.

6870. Is there much difficulty in getting the cattle on board ship?—No; when you have got one or two on board the rest will follow, like sheep.

6871. Then the statements which have been made to this Committee as to there being considerable brutality in getting cattle on board ship, are not well founded?—No, there is no trash in them; any man in our employ found beating the animals unmercifully would be dismissed instantaneously.

6872. The sticks are not rattled upon their sides so severely as has been represented, I presume?—No; our men have sticks with sharp points, goods, to drive them in by.

6873. You do not think there is much ill treatment of Irish store cattle in getting them on board the steamers?—We permit none; you may get one or two beasts in a lot which would be unmanageable, and you would have to use much more than the usual force to get them into their berths.

6874. It has been stated that Irish store cattle, as a rule, when they are brought down, are wild and bad to manage; is that the fact?—They are not; the only difficulty we have is with the stall-fed cattle, which are fit for slaughter; the store cattle we have no difficulty with at all.

6875. Mr. J. Barry.] The stall-fed cattle are much wilder than the store cattle?—Yes, they are much wilder than the store cattle; if you are going to ship a lot of forty store cattle, and you succeed in getting the first two or three into their berths, the rest will follow, but if you commence to abuse them it will multiply your labour.

6876. If one or two fat cattle go on board will the rest follow?—Yes, they will.

6877. What evidence would you have that the holds have been thoroughly cleansed and disinfected?—I would have a thoroughly qualified man appointed to see to it.

6878. And he would have to stand by all the time that the disinfection was going on, would he not?—Yes, he would; but there are four policemen standing by now, and I believe that the amount that would go to them would be sufficient to pay an inspector.

6879. Mr. Clare Reed.] You believe the whitewash is not used for the purpose of disinfection, but simply to prove that some attempt has been made to cleanse the vessel?—The holds of our vessels were much cleaner before we began to whitewash, and much better disinfected, than they are now.

6880. But it is insisted upon in order to show that it has been done, whereas you might put a lot of carbolic acid and water upon the vessel, which would give no evidence that it had been done?—It might be.

Mr.
P. O'Neill,
15 May
1873.

6881. You may take it off as soon as you like; there is no order to keep it on, is there?—You have to whitewash every time the vessel comes in; if the vessel sails four times a week she has to be whitewashed four times a week; if you only carry a pig in your vessel, when she comes back she has to be whitewashed from stem to stern.

6882. An inspector on board, to see that the animals were shipped in a healthy state, would of course be an assistance to you, as the manager of the company, would he not, because it is rather an invidious thing for you to find fault with the goods which your customers are inclined to send?—I should know it immediately. For instance, if a man has a quantity of store cattle, and those store cattle dealers are very shrewd intelligent fellows; if a man saw a beast having any signs of disease, he would call your attention to it if you were inclined to let it pass, and you would have no alternative but to exclude that beast; those men are very shrewd for their own interests.

6883. Would the owner of those beasts call attention to the fact of this beast being diseased?—No; the owner of some other cattle would call my attention to the fact that this beast was diseased. I know an instance in which there were two cattle salesmasters from Liverpool upon the quay, and there was an objection of that kind raised to a beast which was about being shipped, and they said the beast was not diseased, and there was a telegram sent to Liverpool, apprising the police that there was a diseased beast upon one of these vessels.

6884. So that those cattle dealers act as a sort of inspectors upon each other?—They do.

6885. Mr. Karamagh.] With regard to the question that was asked you by the honourable Member the Member for Essex, as to the power which exists under the Cattle Diseases Act, Ireland, to confiscate any infected animal which is imported from England into Ireland, does not that Act also give the power of confiscating any infected animal which is attempted to be exported from Ireland into England?—Yes, I believe the cattle are seized in Liverpool. I am not thoroughly acquainted with that.

6886. The Act says, "If any person lands or attempts to land in any port or place in Ireland, or ships or attempts to ship from any port or place in Ireland," that is the wording of the Act, the animal may be forfeited?—I think so.

6887. Is not that a protection to England?—I think it is quite a sufficient protection; quite as strong a protection as the other.

6888. Do you know Liverpool yourself?—Yes, I know Liverpool very well.

6889. Is Mr. Jenkins correct in his report, in saying that on the quays at Liverpool, where the cattle are landed, there are no water troughs?—I could not answer that question, because the cattle are not kept upon the quays; they are not allowed to remain there; they are taken away to the different railway stations, the cattle are sent to the salesmasters' yards or fields.

6890. Three years ago, before this restriction was put upon the import into Ireland, did you import many cattle?—Nothing beyond calves a couple of months old.

6891. Those calves principally go to Dublin, do they not?—I believe they go to Dublin; we would not carry them.

6892. Could you give the Committee any idea of the amount of those imports?—When those calves used to come by us, about 30 per week

would come from the beginning of March to the end of June, and I suppose the Dublin import is much larger than that; we used to take a good many sheep which were bought up in the Yorkshire districts, but we have had none lately.

6893. With regard to the question of hold versus deck, do you know the Belfast boats?—Yes, I do.

6894. Am I right in supposing that they are built with poops, low main decks, and burriens decks forward?—Yes.

6895. It is in those low main decks that the cattle are carried?—Yes.

6896. Your holds are very different?—Yes, our holds are very different; they are eight feet high.

6897. In fact, cattle carried upon the deck of your boats would be in rather a bad place, would they not?—They would be ten times worse of than the others in bad weather.

6898. We examined a witness from the North of Ireland who sent his cattle by the Belfast boats; he said that he would prefer the deck?—Of course, the deck of his vessels would be much better than the deck of ours.

6899. Is it not also true that the sea passage between Belfast and Glasgow is much shorter than your sea passage?—Yes; they have a river on both sides, and they get into the river in a very short time.

6900. Mr. W. Johnston.] Are there any circumstances under which you would agree with Mr. Jenkins, that "Although live stock are carried on deck as well as in holds, the owners much prefer the former method"?—There are some circumstances in which that might be so; for instance, if two or three dealers were going to the Manchester Market in a hurry, the man having his cattle upon the main deck would get first to the railway, and would get the first train in that way; but as to its value as a berth, the between deck is the best part of the ship.

6901. Have there been any complaints ever made to you or to the company with reference to disease breaking out amongst the cattle when landed in England after having been conveyed by you?—Never.

6902. Mr. Cassley.] With regard to the question of disinfecting and limewashing, you speak of the effect upon the iron of the vessel?—Yes; I have merely been giving the opinion of the engineers who were consulted upon that point.

6903. You are only giving the opinion of other people?—Yes; we have to pay a large fee for that opinion.

6904. I wanted to understand whether you were speaking from your own knowledge?—The only thing which I give of my own knowledge is, that the captain called my attention to the appearance of the iron after the whitewashing, and to the appearance of the iron after painting.

6905. Was that limewash upon the naked iron, or was it upon a coat of paint?—In this case it was not upon a coat of paint; we had some of our vessels done in that way; we had some of our vessels painted, and we were going to have our other vessels painted; but when this order came out, we whitewashed without painting them.

6906. In this case, was it limewash upon iron, or limewash upon paint?—It was limewash upon iron.

6907. In that case, what was the difference; did you compare it with the part of the iron which

which had been exposed to the atmosphere, or were you comparing the iron which had been whitewashed, with iron which had been painted?—With iron which had been painted.

6908. Is that a fair comparison to make?—I think it is.

6909. Surely it is one thing to compare the effect of limewash upon iron which had not been painted, and another thing to compare it with that which had been painted?—I think it shows, no matter which way you take it, that the limewash is injurious to iron.

6910. Supposing that it is painted first, the lime must first destroy the paint before it gets to the iron; I presume you paint because you deem it necessary to protect the iron from the action of the atmosphere and sea-water?—We used to take a great deal more trouble with our boats than we do at present. Our boats are much siltier than they have been in the habit of being, because we cannot keep them clean.

6911. Why cannot you keep them clean?—Because when a shower of rain comes on, and washes the lime down, it is all dirty before you had your boat.

6912. When you say that they are not so clean, do you mean that the limewash runs upon the deck?—Yes.

6913. But limewash and dirt are very different things, are they not?—It is a matter of appearance, they leave to limewash the place throughout.

6914. Is that the only objection as regards the limewash, namely, that it washes off in the rain?—The difference is confined to that as regards cleanliness.

6915. Then assuming the limewash to be done away with, are you prepared to state to the Committee what mode of disinfecting would, in your opinion, be perfect?—We are told that, by the application of salt water, having first reduced the deck, or the hold of the ship, to a very fine surface, the contagious matter that may lie upon the surface, will be washed away, and the surface disinfected.

6916. Were you told that by persons of scientific and chemical knowledge?—Yes, I was.

6917. Do you wish to convey to the Committee that, according to information which you have received from scientific people, sea-water alone is sufficient to disinfect vessels?—No, I should have stated that you must mix it with some substance, I forget what the name of it is, there are so many of them mentioned, but carbolic acid, for instance, should be mixed with water and applied to the places which the cattle come in contact with. I understand that that would be an effectual disinfectant.

6918. Would it take a much shorter time to apply water mixed with carbolic acid than limewash?—Yes, because you could use your hose and your donkey engine, and send the water flowing about, and then dry the sides of the ship afterwards.

6919. The drying of that would take much the same time, would it not, as the drying of the whitewash?—No.

6920. How would you dry it?—You can easily dry it, the air will help you to dry it.

6921. But the air will dry the limewash, will it not?—But a surface of timber would be much sooner dried than a surface of limewash.

6922. You do not know what would be the difference in the time?—I do not know the difference in the time.

6923.

6923. You told the Committee just now that no store cattle go to the Liverpool or Manchester markets?—None that I am aware of.

6924. Do you undertake to say of your own knowledge they do not?—Yes; store cattle are always booked through in Drogheda for their destination in England, whether it is St. Ives, or March, or Norwich.

6925. You mean to say that, as far as your company is concerned, you never bring any store cattle which pass from your control and knowledge; when they get to Liverpool you say they are all booked there?—Yes; a case may occur where a man may omit to book through, but they are booked through in Liverpool, and we receive a return from the railway company, if there is an omission at Drogheda to put the cattle upon the through manifest, and that is corrected by the railway companies. You may take it that there is no store cattle sent to Liverpool or Manchester by our own company as a destination.

6926. You do not speak for other companies, I suppose?—I do not speak for other companies.

6927. In speaking of that question of cruelty, I noticed that you stated that any of your servants would be discharged if they were found guilty of cruelty; do not the drovers and other people insist to get the cattle on board?—Yes; I may tell you that on two or three occasions, when I have seen drovers abuse the cattle coming from the country (men who had happened to get some drink), I wrote to their employers, stating that the men were not taking proper care of the cattle; just to show you how careful we are upon the subject.

6928. You admit that there are cases of cruelty?—Yes, but they are very rare.

6929. *Chairman.* With regard to watering the animals, you have a yard, have you not, at Liverpool?—We have.

6930. Is that belonging to your company?—Yes.

6931. Is that close to the landing place?—No, not immediately; the stock are put in there to be selected by the owners; they are only kept there till they are delivered.

6932. How far is that from the port?—I could not exactly tell you how far that is from the port; I have never been in our present yard in Liverpool; I do not know where it is.

6933. Are there watering troughs in your yard?—I do not know.

6934. You do not know whether the animals are watered in your yard?—I do not know whether they are or not; I think they are merely selected there by the owners, and then taken away.

6935. You do not know how long the animals remain there?—They remain there about an hour, I believe.

6936. You have a yard at Drogheda, have you not?—Yes, we have.

6937. Is that near the quay?—Yes.

6938. How long do the cattle generally stop there?—As a rule, cattle do not come into the yard at Drogheda at all; we have an abundant water supply in our yard there.

6939. Are the animals watered before they come on board, generally?—No, they are not, except, perhaps, in the case of some man who had brought his cattle from a distance, and wanted to rest them, then he might give them water.

6940. Those cattle are not watered before they

Mr.
P. O'Neill.
15 May
1873.

Mr.
P. O'Neill
15 May
1873.

go on board, and you cannot give the Committee any information as to what is done about watering when they get to England?—I am alluding to the store cattle; it is the practice of the dealers to fard the cattle in Liverpool, and rest them for eight or nine hours before they put them on the train.

6941. Do you think that it is ever the case that, upon cattle landing in Liverpool, they are put into the railway train without being watered and fed?—As far as regards store cattle, they are never put upon the train without being watered and fed.

6942. Do you know that from your own knowledge?—I know that from my own knowledge.

6943. How do you know that; is it from what you feel sure that the owners would do, or from any regulations which are made by the company?—I have had occasion to go over to Edgely several times when they were making through traffic arrangements with the railway companies, and I saw the arrangements there, and in addition to that the men are always very anxious to nourish the cattle and keep them in proper condition.

6944. Are your ships chiefly cattle ships?—Yes, they are cattle ships.

6945. That is your main business, is it not?—Yes.

6946. Do you imagine that you bring any large proportion of the Irish cattle which come into the port of Liverpool?—Yes, I think so.

6947. Some of the steamboat companies, I am told, have crutakers, as they are called; men sent with the boats on purpose to look after them; is that the case with your company?—Yes, we send two men with each vessel, whose business it is to look after the cattle exclusively.

6948. Do the cattle often come down to you in a bad condition, bruised about?—Very seldom; the cattle which come to us (the fat cattle) are walked in from the districts in and around Meath. The store cattle are also brought to us sometimes from a distance in the interior of the country that they come in heated, being driven rapidly to catch the boat, if there is only a short time between the sailing of the boat and the arrival of the train.

6949. Can you tell the Committee from what parts of Ireland your store stock generally comes?—They are bought, and sometimes from the west of Ireland. They are kept by parties who hold them for some time before they are shipped by us; some of them are bought in the counties of Longford, Cavan and Westmeath.

6950. I see by the Return for the year 1870, that, as regards cattle, Drogheda is the third port, according to the cattle exported to England?—I thought it was the second.

6951. The return says, Dublin, 182,000 oxen, bulls, and cows; Belfast, 77,000; and Drogheda, 55,000?—Our shipments are larger into Liverpool than Belfast; Belfast ships to Carlisle and other places.

6952. Yours is the only company carrying from Drogheda, I believe?—The only company.

6953. When you have, I do not mean very rough weather indeed, or a gale, but when you have bad weather, how long is the passage generally?—The longest one we had last winter, and it was an unusually severe one, was 14 hours, and that was one of our oldest ships; we have two ships which can make the passage within the given time in any weather.

6954. You object to whitewashing with lime; you are of course aware that that order is made for England, and that it has been carried out?—I am not aware of that.

6955. It has been done at Bristol, I believe, upon the Irish boats coming into Bristol?—I suppose they have to do it like ourselves since the order came into operation; we have been doing it since 1st of March. I do not think they carried on that system of disinfection previous to the 1st of March.

6956. You stated that you had more care taken before the order was issued than since; what was it you did before the order was issued?—The moment the cattle were discharged in Liverpool, our men had to set about cleaning the ship, washing her all over, to prepare for the reception of dead cargo; of course, we should have to do that in any case.

6957. In what way did you wash the vessel, with water merely?—Yes; and then they had sawdust; I am talking now of before the time when the deputation waited upon Lord Hartington; after that we mixed commercial carbolic acid with the water.

6958. When was that?—Between January and the 6th of March, when that Order came into operation.

6959. Since then you have been obliged to comply with the Order to do it with lime?—Yes, we mixed no acid with the water with which we washed the floor of the ship.

6960. I suppose one great advantage, in your view, of carbolic acid, is that it does not mark the sides of the ship?—In the first instance, it is not so expensive, and we can apply it with less labour, and do it in less time; it does not interfere with our traffic in the same way as whitewashing does.

6961. Why will it not interfere with your traffic?—Because, when we can do it in less time and with less labour, of course it will not interfere with our traffic, inasmuch as the limewashing will occupy eight men to do the four holds of the ships, as busy as they can be, for six or eight hours.

6962. Is that your sole objection to lime washing?—No, it is injurious to the iron.

6963. The injury to the iron, the greater time occupied, and the greater labour, are the objections?—Yes, they are.

6964. Are there any other objections which you have to the whitewashing?—There are no other objections.

6965. Do you think that if it were done in that wholesale sort of way with a steam-engine and hose, which you recommended, you are perfectly sure that it would be as complete a wash, and get rid of all the particles which ought to be washed away, as doing it by this more careful hand labour to which you object?—I think that if that were done under independent supervision it would be equally as effectual.

6966. What do you mean by independent supervision?—The inspector appointed to examine the cattle might also superintend the disinfection.

6967. After each voyage?—Yes; when he is there to examine the cattle he might also examine the ship.

6968. How long do you think the operation ought to take if it is done with the steamboat?—It ought to be done in about three hours.

6969. At present it would take about eight hours.

hours, would it not?—It would take six or eight hours; of course, a man going with a brush along the sides is a very different thing from a man with a powerful hose.

4970. As it is done now in a way to which you object, a man goes round and actually brushes the wall?—Yes, the same as you would whitewash any ordinary wall.

4971. And you think that the hose would have the same effect as a brush used by hand?—I do.

4972. You cannot use the hose for lime-wash, can you?—No; we can work the hose with the donkey-engine upon the ship with the mixture I spoke of.

4973. Mr. J. Barclay.] You stated that you used the mixture of carbolic acid and water through the hose; why cannot you put the lime-wash through the hose?—I do not know, I never said it.

4974. Mr. Kewenaw.] The whitewash, in order to stick upon the sides of the vessel, must be of a certain thickness, must it not?—It should be.

4975. And would not that choke the pump and the hose?—It would.

4976. And therefore it would be impossible to do in that way?—Yes.

4977. Chairman.] But I am informed, that in order to have a disinfecting effect, a small quantity of lime only is sufficient, so that it should not be of that choking nature?—The Order in Council provides that you shall put on a thick coat of lime-wash.

4978. I read the Order to be this: that it is compulsory that there shall be an application of a coating of whitewash, made by mixing good freshly-burnt lime and whitening with water; and it says afterwards, that there must be either a certain quantity of carbolic acid or of dry chloride of lime; I do not read the Order to require that it should be a thick whitewash, if it is mixed with carbolic acid; do not you so understand it?—Last month, in one of our vessels which was whitewashed, a policeman came in, and said that it was not thick enough, and he would not allow the vessel to go out.

4979. In fact, your objection is to the policeman's interpretation of the Order, that it had to be a coating of lime?—If it could be done by hose, without being obliged to be a coating, we would have no objection to it.

4980. Mr. Caffery.] You object to whitewashing, as much because of its injurious effects upon the iron as upon the ground of its impeding the traffic, wholly apart from the question of expense?—Yes, we do not regard the expense.

4981. If power were given, as suggested by the honourable Baroness the Member for Essex, to seize as contraband and to confiscate any cattle affected with foot and mouth disease upon landing in England, would that have the effect of destroying the cattle trade in Ireland?—I think it would.

Mr. THOMAS VERDON, called in; and Examined.

4987. Chairman.] You are largely engaged in the cattle trade, I believe?—Yes.

4988. In what manner?—I am a Cattle Salesman and I have also the management of a great many large properties in Ireland; I am also an owner of land in Ireland which I occupy myself, and I have also land which tenants occupy.

4989. I am afraid I must go into a little detail; when you say that you are a cattle salesman, does that mean that you buy cattle and sell them yourself, or that you are a salesman for others?—It means that I sell cattle on commission for other parties.

6082. The Order in Council, which was enforced avowedly in consequence of the strong representation of the Royal Agricultural Society of England, requires lime-wash, and therefore you were not much in error in attributing lime-washing to the representations of that body?—Lord Hartington stated that the whitewashing had been insisted upon in consequence of the strong representations of the Royal Agricultural Society of England.

6083. If whitewashing be a clear evidence of the vessel having been cleansed, does not it, on the other hand, aid materially in covering with dirt and other matters, even the very infecting matter itself?—Yes.

6084. So that, in your opinion, lime-washing, instead of cleansing and disinfecting, aids to cover up the infecting matter?—Yes.

6085. You have given that as the opinion of other parties, but is not it also within your own observation that that is the case?—Yes, it is.

6086. With regard to the landing of diseased cattle in Ireland, are you aware that upon the 28th of April last a cargo of cattle was landed in Dublin from Spain, some of which were affected with foot and mouth disease, and that those cattle were not confiscated as contraband?—I was not aware of that.

6087. Mr. Clare Read.] How often have you been to the Edgell station at Liverpool?—About half-a-dozen times.

6088. Always for the purpose of seeing the cattle there?—Not at all; I went there on other business, but I would see our customers and have a talk with them.

6089. How many cattle can you accommodate in the lairs at the Edgell station?—They can accommodate thousands.

6090. Are there means there for giving the cattle hay?—Yes, there are men in the employ of the railway company who give hay to them.

6091. How is it given to them?—They are taken in detachments; every man keeps his own beasts separate and feeds his own cattle.

6092. Are the cattle in lairs or sheds, and is the hay given in racks, or is it thrown upon the ground?—It was thrown upon the ground when I saw them.

6093. In the lairs?—In the fields.

6094. Is it your opinion that cattle are always fed and watered and rested before they are put upon the railways?—Yes; I am only alluding to store cattle.

6095. What is the difference in the rate per head between fat cattle and store cattle by your own through route?—The average charge for store cattle would be about from 6s. to 6s. 6d. across the Channel, and for fat cattle, 9s. 6d.

6096. So that there would be no inducement whatever for a man to call his store cattle fat?—No, he would have to pay for it.

6097. Mr. Verdon.] You are a cattle salesman, does that mean that you buy cattle and sell them yourself, or that you are a salesman for others?—It means that I sell cattle on commission for other parties.

6098. The head-quarters of your business being where?—In Liverpool.

6099. As a cattle salesman, what number of
O O Irish

Mr.
P. O'Neil.
—
15 May
1873.

Mr.
T. Verdon.

Mr.
T. Vernon,
15 May
1873.

Irish cattle pass through your hands in the course of a year?—Upwards 20,000.

7002. Is your trade confined to Irish cattle?—No, it is not.

7003. You buy cattle also in England?—I buy very few cattle in England, sheep principally, but we sell the greater number, I might say the whole, of the Spanish and Portuguese cattle which are imported into Liverpool.

7004. Are any Scotch cattle consigned to you?—Exceedingly few, but they are occasionally.

7005. What quantity of Spanish and Portuguese cattle would you get in a year?—From 5,000 to 6,000.

7006. You also stated that you were an owner of property in Ireland?—Yes, I am.

7007. In what parts?—In the north of Ireland, near Carrington, which is occupied by tenants; myself and my partner have a large property called Ballyfeighan, in the county of Kildare.

7008. Do you occupy that yourself?—We occupy that ourselves, and we also rent a farm of about 600 English acres in the county of Meath, which we occupy ourselves.

7009. As the occupier of farms in Ireland, what amount of cattle have you generally upon your farms?—We have 700 cattle and about 800 sheep upon our own property.

7010. I suppose you have been in business both as a salesman and as a farmer for some time?—Our firm was established in 1825, and since I was fit to be in business I have been.

7011. Have you been the owner of cattle as occupier since 1825?—We purchased the Ballyfeighan property in the year 1830, and we have held another farm since 1848.

7012. Then your experience as an Irish owner of cattle dates back from some time, and you must have had some experience of two or three periods in which there has been foot and mouth disease?—Yes.

7013. In this memorial which you have sent in, you give it as your opinion, and that of the other memorialists, "that the injurious effect of the foot and mouth and each disease is only transient, and that the operation of the restrictions causes serious injury to trade"?—Yes; that is so.

7014. What do you think has been the effect of these restrictions since the last attack?—In my own judgment the restrictions have not been of any utility.

7015. Do you think that the last attack has been as bad as the previous attacks were when there were not such restrictions?—I think it has been more general, and the disease, perhaps, worse.

7016. When you say the restrictions have been of no utility, do you mean to say that having been carried out they have been of no use, or that the regulations have not been carried out?—As far as I can judge, those that have been carried out are of no use; and as far as I can judge, a great number of the prescribed regulations, in England particularly, have not been carried out.

7017. But we are now talking of Ireland, not of England?—I think the regulations have been fairly carried out in Ireland, more so than in England.

7018. And notwithstanding that, you think they have done no good in Ireland in checking disease?—I think not.

7019. In what way do you think the regula-

tions have been carried out in Ireland?—I think, for instance, the farmers and graziers have very fairly and very generally reported any outbreak of disease which appeared upon a farm. I think, as far as they could, they have complied with the regulations in that respect. When a case of disease has appeared on a farm in Ireland, the proprietor, I think, as far as my knowledge goes, has invariably reported the existence of the disease to the police, as prescribed by the Act.

7020. I gather that the Order has two main objects: one is to stop the movement of an animal affected with foot and mouth disease from a farm, and the other is to prevent disease being spread from fairs and markets; do you think that, as regards the stoppage of movement from farms, the order has been pretty fairly carried out?—Very fairly and very generally.

7021. It appears in evidence that it has been found very difficult (in fact, so difficult that it has hardly been attempted) to prevent the movement of affected cattle from fairs?—It frequently happens that cattle have left their homes perfectly healthy and well, and on arrival at a fair have exhibited symptoms of disease, and I think it would be quite impracticable to prevent the movement of these cattle from that fair.

7022. We have had evidence before this Committee, that as far as regarded the carrying out of the Order at fairs, especially at large fairs, such fairs, for example, as Ballinasloe, the Order has been a dead letter?—Yes, precisely so.

7023. In your opinion, it would be impossible to enforce that Order?—It would be perfectly impossible. If you carried out the Order laid down with respect to the fair at Ballinasloe, you would be obliged to hem in all the cattle within a very narrow space, and prevent them moving out of that space, because every animal upon the Fair Green would have been heated with the animals which were affected with disease upon the Fair Green.

7024. We have had evidence from a witness who was quite qualified to give an opinion, to this effect: that, agreeing with your opinion that the present restrictions were of very little service, he would very much increase them by stopping all fairs, beginning at the 1st of May, for about six weeks or two months, or, if absolutely necessary, for a longer time; what is your opinion upon that suggestion?—If you carried out the suggestion of stopping all fairs and markets for six weeks from, say the 1st of June, you would ruin the greater number of small farmers in Ireland, unless you should make a regulation to pay their rents. If you did not do the one you could not do the other.

7025. I gather that your opinion with regard to foot and mouth disease is this: that the present restrictions are of but little service in stopping the disease, and that the restrictions which have been recommended as necessary for efficiency would make the remedy worse than the disease?—Precisely.

7026. Evidence has been given to this Committee that there has been an enormous loss from these attacks of foot and mouth disease; one witness told us that he thought the loss was a million and a half to Ireland in the course of last year; what have you to say about that?—My experience is confined entirely to feeding cattle; I have no experience in regard to dairy cattle, and I cannot offer an opinion upon the question of dairy cattle; but a very large majority of the cattle

cattle in Ireland are feeding cattle, and I do not at all agree in that statement of the losses which have been sustained, speaking from my own personal experience, and from the information which I have been able to collect personally from a great number of persons engaged in the trade.

7027. I understand this memorial which you have produced to say that you think there ought to be no restrictions as regards either foot and mouth disease, or scab disease; and you say that the vexatious regulations which have been imposed with regard to those two diseases have weakened and impeded the working of the Act with respect to the more serious diseases, such as rinderpest, pleuro-pneumonia, sheep-pox, and glanders; in the first place, I suppose, there is no difference of opinion that there ought to be very stringent regulations with regard to rinderpest?—I think every owner of cattle in Ireland will support you in all the regulations you may think it right to carry out for the suppression of rinderpest.

7028. I gather that you think it would be desirable to have restrictions with regard to pleuro-pneumonia?—Certainly.

7029. Would you have more restrictions than there are at present, or would you maintain those that already exist?—I would maintain the restrictions which exist at present with regard to pleuro-pneumonia, and I would also make it as penal as it could be made, for any man knowingly to offer for sale in any fair or market an animal affected with pleuro-pneumonia.

7030. It has been suggested that the slaughter of animals affected with pleuro-pneumonia should be compulsory; what is your opinion upon that point?—I think it should be.

7031. Have you had many cases of pleuro-pneumonia amongst the animals that you have sold in Liverpool, coming from Ireland?—I have not seen a case of pleuro-pneumonia in the Liverpool cattle market for the last four years, and I do not know of a case of pleuro-pneumonia having taken place amongst all the people for whom I sell cattle. I think, at present, as far as the grazing cattle of Ireland are concerned, they are singularly free from pleuro-pneumonia.

7032. Have you ever had a case of pleuro-pneumonia in your Spanish and Portuguese cargoes?—Never.

7033. Have you had much foot and mouth disease in these cargoes?—Never; or, rather, when I say never, I should say that the law is this: that if a case of foot and mouth disease is discovered to be amongst the cattle on board a vessel coming from Spain or Portugal, the whole of the animals would have to be slaughtered. The animals are very rigidly inspected in Liverpool by a very competent veterinary surgeon. They are inspected immediately on landing; they are inspected 12 hours afterwards, and the voyage occupies five days; therefore, if the disease was in the system at all, it would show itself, and not a single case has ever been detected.

7034. There are a good many cases in the Irish cargoes, are there not?—Very frequently; there is no doubt about that.

7035. How soon do you know that they have the foot and mouth disease; directly that they come into your yard, or to your pasture at Liverpool?—The custom of the grazier in Ireland is this: that he generally consigns his cattle for sale to a cattle salesman; ourselves,

for example. They are shipped from Dublin, Drogheda, Dundalk, or Waterford, or whatever port he thinks proper; they arrive in Liverpool from the Thursday to Sunday; a great number of the cattle arrive on Sunday, the Liverpool market being held on the Monday. The cattle, so far as the graziers and all those who have to do with consigning the cattle are concerned, are invariably sound when leaving the farm. No man, owning cattle or having any interest in them, would think of moving cattle affected with foot and mouth distemper particularly, for the purpose of sending them to a fair market. When they arrive in Liverpool, they are placed in parks which are situated round about the borough; generally speaking, from four to five miles distant from the place of landing; these are very large fields, generally speaking (I am speaking of our own places), from 70 to 100 statute acres, and some of them considerably more. Large fields are selected, because it is found that the cattle belonging to different owners, generally speaking, kept together if they are fed upon one place; therefore, they do not abuse or harm or knock about each other. They are brought into the market on the Monday; and frequently before the Monday, on Sunday, for example, they may show symptoms of foot and mouth disease.

7036. You import cattle, I suppose, or rather you sell cattle which come from Dublin and Drogheda, and many other places?—From every port in Ireland.

7037. Have you found a remarkable exception with regard to Drogheda, that the animals coming from there are free from foot and mouth disease?—They are not any more free than any other cattle. They all land perfectly free, in my opinion; and if the disease shows itself, it has been developed from travelling, or from other circumstances, after they have arrived in England.

7038. They may catch the disease in England?—It is more than probable that nine-tenths of the Irish cattle which are accused of being exported unhealthy, become affected after they arrive in England.

7039. I do not doubt that a successful man of business like yourself takes all the care he can, but the infection once getting into your park, it is very difficult to get rid of it, is it not?—We have a great number of parks, and the parks are always idle from Sunday night about 12, when they begin to move the cattle in for the market, until Thursday at mid-day, or two o'clock.

7040. Do you think the cattle catch the disease in the parks at all?—No, I do not think they do; I do not think that there is any infection in the parks.

7041. You state in your memorial, "That it is the belief of your memorialists that the working of this Act," by "this Act" you mean the English Act, "has been the means of causing great fluctuations in the price of flesh meat, and that its working the exceptional high prices which have been prevalent in many large towns for flesh meat are to be attributed to" in what way do you think the Act has operated; in the first place what Act do you mean?—The English Act, the general Act which was passed, I think, in 1869. The way in which these fluctuations have been caused in the trade is this: In the month of last August, twelve months for the first time that Act was put in force at Liverpool; on

Mr.
T. Fordon.
15 May
1873.

Mr.
T. Vernon.
15 May
1873.

the 14th of August I think it was, a great number of policemen came into the market, accompanied by two veterinary surgeons; they went through the cattle, and seized a great number, some of which they afterwards returned, and some of which they retained, and placed in quarantine. On that particular day, I think, speaking from memory, there were 3,700 cattle in the market exhibited for sale. The week following, I think, the market had fallen to 1,400, in consequence of the Act being so strictly put in force. It deterred everyone in Ireland, or at least a great number, from sending their cattle forward to that market; the price was raised very considerably, and the same effect followed in Manchester.

7042. Then I understand you to explain this part of your memorial by the statement, that when that Act was put in force, a good many cattle were taken up in consequence, and that there was a rise in the price immediately?—There was a very considerable advance in price the week afterwards.

7043. But I think this passage in your memorial would convey rather a different impression from that; it would not convey the impression that the immediate effect of putting the Act into operation was this, but that it was the general effect of the working of the Act?—So far as the market of Liverpool is concerned, the working of the Act has no doubt considerably diminished the regular supply of cattle coming there.

7044. When did the Act begin to get into work?—Last August twelvemonth.

7045. When you say that the Act came into work in August, what you mean is, that the local authorities of Liverpool then put into force for the first time, in a stringent manner, the 57th clause of the Act, which prevented animals affected with foot and mouth disease from being exposed for sale?—Yes, that is what I mean.

7046. The immediate effect of that action was to prevent a number of animals from being sold, and to raise the price of meat?—Yes.

7047. Now I want to know how you can prove to the Committee that the permanent effect since that time has been to diminish the import into Liverpool?—The regulation then put in force diverted a considerable portion of the traffic from Liverpool.

7048. To where?—To other parts.

7049. Will you mention what parts?—For instance, a great number of the cattle which were formerly offered for sale in Liverpool, went by Holyhead, to inland places, and instead of Liverpool being, as it was formerly, the great exposition market for the north of England, a great number of the cattle which used to come to Liverpool, where the dealers came and purchased them, are now brought from Ireland by the dealers in England, who go over to Ireland and buy the cattle, and bring them to their own places.

7050. The general Irish import in 1871 I find to be of oxen, bulls, cows, and calves, 483,825; and 616,080 in 1872?—I think I can give you the number imported into Liverpool from various sources in Ireland. This Table (*producing the same*) is taken from the Liverpool Bills of Entry, and it will be found to be tolerably correct.

7051. You say that you think the working of the Act has caused the exceptionally high prices prevalent in many large towns for fresh meat?—As long as I have been in business I never recollect

the supplies coming into Liverpool being so small, and I never recollect prices being so high; and I attribute that, in a measure, to the working of the Act, in having diverted from the Liverpool Cattle Market, and from the Salford Cattle Market, and from other cattle markets in the same locality, a great deal of the supply that formerly came there.

7052. But have the prices at those markets been decidedly higher than in other markets in the kingdom?—Yes; they are higher in Liverpool at present than they are in London, very considerably higher, so much so that every week in the year men are coming up to London from Liverpool and from Manchester, and purchasing large numbers of cattle in London, and bringing them down to Liverpool and Manchester. In years gone by it used to be the other way.

7053. That would not appear to me absolutely to prove that the prices range higher generally, because we are well aware that for every article of sale a very large market is often resorted to from different parts of the kingdom; but have you any figures to show the prices in Liverpool to be actually higher than the prices in London?—I know it from the quotations given; for instance, last Monday in Liverpool they were higher there than in any other market that I am acquainted with.

7054. Are those quotations given in a price current?—No; you will see it in the "Times" of last Monday if you refer to it.

7055. You say that was the case last Monday?—Yes, and that has been the case for some time past; I can give you one instance; a Mr. Hall who is a very extensive butcher in Liverpool has been here for the last three weeks, and each week he has bought about eighty cattle; he told me that the average price that he paid for these cattle in London last week was about 81 £, and he told me that had he to buy these cattle in Liverpool he thought he would have had to pay 32 £ 10 s. for them.

7056. I suppose you are well aware as a man of business that the fact of one market for any article being at any particular time a better market to buy in, would not prove that it was a better market generally; you would have to show that that difference had prevailed for a considerable time?—It has been so during the last 15 months.

7057. When did Mr. Hall come to London?—He came during the whole of the spring of last year, and he has been coming now for a considerable time; he comes at intervals, not regularly; to the market after Christmas, for example, he came to London.

7058. What time do you get your Irish fat cattle into Liverpool mainly?—The supply of Irish fat cattle into Liverpool commences about the first week in June; Ireland supplies an enormous portion of Lancashire, and a great portion of Yorkshire, and a great extent of that district with cattle from the month of June until, I may say, the Christmas market.

7059. Then the Irish fat cattle coming in from June and during the autumn months make Liverpool a good market for Irish fat cattle during that time; but is it not the case that the Norfolk fat cattle, and the Scotch fat cattle come into London in the spring?—Yes, they come to London; London is well supplied.

7060. Would not it be a very natural thing for a buyer of fat cattle to come to London to

the spring as the chief market for Norfolk and Scotch cattle?—In years gone by it was the common custom for people to buy cattle in Liverpool in the spring months of the year, and to bring them up to London.

7061. Where did they come from?—A good deal of the stall-fed cattle came from Ireland, some of them came from Scotland, from Berwick, and Cumberland by rail; it is the large dealers residing in Yorkshire who buy cattle in Northumberland, Berwick, and that district, and who bring them in the spring of the year and offer them for sale in Liverpool.

7062. Is that the case now?—Yes, but the supplies are not coming in largely now.

7063. With regard to Scotch cattle, I suppose, they come up to London more since the quicker railway communication has been afforded than they used to do?—We never had a very large supply of Scotch cattle coming into Liverpool.

7064. It seemed to me to be the natural course of trade, that in the spring, people in different parts of England should consider London to be the best market for fat cattle?—My experience of years gone by is that higher prices ranged in London than in the local markets.

7065. Was not that experience based upon the fact that there was not such good communication by railway with London as there is now?—As long as I can recollect there has been very good communication by railway to London.

7066. Did cattle come up to London from Aberdeen by railway at that time?—Yes.

7067. In what condition do the fat cattle generally arrive from Ireland?—In very excellent condition.

7068. You do not import store cattle?—No.

7069. The Spanish and Portuguese cattle also arrive in good condition, do they not?—Excellent.

7070. This memorial which has been handed in is signed, I think, by 735 signatures?—Yes.

7071. Of which 406 are graziers and salesmen?—Yes.

7072. And 264 butchers, meat cattle dealers, and I find that in addition, in your analysis, five deputy lieutenants and 66 justices of the peace have signed it?—Yes, they are all graziers.

7073. Are they Irish?—All the graziers, with perhaps about a dozen exceptions, are Irish. The memorial is signed, I may say, by Scotch gentlemen also, holding an enormous extent of land in Ireland, Mr. Allan Pollok, for instance.

7074. Are the cattle dealers all English or Irish?—All English; they are nearly all people who attend the Liverpool and Salford markets. There are a great number of cattle dealers who come from Yorkshire. There is Mr. Raddock's, Mr. Wallbank's, signature; he comes from Berwick; and Mr. Akroyd and Mr. Roebuck, and a great number of the largest cattle dealers, we have coming to our market.

7075. Then am I to understand that you not only recommend that such restrictions as these in the Irish Order with regard to foot and mouth disease, should no longer be in force, but that the foot and mouth disease should be struck out of the Act; that Section 57 should no longer apply to that disease?—Yes.

7076. You make the same statement with regard to scab, do you not?—Yes.

7077. Your opinion is that we had better not attempt to legislate with regard to foot and

mouth disease at all?—Neither not to legislate at all, or to legislate in a way that would stop the traffic altogether; you cannot have a medium between the two.

7078. This is the recommendation in this memorial; you have alluded to the Order which makes it imperative that in all foreign cargoes, if there be any one animal affected with disease, the whole cargo should be slaughtered; you recommend that the restrictions relating to foreign cattle should be maintained if the restrictions in the Act as regards home cattle and Irish cattle were removed?—It looks a very arbitrary order, but I think when we are dealing with *our own*, such as England, Ireland, and Scotland may be said to be, you should not deal with them as you would with foreign countries; I think it is perfectly right to submit to the evils that you have yourself, but not to import any that you can avoid.

7079. At present we do not deal out equal measure, because if one of the Irish cargoes has diseased cattle on board there is no attempt to interfere with the other part of the cargo beyond the diseased animals; in a foreign cargo, as you are aware, if one animal is found diseased, the whole cargo is slaughtered; am I to understand that that restriction, which is more onerous than the present restrictions upon the home and Irish cattle, should be continued if all restrictions upon Irish and home cattle were removed?—No; I would not at all advocate that the whole of the cattle should be slaughtered; I would distinctly object to it.

7080. I understand that you would strike out from Section 57, which prevents the exposure of certain animals for sale, anything which would make it apply to animals affected with foot and mouth disease; would you then allow that an animal affected with foot and mouth disease should be exposed for sale in a market?—In a store market I do not think anyone would do it, and in a fat cattle market I do not know that there is any great evil resulting from it.

7081. Then you would repeal the law, because you do not think that that would be likely to be done in a store market, and you do not think it would make any great difference if it were done in a fat market; why would it not be likely to be done in a store market?—No man having regard for his own property would move cattle affected with foot and mouth disease to a store fair, because anyone who knows anything about cattle knows that it is the movement of cattle affected with foot and mouth disease which causes the injury; and therefore I say that no rational man would expose an animal affected with foot and mouth disease in a store market; as to the fat cattle market, no man would expose one there if he could avoid doing so.

7082. That being your belief, how do you explain the fact that our Department is constantly hearing complaints from places at which the store cattle arrive from Ireland, bringing with them foot and mouth disease?—In the reports which I have seen published a great many of the statements are entirely contrary to the facts.

7083. You think that if, for instance, the buyers of cattle at Norwich market state that they constantly find that they have foot and mouth disease, either they must be mistaken in that belief, or the animals must have caught it after coming to England?—Looking to the returns which are published by the Veterinary Department

Mr.
T. F. Gordon.
15 May
1873.

Mr.
T. Verdon.
25 May
1873.

partment of the Privy Council, more disease prevails in Norfolk, I think, than in any five counties in Ireland. I think it is in Norfolk that the cattle become affected with foot and mouth disease.

7084. Mr. Kewenig. You have already stated to the Right Honourable Chairman your experience, and how you have acquired it; you are a member of the firm of Verdon & Calles, of Liverpool, are you not?—I am.

7085. And from your experience in the cattle trade you believe you are perfectly conversant with the value of cattle and sheep on grazing lands and feeding?—I believe that I am.

7086. You are directly interested in anything connected with the well-being of the cattle trade?—Yes, I am as much interested as any man can be.

7087. You attend the Liverpool cattle market each week?—I do.

7088. And Manchester?—And Manchester.

7089. And you have been in the habit of attending most of the large cattle fairs in Ireland, have you not?—I have.

7090. You have purchased large numbers of cattle and sheep at those fairs?—I have, in very large numbers.

7091. And you have also attended many of the principal fairs in England?—I have attended several of the large fairs in Yorkshire and in Shropshire.

7092. In Ireland you are intimately acquainted with most of the gentlemen who are in the habit of selling their cattle and sheep in the large fairs?—I am.

7093. Therefore you have had frequent opportunities of observing the cattle and their condition both before and after they are purchased?—I have.

7094. Is it your opinion that the cattle in Ireland are generally healthy?—I believe that the cattle and sheep in Ireland are generally healthy, and I believe at the present moment they are singularly healthy.

7095. You are not of opinion that there is very much foot and mouth disease at present in Ireland?—I think there is very little, or scarcely any.

7096. Are you aware at the present moment of the existence of a single case of pleuro-pneumonia in Ireland?—I am not aware of a single case amongst any grazing or feeding cattle. I know nothing whatever about dairy cattle.

7097. Your evidence is chiefly directed to fat and store cattle?—Entirely to fat and store cattle.

7098. Foot and mouth disease has been very prevalent in Ireland during the last year, has it not?—Exceedingly so.

7099. But notwithstanding its prevalence, is it not the fact that it is a disease rarely fatal?—It is.

7100. What would you consider the mortality arising from that disease would be?—The mortality arising from foot and mouth disease, taken in its ordinary course affecting cattle grazing upon a farm, rarely comes up to three per 1000; I can state that from my own experience during a number of years.

7101. That is about half per cent?—It is less than half per cent.

7102. Mr. Dent. Is that three per thousand of the cattle attacked?—Three per thousand of the grazing cattle attacked whilst feeding upon a farm.

7103. Mr. Kewenig. Is sheep the mortality is greater, is it not?—Is sheep it is greater.

7104. In the case of cattle being attacked, how long would you consider under favourable circumstances the attack would last?—If cattle are attacked upon a grazing farm, in my experience I think the disease lasts about eight to nine days, that is to say, it commences and it goes to its height, and then it subsides, and the subsidence is, I think, about nine days after the animal has been attacked.

7105. The animals would be quite well in about 15 days, would they not?—They would be quite well in about 15 days; there is a little tenderness which remains in the foot for a longer period, and it would not be desirable to remove cattle which had been attacked with foot and mouth disease for a considerably longer period than 15 days.

7106. Some reference has been made to this cattle disease, in that Blue Book called "The Trade in Animals Report," at page 90?—At page 90 it is the examination of Professor Simonds; he was being examined by Sir William Miles, and after stating a number of other things he said, "the foot and mouth disease is very seldom fatal, very rarely indeed."

7107. I believe there are a large number of passages in that book which all refer to the same effect?—There was a great deal of evidence taken here, and the representatives of the Irish Agricultural Society, and others, have all given evidence against foot and mouth disease being legislated upon; some of the largest cattle feeders in Ireland, and some very large farmers in England, all gave that opinion.

7108. Mr. Clare Read. That was in 1864, was it not?—Yes, that was in 1864.

7109. Mr. Kewenig. Is not the date of that Blue Book 1864?—No, this is in 1864; there was a Blue Book called "Trade in Animals," that is the year 1866, and in the year 1866, all the evidence that is from Ireland, I think; most of the people who gave evidence that was taken upon the subject of the "Trade in Animals," agreed that foot and mouth disease should not be inserted in any legislative enactment.

7110. Are you of opinion, that foot and mouth disease is introduced into Ireland from England at all?—I am, in my own mind, quite certain that the introduction of the disease has been from England into Ireland.

7111. Is it not the fact, that that disease travels from east to west, and that the cattle in Connaught, are the last to take the disease when it is general in Ireland?—It is invariably the case, I think.

7112. You have often seen cattle upon farms in Ireland, perfectly healthy, and seen the same animals in Dublin, perfectly healthy, and you have seen those same animals after their arrival in England affected with the disease?—I have.

7113. In years gone by, previous to the Privy Council Regulations, foot and mouth disease prevailed, but we got rid of it, did we not?—It prevailed, I think, perhaps not quite so severely as it has done lately, but it was quite as extensive, and it was, I think, completely got rid of.

7114. Without any restrictions?—It was got rid of without any restrictions or regulations at all.

7115. You consider those regulations most inconvenient, do you not?—I do.

7116. Formerly, when we were without any regulations, the disease, when it broke out, would

to spread more rapidly, but it was more rapidly got rid of.—Yes; its rise was more rapid, but its subsidence was also more rapid, I think, than it is at present.

7117. You have already stated to the Right Honourable Chairman, that the movement of any cattle affected with this disease, is very injurious?—I think particularly so.

7118. You do not believe that any owner in his senses would move his cattle off his farm while they were affected with foot and mouth disease?—Certainly not.

7119. Fat cattle, if properly treated, that is to say, left alone and not disturbed, recover very quickly, do they not?—Very rapidly.

7120. Can you give the Committee any instances of fat cattle affected with disease?—I can give you one very peculiar instance; a gentleman, a client of ours, Mr. O'Connell Legglen Murphy, who feeds upwards of 1,800 cattle, and stall feeds 150, thought of exhibiting three animals at the Birmingham cattle show, in the end of November or the beginning of December last year, and he wrote to me that he had sent them to Birmingham in charge of two of his men, asking me to go up to Birmingham to sell them at the cattle show there. They were sent by one of the Holyhead steamers from Dublin to Holyhead, and were rested for two or three hours at Holyhead in a horse stable, and then placed in a horse-box, and brought up to Birmingham, and brought also to a stable where no cattle had been, I believe, for a year before, so the man said. One of those cattle, a very large ox, became affected with foot and mouth disease. At the examination which took place before the animals were admitted into the cattle show in Birmingham, this animal was noticed as apparently having been in an incipient stage of the disease, and was sent back to the stable because from Birmingham, along with the other two cattle. The disease developed itself fully, and I have rarely seen a worse case of foot and mouth disease; the animal's tongue was covered over with vesicles; the lips were also covered with vesicles, and the feet were also sore. Of course, the animal would not be allowed into the exhibition building, neither were the men, nor the animals that accompanied this animal which was affected. I consulted Professor Gamgee, who was one of the veterinary surgeons acting for the Birmingham cattle show committee, and he told me to do nothing to the animal, to leave it alone, and to get it a little gruel and linseed cake boiled, and so forth, and that the animal would soon get right; it did so, and in 16 days afterwards, the animal was exhibited at the Manchester fat cattle show, and obtained the first prize there, and I sold that animal for 72*l.* 10*s.* at that fat cattle show in Manchester.

7121. Was there any outbreak at the cattle show in Manchester arising from this animal?—No; I should mention that the two animals which accompanied the ox had the foot and mouth distemper about five months before they were exhibited; the ox I refer to had never had the foot and mouth distemper; he was bred by Mr. Murphy, and the animal had none of the disease until he arrived in England, and until he was in Birmingham; he came in a horse box from Holyhead to Birmingham.

7122. Upon the whole, you are of opinion that the losses caused by restrictions upon foot and mouth disease are rather worse than the losses caused by the disease?—Much more so.

0.58.

7123. You would not have any legislation at all with reference to foot and mouth disease?—None at all.

7124. With regard to railway companies and Steam Packet Companies, you are of opinion that their trucks and vessels should be thoroughly disinfected?—I am opinion that they should be thoroughly disinfected each time that they convey cattle or sheep.

7125. You have heard the evidence given today by Mr. O'Neill?—I have.

7126. Do you think his objection is reasonable with regard to being forced to whitewash a vessel?—My view is, that if you thoroughly wash the floors and sides of the hold and the ports with salt water mixed with carbolic acid or with fresh water in which there is carbolic acid, that is quite as efficient as the lime wash, and in carrying fine goods such as the Company take from Liverpool, I think lime wash is a great injury. I think many who have fine goods to send would object to their being carried in steamers that were whitewashed, whereas I think if the walls and stanchions were rubbed with coarse cloths and then washed with a hose, the hose being very powerful, every iota containing germs of the disease could be washed away.

7127. I will ask you a few questions with reference to the cattle trade of Liverpool. The cattle trade in Liverpool is a very important one, is it not?—It is a very important one.

7128. The value being over five millions a year?—Yes, the imports into Liverpool exceed in value five millions a year.

7129. Do you think that Liverpool is particularly well suited as a port for this trade?—I think it is as well situated as any port could possibly be; the facilities for landing cattle are as great as they possibly can be at any port, they are greater than at any port I know.

7130. Cattle can be landed at all times of the day and night at the docks and landing stages, can they not?—They can be landed at the docks and landing stages at all stages of the tide.

7131. I think that the railway stations for cattle are within half a mile of the docks at which the cattle are landed, are they not?—The railway stations are within a very short distance of all the places where cattle are landed.

7132. Do you consider the cattle market at Liverpool one of the best markets in the United Kingdom?—I think it is as well arranged as any cattle market in the United Kingdom.

7133. You have plans of the cattle market, I believe, which you would wish to show to the Committee?—I have.

7134. You heard the evidence given, that the cattle were walked four miles to Edge Hill; if there are railway stations close to the docks, why do they drive them so far; do you know Edge Hill?—Perfectly; the cattle stations are close to the docks, and there are lines belonging to the London and North Western Company, and the Lancashire and Yorkshire Company. The Manchester, Sheffield, and Lincolnshire Railway Company, the Great Northern Railway Company, and one or two other companies have not as yet a central station at Liverpool, and their cattle station is situated at Edge Hill, which is about three miles from the docks where most of the cattle are landed, and the cattle which would be going to stations on the Great Northern Railway, and upon the Manchester, Sheffield, and Lincolnshire Railway, would

O O 4

Mr.
T. Fenton.
15 May
1873

Mr.
T. Fowden.
15 May
1873.

would come up to the railway station which is situated at Edge Hill; the cattle which would be going to the stations which are situated upon the Lancashire and Yorkshire, and upon the London and North Western, and upon the other tributary railways, would go from the steamer to their yards, and from their yards to their destination.

7135. You have a map there showing all the railways drawn upon it, have you not?—I have (producing the same); this map was prepared at the time of the Cattle Plague. (The map was handed in.)

7136. At the Liverpool Docks there is accommodation, is there not, for loading or unloading a thousand head of cattle an hour?—At the Liverpool Docks you could unload any number of cattle from the steamers which could possibly be brought there. At the railway station which is in connection with the Liverpool Cattle Market, you could load a thousand head of cattle per hour; that railway station is the largest cattle station, I think, in Great Britain; it is larger than any one in London.

7137. Is not the Liverpool Market attended by all the buyers of the neighbouring large towns?—Yes, at certain seasons of the year. Liverpool supplies the inhabitants of nearly all the large towns in Lancashire, and a great many large towns in Yorkshire, and a great number of the towns in Cheshire. A considerable supply also goes from Liverpool to Nottingham, and a large supply goes to Birmingham, Wolverhampton, and the Pottery districts.

7138. So that in fact Liverpool is responsible for the supply of meat to a very large, and a very thickly populated part of England?—To an enormous district.

7139. Am I right in stating the following figures with reference to the imports of cattle from Ireland into Liverpool, in the year 1872; the number of cattle imported was 294,098; of sheep 333,258, and that the estimated value of those was over five millions sterling?—It was.

7140. No cattle, I believe, come into Liverpool except Irish, Scotch, Spanish, and Portuguese?—None, or when I say none, I should say that occasionally a ship from other places has brought a few cattle on board, but the number might be counted by units.

7141. Do any cattle ever come from Jersey?—Yes, a considerable number come into Liverpool from Jersey, but they are brought by railway from Southampton; we have no direct communication with the Island.

7142. No ship communication?—We have no ship communication; the animals are landed from Jersey, Guernsey, Alderney, and Sark, at Southampton, and are brought from Southampton to Liverpool by rail.

7143. Besides this number of cattle which come by ship to Liverpool, there is a considerable number which come by railway, is there not?—Yes; there is a very large number.

7144. Am I right in stating these figures at 20,000 cattle and 120,000 sheep coming from Scotland and the North of England?—That is under the amount.

7145. But at certain seasons it is not the fact, say from the 21st of June to the 21st of November, that Ireland supplies nearly all the cattle and sheep consumed in Liverpool, Manchester, Warrington, Wakefield, Huddersfield, and Halifax, and all the other places in that district?—Yes.

7146. Mr. Dent.] A great number of grass-fed stock from Yorkshire go to Wakefield Market, do they not?—Yes, but I was in Wakefield Market in August last, and I should say that three-fourths of the animals there were from Ireland.

7147. Mr. Kewenig.] Have you any figures with reference to the number of animals taken to the different towns?—No, I have not; but I know that as a fact from my own knowledge and experience.

7148. Are not all these districts very densely populated?—They are all very densely populated.

7149. You are of opinion that any interference with the Irish cattle trade, would directly affect the supply of meat to those towns?—I am quite sure of it.

7150. Are you not also aware that great dissatisfaction exists at the present time owing to the high price of meat?—I am.

7151. Are you not aware, also, that many times during last summer there were demonstrations in Bolton and Manchester against the butchers, who were not at all to blame for the high prices current?—I am.

7152. Is it true that Liverpool was the first place in which the Act of 1868 was put in force?—Liverpool was the first place in Lancashire, in which it was put in force.

7153. You believe, do you not, that more or less, there is in that district a prejudice against Irish cattle?—I believe that some of the local landowners have a strong prejudice against Irish cattle.

7154. And I believe you are of opinion that some of the magistrates of the West Derby Hundred put the powers granted under that Act into force in a very injudicious manner?—Yes; without any discrimination, and I think in opposition to the recommendations of the officer who was sent down by the Privy Council to make inquiries into the matter. I think the Veterinary Department, in consequence of representations which were made, sent down Professor Simonds, and I think that that will be in the recollection of Dr. Williams; Professor Simonds did all he could to induce the magistrates not to carry out the course they were pursuing, and in opposition to that they still continued to do so.

7155. How would you define that injudicious manner?—I will give you an instance of that. Upon one Monday I was about selling a number of very large cattle at prices considerably over 30*l*. Some of them belonged to the Earl of Derby. After I had sold them, but before I had delivered them, the inspector came round and observed that some of them were suffering from foot and mouth distemper, and instead of allowing these cattle to be removed for the purpose of immediate slaughter, they placed them in sheds contiguous to the Liverpool Cattle Market, and kept them there in quarantine for a number of days. If the cattle had been allowed there, and then to have been removed for immediate slaughter, all liability of infecting other cattle would have been done away with; but so long as they were kept alive they were a source of infection to others.

7156. However, in your opinion the effect of this injudicious administration of the Act was to cause violent fluctuations in the prices of meat?—In one week, the week following the first rigorous application of the Act to the Liverpool Cattle Market, the supply became more than a half

half less. I think the figures were given to the Veterinary Department last summer, when there was a deputation to the Privy Council. Dr. Williams will have the figures of the actual supplies which came forward to the Liverpool Market after the Act was enforced, and before it was enforced.

7167. Has the market since recovered its tone?—No, it has not.

7168. Were there not at that time large public meetings held in Liverpool protesting against the Act of 1869?—There were.

7169. Was not there a requisition to the Mayor of Liverpool very numerous signed?—There was a requisition signed by all the leading shipowners, several bankers, and a great many of the largest employers of labour in Liverpool.

7170. The requisition was to call a meeting to protest against, or to pray for, the repeal of the Act?—The requisition was worded,—"We, the undersigned ratepayers of the borough of Liverpool, feeling the grievous pressure on all classes arising from the short supplies of cattle and sheep coming to the Liverpool Market, and being of opinion that this shortness of supply, and its necessary consequences, are mainly to be attributed to the restrictions imposed upon the cattle trade by the working of the rules laid down in the Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act, request your Worship to convene a public meeting of the inhabitants of the borough to consider what can be done to remove the grievance complained of." That is the requisition, and amongst others you will find the signatures of the largest employers of labour in Liverpool, the largest shipowners, brokers, bankers, &c.

7171. The shipowners are interested very much in the price of meat, are they not, from having to visit the great number of large steamers which leave Liverpool every week?—Yes, they are very much interested. The largest number of ships going from any port with emigrants, I think sail from Liverpool, and, of course, it is of very great importance that these ships should be furnished with an abundant supply of fresh meat. About 13 large steamers leave Liverpool each week for America, and each steamer takes about 10,000 lbs. of fresh meat.

7172. In 1870 am I right in saying that the number of cattle offered for sale was 120,000 Irish, 14,000 Scotch, and 6,000 foreign?—That was the number of cattle.

7173. There were also exhibited for sale that year over 400,000 sheep, were there not?—Yes.

7174. Then since that year, owing to the restrictions, the numbers have fallen off very much?—Very much.

7175. Mr. Dent.] Can you give the numbers for the years 1870, 1871, and 1872?—I can give you 1873; that counts from the 25th of March in the preceding year.

7176. Does the year 1870 terminate upon the 25th of March 1870?—Yes; the number in the Liverpool market in 1873 was 355,118 sheep, and 51,108 cattle.

7177. Mr. Keenan.] Am I right in this statement, which I believe is from the official paper in Liverpool, referring to the Irish cattle trade, that the arrival of sea-borne cattle into the port of Liverpool for the year ending 1871 amounted to 264,244, to which must be added those which arrived by railway, which are estimated at 20,000 more?—Yes, that is so, but the numbers which I am giving you are the numbers
O.B.

which were exposed for sale in the Liverpool Stanley Market. Dr. Williams has that report; it was handed in when the deputation was here last June, but the numbers which you are quoting from now, are the gross imports, many of which only pass through Liverpool.

7178. I presume that would cover every single load of store stock imported?—That number would cover all the store cattle.

7179. Therefore the number mentioned in this report would not apply to the supply of meat?—The whole of that does not apply to the sale of meat.

7180. The Right Honourable Chairman says that it would be an advantage if we could have the same calculations for the years 1870, 1871, 1872, and 1873, of the supplies that were offered for sale at the Liverpool Stanley Market?—That is here already in the statistics of the Veterinary Department.

7181. Mr. Jenkins in his book has made a great many statements about Liverpool; I do not propose to go through them *seriatim* now, but in a general way do you think that they are correct?—I think they are most incorrect.

7182. I will take you through his book afterwards, but generally you think that the statements are most incorrect?—I think the greater number of the statements connected with the Irish cattle trade are grossly incorrect.

7183. Were there not a number of queries sent down by the Dublin Agricultural Society lately, with regard to the spread of foot and mouth disease?—There were.

7184. And you drew out answers for them?—Yes, the questions were sent round to the large graziers and those engaged in the cattle trade, and I, as a member, received one.

7185. Will you kindly read those questions and answers?—I will. (Q.) 1. Do you observe much foot and mouth disease in the fairs and markets, and at what period of the year is it most prevalent? (A.) Very little indeed, but have seen some in autumn fairs last year. (Q.) 2. Do you think inspection of stock in fairs and markets would be beneficial? (A.) Inspection of store stock might be occasionally useful; inspection of fat cattle in markets is useless; all the cattle shown there are for immediate slaughter. (Q.) 3. Are the present provisions of the law as to fairs and markets sufficient; if not, can you suggest any amendments? (A.) The fat cattle markets in England and Dublin are well regulated. All store cattle fairs should be held in fields, not in roads; fat cattle are inspected in Liverpool, Salford, Birmingham, Wolverhampton, Wakefield, and Nottingham; these are the markets I am acquainted with. Any store fairs that I have been in, I never saw any inspection. If the owner of store stock was obliged to give an undertaking to the purchaser of his stock that they were healthy, and had not been in contact with those that were unhealthy for 10 days previously, and this undertaking was to continue in force 10 days after sale, this would do away with the necessity of any inspection; this applies to pleuropneumonia. (Q.) 4. Has inspection by the police at fairs, markets, or otherwise, been of any benefit? (A.) Not in the least. (Q.) 5. Do you advise that local veterinary surgeons should be appointed inspectors, and be bound to attend fairs and markets? (A.) No. (Q.) 6. Do you think that cattle become infected in the
P r " yards

Mr.
T. Fardon.
15 May
1873.

Mr.
T. Fordon.
15 May
1873.

"yards at fairs and markets? (A.) Sometimes, but rarely. (Q.) 7. Would you advise any steps to be taken in relation to the cattle yards, such as to license them, and to have them cleansed and disinfected? (A.) Yes, very desirable. (Q.) 8. Do you think the pens or yards at railway stations or termini, require to be cleansed and disinfected? (A.) Yes, very much to be desired. All railway trucks, railway yards, and cattle pens, should be cleansed each day? (Q.) 9. Have sufficient pens or yards been provided at the stations from which you forward cattle? (A.) No; they are very deficient. (Q.) 10. Is there unnecessary delay in the trucking and forwarding of animals to their destination, and, if so, are you aware of instances of depreciation in value consequent thereon? (A.) Fat cattle are liable to be very much depreciated in value, if delayed in transit. There is a great want of punctuality, and too slow a rate of speed in the transit of cattle on all the Irish railways? (Q.) 11. Are the cattle trucks cleansed and disinfected? (A.) On all railways in Ireland, the trucks, if cleansed at all, are not properly done so, and are not disinfected. All railway companies should be made to clean and disinfect each time they are used for carrying cattle and sheep. (Q.) 12. Are the present provisions of the law, as regards the transit of stock by railways sufficient, if properly carried out? (A.) Yes; if there was power to make railway companies clean their yards and trucks, and compensation more easily recovered for detention. (Q.) 13. Do you think it advisable, that a person should be employed to compel their fulfilment, and what class of person would you suggest? (A.) Yes, there should be a general inspector, who had a knowledge of the cattle trade, appointed by the Board of Trade for all the railways. When complaints are made, he should have power to examine witnesses on oath, draw up report, and grant certificates of claims for culpable negligence and detention, which should be received as evidence. He might also have power of assessing damages to be summarily recovered for negligence and detention, and if under 50 *l.* the award to be final. (Q.) 14. Would it be desirable to have local inspectors appointed to examine into the cattle traffic on railways? (A.) No. (Q.) 15. Can you suggest anything to be done with lairs and yards, and would it be advisable to have them licensed? (A.) Yes, it would; all the receiving yards at the different seaports in Ireland should be properly paved, divided into compartments, and supplied with water, also cribs or racks for holding hay; these yards should be cleansed and disinfected each day, when in use; the accommodation at most places in Ireland is defective. (Q.) 16. Are most of the cattle for export taken by rail or by road, from your locality; state port of exportation? (A.) Fat cattle more than 10 or 12 miles from the seaport go by rail to Dublin, Drogheda, or Dundalk, as a rule. (Q.) 17. What becomes of them at the seaports, and are there means by which they shall be properly fed, watered, and otherwise cared for; and, if so, are they carried out? (A.) Often a long delay occurs, as the sailing of the boats does not agree with the arrival of the trains; there is not proper accommodation for feeding cattle at most of the Irish seaports, and there ought to be such pro-

vided by the various steam companies. (Q.) 18. Are cattle driven at once from the railways to the steamers, if not, how are they dealt with? (A.) Cattle, when they arrive by train, are driven to the various receiving yards, and wait there for shipment. (Q.) 19. Is the present system of inspection on the quays efficient; if not, give your reasons for saying so? (A.) No, inspection on the quays is desirable or requisite, as regards fat cattle; if there is to be inspection it should be at the port of embarkation, and should be confined to stores; fat stock require no inspection. (Q.) 20. Could a system of inspection of cattle be adopted in the yards or lairs, before being brought to the quays? (A.) If there is to be inspection, it should be in the yards or lairs, before the cattle are shipped. (Q.) 21. Can you suggest anything to be done to improve the stings in the steamers viz., make smaller pens, better ventilation below, &c.? (A.) The City of Dublin Company's Steamers, the Holyhead steamers, the Drogheda and Dundalk steamers, are perfect, so far as I can judge. The decks of all steamers should be covered in. Some steamers in the cattle trade might be much improved by raising the bulwarks, giving greater height between decks, &c. All the steamers might be better cleansed and disinfected. (Q.) 22. Are the steamers properly cleansed and disinfected? (A.) They are not, and should be compelled to do so; abundance of water, or rubbing the posts, &c., with dry coarse cloth or chloride of lime, or sulphuric acid, are excellent disinfectants. (Q.) 23. Would quarantine and the consequent detention of stock at the ports of debarkation affect the trade injuriously? (A.) Detention or quarantine would be most injurious to fat cattle, and even in the case of store and desirable.

7175*. In the Veterinary Report for 1871, in the third paragraph of page 9, there is this statement, "That foot and mouth disease is readily produced by contagion has repeatedly been proved; indeed so readily is it communicated in this way, not only by animals but by man, or by substances which have been in contact with diseased animals, that it is an extremely difficult matter to prevent its spread, and many instances of outbreak have occurred in which it has been found impossible to trace the means by which it could have been communicated." Instances are given in the following paragraphs, and at page 10 the same thing is stated again; is that generally speaking, your opinion?—It is quite my opinion.

7176. I must refer to that document which has been put before this Committee by Dr. Williams; it is termed, I believe, the Chester Memorial, and is printed amongst our Papers; you are acquainted with the county of Cheshire, are you not?—I am, very well.

7177. Is it the fact that more pleuro-pneumonia and more foot and mouth disease prevail in Cheshire than in any other county in England, except Norfolk?—It is.

7178. How have you acquired your general knowledge of Cheshire?—I live not very far from Cheshire; my father-in-law has a large property in Cheshire. I shot over very large properties in Cheshire for a great number of years, and I hunted over a great portion of the county of Chester, and of course when you are shooting over a country you see very plainly the

the way in which cattle are managed. When you are riding over a country, you get a very general knowledge of the description of the land and the cattle which are fed upon it, and of the whole domestic economy and the agricultural management.

7179. Your opinion of Cheshire is that it is a source of infection of all kinds of the worst diseases?—I think it is the home of all the worst diseases which exist in cattle. There is no rinderpest existing there at present, but with the exception of rinderpest I think everything else is there.

7179.* I am particular in asking these questions, because Mr. Jenkins in his report refers to Cheshire as a pattern county, but the veterinary return prove the fact which you have stated, that disease is more prevalent in Cheshire than in any other county in England, except Norfolk. If you refer to Tables 25 and 26, at page 32 of the report of 1871, what is the number put down for Cheshire in those Tables; Norfolk, I believe, carries off the palm?—The return relates to pleuro-pneumonia, and there are 295 cases put down for Cheshire.

7180. All I want to ask is in looking down the tables is not Cheshire the largest?—With one exception it is the largest considerably.

7181. With the exception of Norfolk?—Yes.

7182. Is it the fact that hundreds of calves from Cheshire, are sold in Manchester to dealers who take them into Ireland?—It is, and they are sold at the railway stations; for instance, they are sold at the Boston Railway Station; they are brought into Ireland and sold, not as has been stated here as veal calves, but as rearing calves. I never knew a calf to be brought to Ireland for the purpose of slaughtering it; they are all brought for the purpose of rearing.

7183. Mr. Dent.] Was it stated before this Committee that those calves were taken to Ireland to eat?—Professor Baldwin stated that they were taken to Ireland, and I never knew veal calves brought to Ireland.

7184. Mr. Keworth.] You can state the case of a Mr. Brophy; what happened to him?—He is a client of ours. He had abundance of milk at one time, and he desired half a dozen English calves to be bought for him and sent over for the purpose of rearing them. They were Cheshire calves purchased in Manchester; they were bought in Manchester on Tuesday, and they arrived at his place the afternoon of Wednesday. On Thursday afternoon he observed two of these calves to be sick, and before Saturday three of them had died, and on Saturday two of his own became affected with foot and mouth disease, and before the Monday following all the imported calves, except one, and four of his own, died.

7185. Mr. Brophy had no foot and mouth disease before that upon his farm, I believe?—No.

7186. Mr. Clare Head.] Foot and mouth disease may be fatal amongst calves, though it is not fatal amongst full-grown stock?—It is fatal amongst calves, whereas it is not amongst old stock, but I am not in the habit of dealing with dairy cattle or calves.

7187. Mr. Keworth.] Is it the fact, that butchers say that Cheshire sheepskins are of less value than others?—Yes.

7188. Have you observed in the course of your experience in Cheshire, many cases of sheep scab in the flocks?—A great number, more so than in any other place, I think.

0.58.

7189. You know a great many of the different dairy counties in Ireland, do you not?—Yes; I do.

7190. Do you think that Cheshire is much in advance of them?—I think the county Carlow, the county Wexford, the county Kilkenny, and the county Limerick, which are dairy counties with which I am acquainted in Ireland, are many years in advance of Cheshire, both in agriculture, management, and everything else. I think they have very much better cattle, and I think they manage them and cultivate the land very much better.

7191. Are you of opinion that more pleuro-pneumonia comes into Liverpool from the Cheshire dairies than from any other source?—I am.

7192. Have you a letter with you which relates to that point?—Yes; I heard that it was stated that the Irish cattle were in the habit of bringing pleuro-pneumonia into Cheshire, and I made a great number of inquiries relative to that. I wrote to one of the largest wholesale butchers in Liverpool, asking him his experience of the cattle they had killed from Cheshire, and from other places, and he gives it in this letter: "20th April 1873, Dear Sir—I am duly favoured with your letter of Thursday, 10 a.m. In reply, I have to state that, in my opinion, Irish cattle were never more healthy than they are at present. My experience goes back 35 years. For the last 20 years I have slaughtered each week about 40 cattle, and from 20 to 180 sheep and lambs. Some weeks I have slaughtered 100 cattle and upwards; but hardly ever less than 35 or 40 cattle. The Scotch cattle and sheep are generally very healthy, but not so much so as the Irish cattle and sheep. Although not one-fourth of the quantity of Scotch cattle compared with the number of Irish cattle are killed in Liverpool, I have seen quite so many cases of lung distemper from Scotland as from Ireland. If you want any other information I will, if I can, gladly furnish it to you. I can prove on oath all these statements; you can make any use you like of them. Some 15 or 16 years ago a large number of Irish cattle were affected with pleuro-pneumonia or lung distemper. Sometimes I met with five, seven, or 10 per week, now I do not meet with 12 cases of lung distemper from Ireland in 12 months; one case per month, or 10 in the year, would be quite as many as I meet with. Although I have purchased many thousand Spanish and Portuguese cattle, I have never met with a single case of lung distemper amongst them. In my judgment they are sounder and healthier cattle than any other I have ever seen. Within the last two years I have seen a considerable number of dairy cattle, some from Liverpool, but mostly from Cheshire, sent to be slaughtered at the Liverpool abattoir that have been affected with lung disease. I am quite sure the great majority of cases that I have seen affected with lung distemper during the last two years have been Cheshire cattle. The cattle and sheep coming to be slaughtered in Liverpool from Cheshire are more unhealthy than others. Lung distemper prevails amongst the cattle, and scab and rot amongst the sheep from Cheshire. I have thus endeavoured to lay before you my opinion on these various diseases, and hope you consider them satisfactory. Believe me, dear sir, yours truly, W. Madden."

7193. What is the name of that gentleman?—William Madden: he is one of the largest whole-

P 2

sale

Mr.
T. Vernon.
15 May
1873.

Mr.
T. Vernon.
—
15 May
1873.

sale butchers in Liverpool. I have also here a letter upon the same subject from the Vice Chairman of the Abattoir Company, and the Managing Director of the Abattoir, writing from Liverpool on 21st April, 1873. He says:—"Dear Sir—In reply to your note of the 18th inst., asking for information about the lung disease in the animals slaughtered in the public abattoir, Trowbridge-street, I can speak confidently, as one of the Managing Directors of the above, and also as an extensive wholesale butcher, that it is a very rare occurrence indeed to find either an Irish or Scotch animal affected with the lung disease. I am in the habit of slaughtering about 80 animals per week, and I only had one animal so affected for the last two years. In reply to your question about Spanish and Portuguese cattle, I never saw or heard of a case, and I am sure if there had been one I would have heard of it, as the circumstance would have caused so much surprise (they being exceptionally sound and healthy), also, as I generally slaughter about 30 per week in the season, I can truly say they are the soundest animals in every way that I ever saw. I believe the great bulk of the animals so affected (in fact, I may say all) are cattle brought from Cheshire and Lancashire,

and the dairies in the town. If there is any other information I can furnish, I will be very pleased to do so. Very faithfully yours, Charles Wright."

7194. Do you know the writer of that letter?
—Yes; I know him perfectly well.

7195. Do you believe that the statement in that letter is true?—I do firmly.

7196. You have read or seen this memorial from the county of Cheshire to the Lords of Her Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council?—I have. I recollect it being published in all the Liverpool papers at the time.

7197. They begin by showing "that great losses have occurred in Cheshire from the foot and mouth disease during the last three years;" that is the way they begin; and then they say that Captain Jones Smith shows clearly that much of this disease has been brought into this country from Ireland; and then they go on to say that greater care should be taken by inspectors in Ireland; are you of opinion, from your knowledge of Cheshire, that it would be more wise for them to look at home?—I am of opinion that the best preventative of disease in Ireland would be to prevent any calves being exported from Cheshire into Ireland.

Monday, 19th May 1873.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mr. James Barclay.
Mr. Jacob Bright.
Mr. Callan.
Mr. Clay.
Mr. Dent.
Mr. Dodson.
Mr. William Edward Forster.
Mr. William Johnston.

Mr. Kavanagh.
Mr. Monsell.
Mr. O'Connor.
Mr. Pell.
Mr. Clare Read.
Mr. Ridley.
Mr. Tipping.

THE RIGHT HONOURABLE WILLIAM EDWARD FORSTER, IN THE CHAIR.

Captain CHARLES DENT, called in; and Examined.

7138. Mr. Callan.] You are, I believe, Marine Superintendent for the London and North Western Railway Company, upon the steamers engaged in trading between Dublin and Holyhead?—I am.

7139. How long have you been so?—For nearly eight years.

7200. During that time you have adopted a system of cleansing of your own, have you not?—Yes; I adopted it from the day I first went there.

7201. And you object to the present Order in Council with regard to cleansing, as not so efficient as that of your own system?—Yes, I do.

7202. Will you explain the difference between your system and the system which you object to?—I object to this Order in Council; I do not object to the use of whitewash and disinfectants, but to the abuse of them. The Order in Council is impracticable; it is perfectly impossible to clean the vessels in the time, in the way in which it is prescribed. I suppose many here present know enough about a ship to know the absurdity, I may say, of insisting upon a vessel being painted completely throughout four times a week, which is what we must do in order to whitewash the vessels; and I find the result of that is, that the men get into a slovenly way of cleansing the vessels, that where there is dirt they first throw a dab of whitewash over it, and this whitewash constantly going on, in a short time will become so very thick that the vessels will be in a very filthy state. In fact, our vessels now, since they have been under the guidance of police-men, and so far taken out of my hands, are in such a filthy state that I would never pass the vessels if I were the surveyor. I am ashamed of them, and there are great complaints from the passengers of their clothes being ruined from this whitewash being thrown over the bulwarks and around the vessels. Another point, and also a very serious point, is that there are certain portions of an iron ship with regard to which it is well known that if she is taken care of she will last practically for ever, but if the iron is exposed to deteriorating influences, it deteriorates very rapidly indeed. There are inspectors and police

appointed to see this Order in Council carried out. I questioned them on one occasion, and I said, "Have you any idea as to the effect it will have upon the ship?" and they said, No, that was none of their business; they had only to see the whitewash put on wherever they thought proper. Now, there are certain portions of the skin of that ship which (this whitewash being put on constantly four or five times a week, wet and dry) will deteriorate to such an extent (the rivets and the plates of iron, for example) that the ship will not, I expect, pass the Board of Trade surveyor in 12 months time. There has been an Act of Parliament passed very lately, making certain people responsible for keeping their ships seaworthy, the penalty thereof being as for misdemeanor, and I, as a professional man in charge of those steamers, felt so strongly that it was an improper thing to do, that I wrote to the Board of Trade and to the directors of the London and North Western Company, stating that I could not take the responsibility of the ships upon my shoulders, when they were allowed to be treated in this way by people over whom I had no control, and I also mentioned that in our particular running, the vessels were always thoroughly cleaned in Holyhead, and disinfected. Each captain reported to me every time the vessel came in, in writing, whether the disinfecting had been done; we had much more time to do it there, but this Order insists upon it being done in Dublin after discharging the return cargo from Holyhead, which gives us sometimes about 45 minutes to do it in. Now we are very anxious not only to do the very best we can in keeping the ships as clean as possible, but we are anxious to meet the views of the Government, and I say it is practically impossible to do what this Order requires. It would take, I calculate, 100 men with whitewash brushes eight hours in cleaning that vessel in the way that the Order desires it to be done; and if they were to summon us to-morrow, and to say that the vessel was not cleaned in accordance with the Order in Council, neither I nor anybody else could get into the witness box to say that it was. To do a vessel out takes my crew three whole days.

P P 3

7203. You

Captain
C. Dent.
1 May
1873.

Captain
C. Dent.
19 May
1873.

7208. You say that it would be practically impossible to carry out the Order in Council, and you object also to the limewashing, because it is deleterious to the iron?—It is deleterious to certain portions of it.

7209. And because it is carried out by parties who do not understand its effect upon the vital portions of the ship?—Yes, I do.

7210. But you also object to it because it is not so efficient as the manner in which the ships were cleansed formerly?—No; we used to clean out thoroughly; but now she is only a whitelashed.

7211. Mr. Borsley.] Do you carry cattle in the holds of your vessels?—Yes, we do.

7212. You say that you could not limewash a vessel in less than three days; you mean to go over the whole of the ship?—Yes; the authorities have the power to insist upon that being done. There is a little word insinuated in this Order in Council in Ireland, differing from the English Order in Council, for it says, "any part of a ship where animals and their droppings have come in contact, or might have come in contact"; that word "might" enables these persons to demand that every part of the ship should be done every time an animal is put into the hold.

7213. Does the whitewash affect the paint?—Yes, it does.

7214. How does it affect it?—It eats it away, and it eats the iron away. I have had great experience of it, and I know that that is the case.

7215. Do you know what its effect is upon the inside of a ship?—Part of the ship is painted, and part is whitewashed; we put boards where the animals come in contact with the side; we used to whitewash these boards. The whole exposed surface of the skin is painted; we put anti-corrosive paint upon that, and that is constantly replaced.

7216. Do you carry the cattle in the holds, or between decks?—We carry them upon the lower and upper decks.

7217. What do you put below the cattle in the lower hold?—Nothing, if a vessel carries nothing besides cattle; if we carry cargo and cattle, the cargo would be below in lower deck, not hold. They are decks, not holds. The lower part is two feet from the bottom of the ship, but it is made a regular deck for the purpose of carrying cattle.

7218. How did you disinfect before this Order was issued?—Upon this principle that I have stated.

7219. But how did you disinfect before, when you said you kept the ships clean?—We did it with lime and chloride of lime.

7220. What is the difference now?—I say I do not object to the use of limewash, but now that the vessels are put under the charge of policemen, who know nothing about it, they put it about everywhere; we used to do it judiciously before, but now they insist upon its being "slicked on," as we call it, with a brush everywhere.

7221. As I understand, you do not object to chloride of lime being used in disinfecting the ships, but you object to the vessels being put under the superintendence of policemen, instead of being under your own control?—Yes; and I also object to the lime being applied to those parts of the ship which it deteriorates.

7222. Which parts of the ship does it deteriorate?—The skin of the ship.

7223. You do not object to its being applied to the wooden platforms?—We do not object to that; we used to sprinkle the chloride of lime about afterwards.

7224. Did you do anything to the iron of the ship?—It was washed and scraped. We try to keep the skin of the ship as dry as possible. I have sometimes introduced stoves to keep it dry. Wet on board a ship tends more to spread disease than anything else.

7225. Did you simply rub down the iron of the ship?—We used to rub it down and scrape it down, and sometimes wash it.

7226. Do you think that scraping would be effectual in clearing off any infectious matter which might happen to be left behind?—Yes; I think, as a rule, when you look at the arrangements of our ships you will see that the bulwarks very seldom touch the animals at all. The animals naturally bear away from the bulwarks; their heads are towards the sides, and all their droppings go into the centre.

7227. Do you use carbolic acid and a steam hose in washing down these places?—No, I do not use carbolic acid; I always use chloride of lime; and one reason for that is, that it has such a very strong smell that I could tell in a moment when I went on board a vessel whether the Order had been properly carried out or not.

7228. Have you any idea what is the temperature in your holds on a passage coming across with cattle on board?—It varies very much in different weather; it is a very difficult thing to keep them down below 75.

7229. And does the temperature go any higher?—I think it has gone as high as 90. I could not say that it has gone as high as that. I should say that it is the case, but some animals are much hotter than others; sheep, for instance, are much hotter than cattle.

7230. Would you propose that there should be no control over the cleaning of ships by any party but yourself?—I do not object to there being control, but I object to control by people who are ignorant of ships. Our people, and the magistrates of Anglessea, when it was proposed, came down and saw the system, and they thought it would be very much safer in my hands than in the hands of any other people whom they could appoint; it is our interest to prevent contagion as much as anybody.

7231. Very likely that may be the case in your vessels; but are the Committee to presume that all the steam companies have equally experienced overlookers?—I could not say that, not being acquainted with them.

7232. Mr. Dodson.] How long is it that this whitewashing Order has been in force?—The Order was issued on the 6th of March, and I think it came into operation about the first week in April.

7233. Last April?—Yes.

7234. Is it an English Order or an Irish Order?—It is an Irish Order in Council.

7235. At which end of the voyage does the disinfecting take place?—It takes place now in Dublin, but it is not after a voyage; it is after the double voyage.

7236. And going back to Ireland you do not carry cattle, I believe?—Very rarely. We used to carry a few. We carried a great many horses.

7237. How long does the present, practically, take you?—I tell you candidly, it is not done at all.

all. We satisfy the inspector, but that is all. I should not be satisfied if I were the inspector. We have about three hours to carry it out in.

7233. So that, although the Order is theoretically very obstructive and injurious, in practice it is not so?—It is not so, because it is not carried out. We could not sail if we did carry the Order out.

7234. Is the vessel whitewashed entirely now?—The whole of the vessel is whitewashed.

7235. You say the Order is not carried out?—It is not carried out in its entirety; it is to a certain extent; that is to say, there is always a man going about and brushing here and there and everywhere. We could not do it properly in the time.

7236. Do you do it at all?—Yes; the inspectors are very particular in seeing the lime-wash upon the ironwork, especially, because it shows.

7237. Do you whitewash the ironwork as well as the woodwork?—Yes, we do at the present moment.

7238. When you say it is injurious to the ironwork, are you speaking from experience?—I am speaking from very long experience in Her Majesty's Navy.

7239. Have you seen it applied there?—Yes, I was an old "mate of the deck." Some of the Committee may know what that is; and I very often applied it to the iron knees to make the vessel look pretty, and I found that the iron deteriorated.

7240. Limewashing has been recognised as injurious in Her Majesty's Navy, has it not?—Yes, as applied to iron.

7241. Has the practice been prohibited?—It always was prohibited, as regarded touching any vital part of the ship.

7242. Then when you say it is done, do you mean to say that it is done in contravention of the rules?—There is no absolute rule. I am speaking of the time when we had wooden ships. I am speaking of the iron knees, the places where we put it were parts which could be replaced; parts which did not regard the safety of the ship, but we found the action of wet lime upon them would cause an amount of oxidation very much like the junction of lead and iron or copper will.

7243. With reference to the effect, will it appear in a short space of time?—That depends very much upon how often it is used; we only put this limewash on, perhaps, once a week, and therefore you would only see the effect of it at the end of one or two years, but I say that as regards putting it on the vital parts, that is a thing which I would not order, and therefore I could not say how long it would take, but I should be very doubtful if one of our vessels would pass the Board of Trade survey at the end of 12 months, if we put it on four times a week; it is the constant wet and dry which injures the iron. If you immerse iron in water it does not deteriorate so rapidly; there is a certain skin of rust comes upon it, but that is all. If you cover it with paint it will deteriorate after a long time, but if you keep it wet and dry it will deteriorate in a very short time; that was shown to be the case in the "Megara."

7244. Is it the whitewash or the wet which affects the vessel?—I think the wet has the principal effect, but the lime no doubt does eat it; it has a burning effect.

7245. When you wash the iron do you use salt?

water with it?—Yes, the water is drawn by a steam-pump from the sea water alongside.

7246. Is this whitewash put on thick?—Yes, it is pretty thick, I fancy.

7247. Too thick to be pumped by a hose?—We could not use our donkey-pumps for pumping lime. If you understand, those pumps which we use, draw the water through the ship's side, at the bottom of the ship, and to pump in lime or anything of that kind through that pump, you would have to break the connection, and then to put a snout hose into the tub or bucket, whatever you wanted to use; this is a powerful steam pump, and if you had a pumping reservoir of considerable size, it would empty it in about half a minute. There is another objection to any pump being used for these things, and that is, that the donkey-pump is also used to pump the ship out, to keep the boilers pumped up when they are stationary, and in the event of a fire it is your most efficient fire-engine. Now if we use anything like lime, or if we get into very shallow water, where the sand is stirred up, we object to use the pump then; in fact, the valves are so very delicate, that if any of these small particles get into the valve, they will destroy the pump, and if you wanted the hose to put a fire out, you would find it was destroyed for use, and you would have to take it to pieces and clean it again; it does not matter if there is a handful of sand or 10 buckets full, it is all the same.

7248. This wash could not be applied through a hand-pump, could it?—There is no doubt that you could do it through a small hand-pump.

7249. Would not that be a more rapid and economical way of doing it than by laying it on with brushes?—No, I do not think it would.

7250. How did you apply the carbolic acid?—I never applied it. I used chloride of lime instead; there are certain alternative things allowed us.

7251. How was the chloride of lime applied?—It was mixed with lime, and a man would go round, and be would see the various parts that the animals had touched, and the lime was laid on with a brush, and slushed about the hold.

7252. Mr. Moffatt? Are you aware that the Steamship Owners' Association were consulted before the Order was issued?—I believe they were.

7253. And they approved of the regulation?—I think I know something about that.

7254. Will you tell the Committee, if you please, what you knew about that?—At the time the Commission was appointed, an inspector was sent down to Holyhead, and I went over the port with him, and he was so perfectly satisfied that our experience there was beyond anything he knew of, that he asked me if I could suggest anything to him, and I told him, "No." "If you can suggest anything to me, I shall be very glad to hear it, because I have carte blanche to do everything that can be done." The Order in Council, I have every reason to believe, was framed upon our regulations, because I happened to see the Order before it became law, and I objected to one or two items contained in it, and they said there was no reason for me to object to them, because they were so perfectly satisfied with my arrangements that they said I should never be troubled about it.

7255. Who was the inspector?—Mr. Galloway, of the Board of Trade.

7256. Are you aware that the disinfecting order

Captain
C. Dent.

19 May
1873.

Captain
G. Dent.
—
19 May
1873.

order is carried out in the vessels trading to Bristol?—I know nothing of that of my own knowledge.

7257. The gentleman you mention was the inspector of ships from the Board of Trade?—The inspector was sent down specially by the Board of Trade, I believe.

7258. Not from the Privy Council?—Not from the Privy Council.

7259. Do you think that the use of whitening is injurious to ironwork?—It is not the whitening itself; it is the putting on the material wet that I complain of: wet and dry.

7260. Because I observe in the Irish Order it is said, that whitening and fresh burnt lime be mixed with water, but it does not mention what proportion. Therefore, if whitening were not injurious, a composition might be made which would not be injurious to the ironwork?—Lime has a certain burning effect, but the great object seems to be to put on something that shows; we shall never have anything which will give satisfaction, as long as we do not put on anything which shows; some of these bulwarks are very nicely grained, and this whitewash dries and forms a skin, and these people will never be satisfied till it is done. To do that, you must have it mixed to a certain thickness, and it will cover the paint, and unless you lay up your vessels every two or three months, and scrape them thoroughly, to see what mischief is done, you may, before you know it, have a hidden danger with a coat of whitewash over it, and before you know it, a plate may fall out.

7261. Do you wish to find in a letter which you addressed to the Under Secretary of State for Ireland?—I do. (*The same was handed in. Vide Appendix.*)

7262. Mr. Caffes.] An honourable Member asked you whether there are equally experienced persons in charge of steamers at other ports besides Holyhead; have not all the Irish steamers between Ireland and England equally experienced captains?—I understood that question to refer to persons in my position, not to the captains; the captains are men of experience, no doubt.

7263. Do you know Captain Williams, the agent in Dundalk?—No, I do not.

7264. Do you know that the captains in charge of the Dundalk boats are men of great experience?—Yes. There is a great difference to be observed. This Order treats a ship very much like a cattle truck. A ship is a very valuable thing; you have to look after her safety at sea, and she has officers and a captain to see that she is kept clean, whereas a cattle truck does not belong to anybody, you might say.

7265. Some of the Committee appear to be under a misapprehension; is this whitewash a different material from limewash; would not water saturated with lime cleanse even more effectually than whitewash?—The terms "whitewash" and "limewash" are used indiscriminately; you will find people use them to mean one and the same thing; people call "limewash" "whitewash."

7266. You, perhaps, may make a difference between whitening and limewash?—Whitening is what you use for your ceilings; the difference is that the lime used for whitening has had a great deal of the burning properties taken out of it,

but you must use your freshly burnt lime as well as your whitening.

7267. Mr. Tipping.] You have spoken of whitewashing a ship four times a week for 12 months, and that your so doing would injure the vessel upon the register as a first class vessel?—I think so; I doubt whether the vessels would pass at all.

7268. Supposing that nothing of the kind was used, what would be the average time that a vessel would last?—The vessel would be practically indestructible; we take the greatest pains with the iron, and the parts we cannot get at; the lower part we cement all over; the hold used formerly to be planked in, but I found that in many of our steamers when we ripped the planking up there was a seepage of water, and by that alone the rivets were so rusted away as to be perfectly unsafe, and I had to have these plates replaced. To prevent that in future I have ordered up all these places, so that now any person can see the skin of the ship in any place.

7269. There is in your opinion, a constant hidden danger going on, is there not?—Yes, it is shut up; when it is covered with whitewash the thing is as much covered as it would be under the planking.

7270. So that the owners of vessels, if this system goes on, will have to recoup themselves by charging greatly increased rates for the carriage of cattle?—Yes; that will be so eventually.

7271. There is no way of recouping themselves, except by increased rates?—That is so; but there is another thing to be taken into view. Suppose one of those vessels goes down with 1,000 persons on board, the responsibility would rest upon somebody, and I object to its resting upon me while this system is carried on.

7272. Mr. Dalton.] Are your vessels built for the cattle trade?—Yes, purposely.

7273. Would it not be worth your while to put up some moveable planking against the sides of the ship, so as to avoid the effects of the whitewash upon the iron?—It might be worth while, but that would cost a great deal of money, and it is open to the objection I mentioned before, that it hides the skin of the ship.

7274. But suppose the planking were moveable?—If the planking were moveable it would be always coming down, as we have very rough work in these vessels, and they have to be very strong indeed.

7275. Do you mean to say that in the holds of those vessels you could not fit up shifting planks?—I do not say we could not do that, but that would practically be of no use.

7276. Why would it practically be of no use?—Because, unless we had it thoroughly well bolted and caulked, so that we could not pull it down when the people were whitewashing, a quantity of wet would find its way behind.

7277. It would not suffice to shield the iron?—No, I should not be satisfied with it; the only thing we could do would be to take and shut it all in again, and that would be taking a retrograde step. Anybody acquainted with iron ships would tell you that the safest thing to do is to keep the iron as accessible as you can, in every part.

Mr. WILLIAM BOLSTER, called in; and Examined.

7278. Mr. M^{rs}W.] I BELIEVE you are Chairman of the Limerick and Clare Farmers' Club?—I am.

7279. And are deputed by them to give evidence before this Committee?—Yes.

7280. For three years, I think, you were chairman of the Kilmallock Board of Guardians?—Yes.

7281. Kilmallock being in one of the richest districts in Ireland?—Yes, it is one of the richest districts in Ireland.

7282. You farm largely yourself, do you not?—Rather so. I have 400 acres of land in my own hands, principally grass. My farm is altogether under the Postmaster General.

7283. Have you any knowledge of foot and mouth disease, and pleuro-pneumonia?—I have had a great deal of knowledge of it since it first came into the country. I perfectly remember having to attend, in my father's time, a very large dairy herd of his, out of which he lost 40 cows by pleuro-pneumonia. I think that was in the year 1845.

7284. Do you remember his cattle having the foot and mouth disease in 1840?—Yes.

7285. Have you ever had pleuro-pneumonia among your own dairy cows?—I have had pleuro-pneumonia among my own dairy cows.

7286. Have you had foot and mouth disease in your park?—Yes, in 1871 and 1872.

7287. Have you consulted much with the farmers of the county of Limerick generally, so as to be able to state their views with regard to this question?—Very much, so within the last three weeks since this inquiry, from which we look forward to so much good arising, has attracted the attention of the country.

7288. Beginning with the foot and mouth disease, will you state what your experience has been?—My experience of foot and mouth disease is that it is very infectious and very taking; but I do believe that cattle will get foot and mouth disease which never have had any communication with any infected cattle; my own experience makes me believe that.

7289. You are aware that your opinion upon that subject is not shared generally by the witnesses who have been before this Committee?—I believe that foot and mouth disease is very contagious; I do not deny that at all.

7290. Everybody admits that foot and mouth disease is very contagious, but the question is whether it ever breaks out spontaneously?—I was going to explain that to the Committee in this way: I have read the evidence of Professor Baldwin and Professor Ferguson, and several gentlemen who were examined here before you. I forget the exact witness, but I think it was Professor Baldwin, who stated that the disease was generally communicated by mixing with diseased cattle, or by running streams, or by fodder going into the cattle. My experience is this: there is no stream running into my farm; all my cattle are watered solely by springs upon my own land, and upon both occasions that my cattle got foot and mouth disease the disease was not in my immediate neighbourhood. Again, I scarcely buy a cow, and I never sell a cow, except a fat cow, and if I do take them into a fair, since the disease came into the country, I generally endeavour never to bring them back, so
0.68.

that I could not bring the disease in that way. I believe the disease, in some cases, arises from atmospheric causes, but it is contagious, there is no doubt about it, most contagious.

7291. Have you observed that the disease has been very much propagated throughout the country after large fairs and markets?—Very much so. I believe the disease has been extended a good deal by that means.

7292. With regard to pleuro-pneumonia, do you believe that pleuro-pneumonia is generated spontaneously?—Not always. I have an idea of my own, from my practical experience, that pleuro-pneumonia may be bred in a herd originally and then extend afterwards. I think that bad treatment, such as bad water, bad ventilation, filthy houses and sheds, would be likely naturally to breed pleuro-pneumonia.

7293. What course did you take with regard to pleuro-pneumonia, when it broke out amongst your cattle?—Simply destroying the infected animals, and immediate separation of those that had been in contact.

7294. That you found effectual, did you not?—It stopped the disease; I only lost six I think.

7295. Mr. Chas. Reed.] Out of how many?—Out of 50; the herd consisted of 50.

7296. Mr. M^{rs}W.] But you did not slaughter all the cattle?—There were only six that took the disease, and I slaughtered them.

7297. You have read probably the suggestion made by Professor Baldwin, that fairs and markets should be shut up for two months, namely, the months of June and July?—Yes, I have.

7298. What is your opinion with regard to that proposal?—I think it would be very ruinous to the trade of the farmers of the country, and to the people of England too. I think it would be ruinous to both, particularly to the Irish farmer, who has so many demands to meet, and at every fair so much business to transact, without, as we believe, having any effect in the direction that Professor Baldwin mentions.

7299. How do you believe that that would not be effectual?—The disease may remain actually incipient in the country all the time, and the restriction would not be sufficient to shut out pleuro-pneumonia altogether; I am sure of that.

7300. But with regard to foot and mouth disease?—Foot and mouth disease may remain, but in my county, at present, we have not any foot and mouth disease. I have been inquiring and I could not hear of one case.

7301. How long is it since the foot and mouth disease disappeared?—It disappeared about last January.

7302. If you object to the very stringent measures proposed by Professor Baldwin, what is the course you would recommend to be taken with regard to foot and mouth disease?—The present law is quite sufficient if it were more stringently carried out, and if the farmers whose cattle had foot and mouth disease were more careful, and if the police were more vigilant, I think that would be quite sufficient. They only require some assistance to enable them to carry out these rules more stringently, but I think if they were carried out more stringently the law is quite sufficient to shut out the disease, that is to say, by not allowing cattle to be removed from an infected farm until the disease is got rid of.
Q Q I am

Mr.
W. Bolster.
19 May
1873

Mr.
W. Rolster.
—
19 May
1873.

I am aware that cattle are frequently taken to fairs and exchanged, which have foot and mouth disease.

7303. Do you believe that any amount of vigilance on the part of the police could prevent that?—I am quite satisfied it could; I think the magistrates are a little too lenient when parties are brought before them, in not imposing, as I would, if I had the matter in my hands, a very heavy fine; I think the most injurious thing we have to contend with is the removal of infected cattle from the farms.

7304. Mr. *Clave Road*.] To the markets?—To the markets and from one farm to another, if they have to go a great distance.

7305. Mr. *Mosmill*.] Does that defective action which you have referred to, exist to any great extent?—I think the police have done their duty in my part of the county very fairly, but I have heard from other portions of the county that there has been very great neglect.

7306. Have you heard of many cases of heaves affected with foot and mouth disease, or pleuro-pneumonia being taken into the Limerick market at night by butchers?—Yes.

7307. And that has been going on systematically for some considerable time, has it not?—Yes, during the last year particularly, I recollect there was a large number of animals moved into the town during the night, affected with pleuro-pneumonia.

7308. Could that have been done if the police had been duly vigilant?—It would have been quite impossible, because it was notorious throughout the country that the cattle were all infected and dying with pleuro-pneumonia.

7309. I gather your opinion to be that the present law is quite sufficient for the purpose it is intended for, if it were more stringently carried out?—Yes, if it were more stringently carried out.

7310. Do you think there ought to be local inspectors to assist the police?—I do; I do not think the police are sufficient; I do not believe that they are paid sufficiently, and then the police have so many extra duties, besides what they think to be their own duties, that they have not time to do these things. I think they have more idea of being a military force than of doing things for which they receive no extra pay.

7311. But in the county of Limerick, which is a county in which there is no disturbance of any kind, what have the police to do?—They have to collect a tremendous lot of statistics. I see them going about with books, pens, and ink, under their arms all over the country.

7312. You think the police could confer greater benefit upon the country by carrying out this law more stringently than by going about with these books under their arms?—Without doubt I do.

7313. Professor Ferguson stated in his evidence before this Committee, that although the police were not capable themselves of distinguishing the particular character of the disease in cases that they have inspected, still that they were able to give such returns to Professor Ferguson that he was able, in almost every instance, from the returns, to form a sound opinion of what the nature of the disease was; if that be so, why are inspectors required?—I do not believe the police are a sufficiently intelligent body to tell what disease a cow is suffering from. If a cow got a fever to-morrow, which is very

likely, and I got a policeman in to discern the character of the disease, he would not understand it, and would undoubtedly report it as pleuro-pneumonia.

7314. But I do not understand that the police give an account of what the disease is; they report upon the symptoms, and it is upon that report that Professor Ferguson pronounced his opinion?—I think it is very likely that Professor Ferguson would pronounce upon their report that it was pleuro-pneumonia.

7315. But Professor Ferguson says that he is able to determine the character of the disease from their reports?—But a cow in a fever has a heaving of the sides, and all that sort of thing, just as a cow in pleuro-pneumonia would have, and I believe that a policeman would report it in such a manner that Professor Ferguson would come to the conclusion that it was pleuro-pneumonia. I also believe that many deaths in the country, from other causes, have been mistaken for pleuro-pneumonia. Cows are very liable to inflammation of the lungs, by taking cold after calving, or having been left out at night, after having been accustomed to a warm shed, and those cases would be very often mistaken for pleuro-pneumonia.

7316. What number of inspectors do you say would be required for the county of Limerick?—It would be difficult to say. I think there ought to be an inspector for each barony.

7317. How many baronies are there in the county?—I am not quite certain what number there are, but I think there are 16.

7318. Suppose there are 12; you are aware, of course, that those local inspectors would have to be paid out of the local rates?—I should be very sorry to think they would, but I believe they would.

7319. Would you face that expense for the purpose of getting the benefit of having these local inspectors?—I would have no objection to have the country taxed to a fair amount, if really we could get rid of disease, and protect ourselves from these maladies.

7320. Do you really consider that it would not be possible to protect ourselves by taking care that the police were more vigilant, without having this enormous number of local inspectors?—I think it is quite possible you could. I think if the police took a greater interest in the matter, and were more closely looked after, they would be quite competent to do it. As you have said, the county is very quiet and peaceable, and the police have nothing else to do, unless it is to get up these statistics.

7321. Are there any companies for insuring cattle in Ireland?—There have been, but I do not think there are any now, because they were all huddle companies, I may say. I myself insured at the time I had pleuro-pneumonia, but I never got 1s. from the company; they turned out to be blacksmiths in London, or something of that sort.

7322. Have you any suggestion to offer to the Committee on that subject?—I have; I think it would be a great benefit to the farmer if we had a cattle insurance company guaranteed by the Government; we would be most anxious to insure in it if we could have a guarantee for its solvency, but we have been so frequently "stuck" by these companies, that now we will not insure in them. I am quite satisfied if there were some company started that the people had confidence

confidence in, stockowners would be very glad to take advantage of it to protect themselves from losses of cattle. My suggestion would be not, perhaps, that Government should guarantee it, but that the fund might be secured upon the rates of the county, and it would be a very paying concern too, because every man does not lose his stock, and I think very likely the funds would accumulate.

7323. Have you formed any calculation of the loss from foot and mouth disease in dairy cattle?—I have; it varies a good deal; if the foot and mouth disease is confined in a dairy, as it sometimes is to the mouth, it is not of much consequence, but if it goes to the legs and feet, it then becomes a very serious thing to the dairy farmer. Looking at the loss upon my farm, and upon that of the gentleman next me, when his cattle were affected last year, I have not the slightest hesitation in saying that when the feet and legs are affected, and by the exchange of cattle, and by an odd death, the loss upon a dairy would be £1 a cow. I do not mean for fat cattle or young stock, but confining it to dairy cattle.

7324. Are you able to state what effect upon the spread of disease the had arrangements on board steamers and on railway trucks have?—I have seen cattle frequently embarked at Cork treated in the most brutal manner, with regard to heating them, and from the filthy, dirty, confined boats.

7325. You would be in favour of very stringent regulations being carried out, both with regard to steamers, and also with regard to railway trucks?—Many of the railway trucks that I have frequently seen at stations in Ireland, have emitted such a stench as would almost give a man pleuro-pneumonia himself.

7326. I see that the Great Southern and Western Company state that in no instance has the conveyance of live stock by their trains been the cause of spreading any cattle disease; do you believe that?—I do not believe that; I believe they charge quite sufficiently (they make very high charges) to keep their trucks clean, and I think they ought to be very anxious to prevent the filthy state they allow the trucks to get into.

7327. Do you know many cases of beasts being sent off in a perfectly sound state from the county of Limerick, catching foot and mouth disease on their way to Liverpool?—I have heard of such cases. The stock have been perfectly healthy when leaving the fair. It does not make such a great difference to the cattle dealers even if the animals are affected with foot and mouth disease. I believe that when an animal is slaughtered in a case of foot and mouth disease, the beef is just as good, but I would not say the same with regard to pleuro-pneumonia. I do not think that foot and mouth disease makes any difference to the meat of the beast.

7328. Do you believe that the crossing of the Irish cattle with higher breeds has had any effect in making them more liable to these diseases?—I believe that many years ago the constitutions of the Irish cattle were a great deal stronger and better able to contend with the uncertain climate we have in Ireland than the cattle which we have now, since we began to cross with the shorthorns and other breeds.

G.S.R.

7329. Did you ever hear of any of these diseases existing amongst the cattle in the wilds of Kerry?—I never heard of it. I made it a particular point to try and find it out; and I could not find out from any Kerry men whom I have met for the last month, that in the wilds of Kerry, where these imported cattle have not been, or cattle of that description, and amongst the real old Kerry breed, there ever was such a thing as pleuro-pneumonia.

7330. I gather from your evidence, that you are altogether opposed to the abolition of the existing restrictions, but also that you are not prepared to recommend the adoption of any plan such as Professor Baldwin's, because you believe it would not succeed?—I think it would be very injurious.

7331. You are in favour of more stringent penalties where there is a contravention of the law, and also in favour of some mode or other of having those penalties enforced?—Most decidedly. I think if a proper cordon were drawn around an infected district, and those cattle were not allowed to be taken away while they were infected, the law, if carried out, would be most likely to stamp out the disease.

7332. And, so far as you know, those are the opinions of the farmers of the country?—Most decidedly.

7333. Mr. Dew.] Are the farms in Limerick for the most part large farms?—They are very extensive farms.

7334. Are your farms dairy farms or feeding farms?—Both.

7335. Do you send much fat stock to England, or lean stock?—The fat stock, generally speaking, is not sent by farmers; they are generally sold at the fairs to dealers, and they send them to Liverpool, Manchester, and Bristol.

7336. But from Limerick do they send store stock to the English market?—A great number of young cattle go over, but those again are not sent by the farmers.

7337. I did not mean that the farmer himself was the person who sent them to the English market; but are they not raisers of store stock for the English market?—Yes.

7338. You send from Limerick a high class of animals, do you not?—Yes, we do.

7339. Have you seen the shipping of any of those animals at Cork or Waterford?—I have frequently seen them shipped at Cork.

7340. You therefore do not quite agree with the official witnesses whom we have had here, as to the excellence of the arrangements and the kindness with which the animals are treated?—I do not. I believe there is a great want of cleanliness and a great want of ventilation.

7341. In 1845 pleuro-pneumonia must have been very severe upon your farm?—Yes, it was.

7342. How many cows did your father lose in 1845 from pleuro-pneumonia?—Between 30 and 40.

7343. Were there any steps taken then to slaughter the animals and to isolate them?—Acting upon the system that was then in force, we made a hospital in a field and tried to recover them, but I believe that keeping them was a great means of spreading the disease; we had no law to restrict us at the time from doing anything we pleased with them.

7344. You would be in favour of considerable stringency with regard to keeping steamers and railway

Mr.
W. Bolster.
—
19 May
1873.

Mr.
W. Selater,
19 May
1873.

railway trucks clean, and disinfecting them?—
Certainly.

7345. You would not be inclined to remove foot and mouth disease altogether out of the operation of the Act?—I would not. I should be very sorry to see it removed altogether out of the operation of the Act, because I think that if foot and mouth disease exists upon a farm, it would be very unjust to allow a farmer to remove those cattle affected with it to a fair, and to mix them up with cattle which had not had foot and mouth disease.

7346. But we have heard evidence here from farmers and dealers, that they think so little of foot and mouth disease that they would have it removed from the Act altogether, believing that the disease dies away altogether of itself; you do not agree with them?—I do not agree with them. I believe it will die away sooner by being more cautious as to how cattle are allowed to mix with the animals affected with the disease.

7347. Do you believe that foot and mouth disease will die away in consequence of the restrictions which have been imposed?—I do; I believe if you calculate upon the whole country, the losses which have been caused by foot and mouth disease, as compared with pleuro-pneumonia, it would be very nearly as much as from pleuro-pneumonia.

7348. We have had it given as a million and a half last year; have you formed any idea of what it might have been?—I have not.

7349. I suppose the Irish cattle trade is a very increasing trade, is it not?—Yes, it is.

7350. Are there a great many more engaged in the cattle trade in Ireland, and more cattle come into England than used to come?—Yes, it is a very increasing amount, and I think will increase more; the country is all getting into grass.

7351. Is the country becoming still more laid down in grass?—Yes.

7352. You think that will increase the production of cattle?—Yes, decidedly.

7353. Do you think you could produce more beef upon grass land entirely than you could upon a mixed farm?—I should be very sorry to try to produce beef upon a mixed farm in Ireland, from the scarcity of labour.

7354. Mr. *Clare Read*.] The expenses upon your arable land are so much, that you think that, notwithstanding the high price of beef, you could not make it answer?—It would be totally impossible that I could get labour to do it.

7355. What wages are you giving in your part of Ireland?—The standing labour that I have myself I do not think is as high as it ought to be, I candidly tell you. My standing labourers have every day, when they work, 1 s. a day. I give them a comfortable house, which is not very usual in Ireland, I am sorry to say; but they have a comfortable house from me with a chimney, and well ventilated. I give them a quarter of an Irish acre of potato land, tilled, for which I charge them no rent.

7356. Mr. *Dest*.] And they have the house for nothing?—Yes; then they have grass for a pig, if it is well ringed in the nose, and there are some other little perquisites upon my farm.

7357. What do you pay for occasional labour?—If I wanted an occasional labourer to-day I would have to send five miles for him, and I would have to send a horse and car for him, and to send him home in the evening, and to pay him

2 s. 6 d., and supply him with food. For reaping and mowing in the hay harvest I would have to give him very often 4 s., and drive him home backwards and forwards too.

7358. Mr. *Ridley*.] At what would you put the money value of the advantages your regular labourers have; how much per week would you consider to be additional to 1 s. per day as representing the advantages they have?—The value of the house could not be very far, I suppose, from 30 s. to 2 l. a year, and the value of a quarter of an acre of potatoes, I should suppose, would not be more than about 5 l.

7359. Do you mean that it might be represented as 14 s. a week throughout the year?—No; I mean a little more than half that amount; it is only 6 s. in money at present, and I think the other things will make it up to about 8 s. 6 d.

7360. Mr. *Clare Read*.] We will take you back to pleuro-pneumonia, if you please; do you think that pleuro-pneumonia may be effectually stamped out by killing all the animals which are diseased?—I think it would be very likely to be so.

7361. In your own case when you had a dairy of 50 cows, out of which you only lost five or six head, you stopped the disease by killing those that were diseased immediately on the appearance of the disease?—I am under the impression that that is what stopped it, but I did so.

7362. Upon the other hand, when your father's cattle had pleuro-pneumonia, by endeavouring to doctor them, you lost between 30 and 40?—I might say it went through the whole herd almost.

7363. How many did the herd consist of?—This herd was about 50, and there were some recovered, but they were afterwards worth very little. The actual deaths were between 30 and 40.

7364. Do you think that it would be a good thing to make it compulsory to slaughter all cattle affected with pleuro-pneumonia?—Most decidedly.

7365. And to compensate the owner?—Most decidedly.

7366. Some honourable Members of the Committee seem to imagine that if you were to give a farmer a good compensation for cattle affected with disease they would become very reckless; is that your opinion?—I do not believe that.

7367. Why not?—It would be very ridiculous to think that farmers would wish such a thing; for instance, if I had 50 dairy cows, worth, say, 18 l. a-piece, and the Government wanted me to slaughter them all, I should lose all the profits I would obtain from them during the season, which might be worth 15 l. more to me in the course of the year.

7368. You might replace them, might you not?—Not while I had pleuro-pneumonia on my farm.

7369. You would not attempt to do so?—I would not.

7370. You think that if farmers were paid full compensation they would not be careless?—I think if farmers were paid full compensation, it would be their interest to take the greatest possible care, because compensation would only half pay them for the loss of their cattle.

7371. Have you ever tried inoculation to prevent pleuro-pneumonia?—I have seen it tried and effectually tried.

7372. Can you give the Committee an idea of how that is done?—A gentleman in my county had a very large herd of cows a year ago, and

he lost nine or 10 of them, it occurred to him to inoculate the remainder, and he got Mr. Preston a veterinary surgeon in Malloy, I think, who inoculated the rest of the herd from the lung of a dead beast. He lost three after inoculation, which we supposed were really affected at the time; but the disease ceased, and he has not lost a cow since. I also know another gentleman who inoculated, and I am quite satisfied that pleuro-pneumonia ceased upon his farm, and has not been there since.

7373. You are of opinion that you can check pleuro-pneumonia by these means?—Yes, if properly done; but it is very dangerous otherwise. It is done in the tail, and if you do not take great precautions, the inflammation gets to such a height, that very likely you may lose the cow.

7374. In the case which you first mentioned, where three died after inoculation, did they die very soon afterwards?—They lingered on for about three weeks, I think.

7375. Were they then killed directly?—Yes.

7376. You seem to be very sanguine that by slaughtering the diseased animals, and by inoculating the rest of the herd, you might stamp out pleuro-pneumonia?—I have great faith in that opinion.

7377. And you think that that would be an inestimable benefit to the farmers of Ireland?—I think that it would be an inestimable benefit to them, because in Ireland we are almost dependent upon cattle.

7378. You also stated that you had an instance or two in which your cattle had been affected with foot and mouth disease, and had not come in contact with diseased animals?—My dairy cows never got the foot and mouth disease; there was only a small fence between them and my young stock, and my young stock had it in 1872.

7379. Did you ever know a case in which foot and mouth disease broke out without a case being in the neighbourhood?—In the neighbourhood, but not in the immediate neighbourhood; I never heard of a case of foot and mouth disease without its being in the parish; but I am satisfied that it has spread through the herds of itself.

7380. You have stated that filth and the bad treatment of cattle might produce pleuro-pneumonia?—I believe it might be spread in the beds by filthy houses, bad ventilation, and bad water; it is frequently the case in Ireland that cattle have filthy water to drink. I think it right to tell you of the Limerick Model Farm, which is near the Postmaster General's. The manager there told me that owing to the purity of the water, which is pumped at a certain time before the cattle are allowed to drink it (a great proportion of the cattle on that farm being prize cattle), he has never had a case of pleuro-pneumonia, although it existed in his neighbourhood.

7381. Are the cattle in Kerry taken better care of?—No, the cattle upon the wilds in Kerry are left to nature.

7382. Yet they do not get pleuro-pneumonia?—No, their constitution is so insured to exposure.

7383. You do not know whether foot and mouth disease is spread from fairs and markets?—My cattle which got it last January were never in a fair.

7384. Does not foot and mouth disease generally come in the wake of a large fair?—I never remember that it did; it may come from fairs.

658.

7385. When you say that it dies out now, you have not many fairs in January?—We have fairs in every month in the year.

7386. There are not many fairs in January and February, I believe?—We have very large cattle fairs in February, March, and April.

7387. Have you never observed that where there is foot and mouth disease, it is almost invariably where there is a large cattle traffic?—Yes, there is no doubt of it.

7388. And when you talk about cattle in Kerry, do not you think that no cattle having been taken into Kerry is the reason for no disease existing there?—With regard to Kerry, I was speaking more of pleuro-pneumonia than of foot and mouth disease.

7389. But they do not import cattle into Kerry, do they?—No, not into the wilds of Kerry, though some of our best short-horn breeders live in the county.

7390. Mr. Dodson.] You said that it would be desirable to slaughter in cases of pleuro-pneumonia, and give full and fair compensation?—Yes.

7391. What do you consider would be full and fair compensation when an animal got pleuro-pneumonia?—The full value of the animal before she got it.

7392. Not taking into account the disease at all?—Not taking into account the disease at all.

7393. Do you keep sheep?—Yes, I do.

7394. Have you had any experience in sheep-pox?—I never had; we had foot and mouth disease in sheep last summer, not in my own sheep, but in my district.

7395. You have had no experience in sheep-pox?—No, I never saw a case of sheep-pox.

7396. You stated that you would have an inspector for each barony, do you mean by that a veterinary inspector?—I do not; I mean a practical man. We would not fire of all be at the expense of a veterinary inspector, but I mean a practical man who might be acquainted with those diseases. At the same time I should be rather inclined to retract that opinion by saying that the police would be sufficient if it were possible to make them carry out the law more stringently.

7397. You say, "if it were possible to make them carry out the law more stringently," in what way do you think the police neglect their duty?—I think the police are careless in some districts.

7398. Are the magistrates strict in enforcing the law?—They are too lenient, I think.

7399. That is with regard to penalties?—Yes.

7400. Are the penalties inflicted often nominal?—A man sometimes merely has to pay the price of the summons and the fine of 1 s.

7401. That is for removing infected cattle?—For removing cattle; and there was, a short time ago, a case of a man charged with killing an infected animal in a grove in a thickly populated district, who was only nominally fined.

7402. The police go round the country collecting statistics, and if they saw any diseased animal they would report it; that is their duty, is it not?—Yes, but it is the owners' duty to report it to them in the first place.

7403. Is there any disposition on the part of farmers in your district to conceal disease?—There is a great disposition to conceal pleuro-pneumonia, but I do not think that there is any disposition to conceal foot and mouth disease.

q q 3

7404. Why

Mr.
W. Scoster.
19 May
1873.

Mr.
W. Bolster.
—
19 May
1872.

7404. Why is there that difference?—Because a farmer having pleuro-pneumonia on his farm, there is actually an objection to purchase from him.

7405. Why does not the same apply to foot and mouth disease?—Because we do not think so much about it.

7406. The farmers do not think so much of it?—No they do not.

7407. But the result in Ireland of a man being known to have foot and mouth disease upon his farm is, that he cannot move a diseased animal alive, and he cannot move an animal which has been herded with it, without a license?—That is so.

7408. The consequence is that the farmer who makes it known that he has foot and mouth disease upon his farm, is put to considerable inconvenience, if not loss?—Decidedly.

7409. Still, notwithstanding that they do not conceal foot and mouth disease?—I think not; it would be impossible to conceal it. They could a great deal more easily conceal pleuro-pneumonia, because foot and mouth disease spreads so rapidly amongst a flock that they are all in it and everybody sees them.

7410. The fact being that pleuro-pneumonia is more easily concealed, the fact of a man having pleuro-pneumonia upon his farm is a more serious thing?—Pleuro-pneumonia goes on slowly and attacks the whole herd.

7411. You do not believe that farmers conceal foot and mouth disease?—No; but I do not think that I ever knew a single farmer who would admit that he had pleuro-pneumonia, although I knew that he had it at the time. There is a good deal of it in a portion of our county at the present time.

7412. When was foot and mouth disease worst in your county?—At its first appearance.

7413. When was that?—In 1849. I remember attending a lot of cattle then suffering from the first outbreak of foot and mouth disease.

7414. Has the foot and mouth disease been milder since?—Very much so. I think we lost a great deal of cattle upon the first outbreak of foot and mouth disease by too much meddling with them. My practical idea of foot and mouth disease, so far as the mouth goes, is not to meddle with the cattle at all.

7415. Being milder in form now, is it less extensive now than it was in 1849?—It was as extensive last year as ever it was.

7416. You think the restrictions have done good?—I do, decidedly; but I think they would do more good if they were more stringently carried out, and I would be for carrying them out stringently.

7417. The effect of the restrictions is to prevent the extension of the disease, is it not?—Quite so.

7418. It does not affect the mildness of the disease or the reverse?—That is impossible.

7419. But you think that, without the restrictions, the disease of late years would have been more extensive than it has been?—I have no doubt of it.

7420. And that if the law were efficiently enforced, more might be done towards restricting the disease?—Most decidedly.

7421. You think that if the law, as it stands, were enforced, it would be quite sufficient?—Quite sufficient.

7422. You recommended the insurance of cattle

to be guaranteed by the county rate, if I understood you rightly?—Yes, I did.

7423. You have no apprehension that that would induce recklessness as regards disease upon the part of the farmers?—No, it could not induce recklessness in this way, that it would have just the same effect as if the Government paid the compensation for the slaughter; it would not at all be a profitable thing for me to lose my cattle, but I would look at it simply as a protection.

7424. Do you intend that it should be an insurance only against actual loss of animals by death, or insurance against sickness?—I would make it general against accidents and everything.

7425. Against sickness?—If a cow broke her leg by accident I would make it apply to that case all the same.

7426. If an animal got foot and mouth disease, and there was thereby a loss to the farmer, would you allow him to insure against the loss of condition?—I would give him nothing, except in the case of death.

7427. And not in the case of sickness merely?—No.

7428. Mr. Barclay.] If you were not going to compensate the farmer for sickness but only for death, would it not be the farmer's interest, if the animal was not likely to be cured very suddenly, that the animal should die?—We do not lose animals by foot and mouth disease but very rarely.

7429. I was not speaking of foot and mouth disease specially, but with regard to an animal being sick with any other disease?—Practically speaking, pleuro-pneumonia is the only thing which they would die with, and the sooner they died of that the better.

7430. Do not animals die from inflammation?—Yes, but that does not very often occur.

7431. If an animal was suffering from that disease, and likely to come out a great deal worse than when she was attacked, would it not be the interest of the farmer that the animal should die, and that he should get his insurance?—It would be to the interest of the farmer; but I should think if a company was started, they would make a provision to guard against that; they would have an inspector to inspect the sick cattle, and to insist upon the farmer's treating them properly during the illness, and if he did not abide by these directions, he would not be paid for the dead beast.

7432. If we except foot and mouth disease, and pleuro-pneumonia, does not the health of the animals depend very much upon the way in which they are treated?—The best treated animals will get foot and mouth disease.

7433. I said, if we except foot and mouth disease, and pleuro-pneumonia; does not the health of animals depend very much upon the way in which they are treated, and fed, and watered?—Certainly.

7434. Therefore, a man who treated his cattle badly would be likely to have most claims upon this insurance company?—If a farmer insured his cattle, and treated his cattle badly after insurance, I do not think the insurance company ought to pay him. I think it would tend to make him take care of his cattle, and treat them properly.

7435. Is there not a very strong stimulus in the meantime to take care of their cattle?—In many cases they have not the cow-houses and the

the places they ought to have; they have them in filthy little sheds, and it is only a miracle that they do not get more disease; they frequently have them in their own houses, sleeping with themselves.

7436. Then if the farmer was going to be paid if the animal was taken unwell and died, there is not much stimulus to a farmer to take better care of his beasts, is there?—But he would lose the beast, and he would lose the profit of the season.

7437. I was asking whether the fact that he would be paid for an animal if it died would be any greater or less stimulus than exists at present for him to take care of his cattle?—I think it would be a great stimulus to him to take care of the rest.

7438. You recommend the slaughtering out of pleuro-pneumonia?—Yes, I think that is the only thing that can be done for it.

7439. And that compensation should be given to the owner from the county rates?—Yes.

7440. Is not that practically an insurance of the animal to the farmer?—Yes, if it was carried out it would be quite sufficient.

7441. And combining also the great advantage of getting down the disease, with indemnifying the farmers?—Yes.

7442. Then it would be strictly for the benefit of the farmers generally in each district that cattle should be slaughtered, the owner indemnified, and the disease put down?—Yes.

7443. That would be a sound principle of insurance, in your opinion?—I think it would be a very fair one.

7444. How did you get pleuro-pneumonia into your dairy stock?—I cannot tell you.

7445. Was one animal first attacked?—Yes.

7446. Did you recognise it at once?—Yes.

7447. What did you do with it?—I slaughtered and buried it.

7448. And you kept a sharp look-out upon the rest of the stock?—Yes; from the experience that I had in my father's time, I came to the conclusion that it was ridiculous to be trying to cure them; they were not fit for butchers' meat. Dairy cows generally are not at that time; they are too thin.

7449. If you watch your animals very closely, you can detect very well when an animal begins to be affected, by the appearance of the animal, can you not?—Immediately.

7450. Without its having any very prominent symptoms about it?—There is a dulness in the appearance of the animal, and a sharp cough, accompanied by a kind of grunt in the chest and side.

7451. You spoke of inoculation which had been tried after seven animals had died, and that after three died, the rest of the herd was not affected?—Not since.

7452. In the case of the first animals, were they slaughtered when attacked?—I could not tell you.

7453. Assuming that they were slaughtered, you had just the same result without inoculation in your own herd?—It does not follow; it might have been so.

7454. If those seven animals had been slaughtered out, the result might have been much the same as in your own herd?—It would be, if they did not get it afterwards, exactly the same.

7455. Do you know whether the three animals

that died afterwards were isolated?—Yes, they were after they got the disease, or, I should say, after they were noticed with it.

7456. So that the result of this case of pleuro-pneumonia did not differ from yours, excepting that the animals were inoculated?—Just so.

7457. It is quite possible that if there had been no inoculation the result might have been the same?—It is quite possible.

7458. Therefore that case does not seem to afford you a strong ground for having confidence in inoculation?—I would be more inclined to trust to inoculation than to my own experience of the other, because my shutting it out by simply slaughtering four or five cows may have been a chance.

7459. Assuming that you were so unfortunate as to have pleuro-pneumonia break out in your dairy stock when you got home, would you proceed to attempt to cure them by inoculation?—Decidedly I would slaughter the infected animals, and inoculate the rest immediately.

7460. You have so much confidence in the system that you would inoculate the whole herd?—Yes.

7461. Have you any other grounds for believing in it, besides those that you have stated to the Committee?—Yes, I know other parties who have tried it. With regard to pleuro-pneumonia I know one man in my neighbourhood who lost his whole herd by it, and I have known the next dairymen with his cows actually drinking from the same pond, and mixing in the same herd, and pleuro-pneumonia never extended to his farm.

7462. Are you satisfied that the herds actually mixed?—Yes, I have seen them together.

7463. How did they get mixed together?—Owing to there being a bad fence.

7464. Mr. Kewenough.] With regard to this inoculation, how was it performed?—One of the slaughtered animals was opened. The lungs are what are principally affected; they are all in a state of decomposition, I might say, and they cut the thin skin under the tail of the animal, it is then just like vaccinating a child against small-pox.

7465. The virus is taken from the dead beast, is it not?—Yes, the virus is put into this little cut, and it is bandaged up for 24 hours, and the beast is sure to be affected with pleuro-pneumonia in a day or two afterwards.

7466. Mr. Barclay.] In the case in which the animal died, the disease affected the lungs, did it not?—Yes.

7467. Do you think that you will prevent the disease affecting the lungs by transferring the disease to the tail?—I think you will prevent it being transferred to the lungs.

7468. Does the animal present any symptom of disease except in the tail?—The animal presents almost all the symptoms except in the breathing.

7469. The animal is affected except as to the lungs?—Yes.

7470. And in the case of pleuro-pneumonia it is only the lungs which are affected?—Yes, that is so.

7471. Does not that show that it is a different disease altogether?—No, I think it shows that it is a milder type of the disease.

7472. In the second case the lungs you say are not affected at all?—I never saw a cow opened after having been inoculated.

Q Q 4

7473. Have

Mr.
W. Bolster.
19 May
1873.

Mr.
W. Bolster.
—
19 May
1873.

1473. Have you seen a cow unwell after inoculation?—Yes.

1474. Did she show any symptoms of disease?—The cow seemed to be very ill.

1475. Upon the lungs?—There was not so great a heaving of the sides as there would have been if she had not been inoculated.

1476. Did the cow show the characteristic symptoms, the short hard cough and the great you spoke of?—She did not; merely heaviness; she was certainly very sick.

1477. You are in favour of maintaining the present restrictions upon foot and mouth disease, are you not?—Yes, I am.

1478. You think it possible that policeman might undertake the looking after and carrying out of the restrictions?—I think they are perfectly competent to do it, and they have plenty of time to do it also.

1479. In the first place you stated that there was not much difficulty in having foot and mouth disease reported?—There is not much difficulty because it makes itself so conspicuously known at once.

1480. The difficulty does not lie in that point, then?—No, certainly not.

1481. I suppose the police constables do report the disease to their superiors, when they hear of it?—I am sure they do; they serve you with a printed form, the copy of an Order in Council, and they come again and withdraw that after a certain time.

1482. What further would you wish the police constables to do?—Simply to have a stricter cordons around farms which were infected.

1483. That would involve the placing of a police constable upon any infected farm, would it not?—No, I think not; it would involve watching, but if the law was broken in his absence the farmer should be fined heavily for doing so.

1484. The difficulty now is, that the farmers remove their cattle from farms to fairs and markets at nights?—Yes, they do so.

1485. How do you propose to have an efficient control, so as to prevent farmers from moving animals affected with foot and mouth disease upon a public highway, or to fairs or markets?—I think the present law is sufficient to accomplish that object.

1486. But you would have the law carried out, and see that the farmers did not transgress the law?—If the Government sent their directions to the inspector who has the control over the constabulary, to see that the men under him did their duty more stringently, I am quite sure they would do it.

1487. Do you think the police constables by patrolling round a district would find it possible to see that the farmers adhered to those regulations?—I think they would find out a great many more cases than they do, and if examples were made of those cases, they would be stopped in future.

1488. You would depend on finding out a few cases, and making examples of those, so that others might be deterred from offending?—I think it would have a great effect in deterring others.

1489. But in order to make the regulations thoroughly efficient, would not you require to have efficient control over each farm to see that the animals were not moved about during the day on a public road, or anything of that sort?—The

police ought to be able to do that; we have barracks in almost every parish or small district, and five or six men walking about constantly could very easily carry that order out.

1490. Are there a sufficient number of men to take statements of the cattle upon each farm, and to see that no cattle were moved afterwards for a considerable period?—I think it might be done without their knowing it is a good many instances, but I think you would also catch a good many, and I would punish them heavily.

1491. What do the farmers do at present with cattle affected with pleuro-pneumonia?—An intelligent farmer, I think, with dairy cattle would be very likely to destroy them, but I would not say that was carried out extensively. I think the most safe answer I could give to that question would be that the farmers would very likely sell them if they could.

1492. They would conceal the disease and take an early opportunity of sending the infected animal to market?—Certainly not to market. The farmers would sell them to what we call an inferior butcher, and he would sell them as meat in some shambles or other.

1493. If they are store animals, I daresay they find their way to market all the same?—Yes, provided they are not affected.

1494. Provided they are not visibly affected?—Yes, provided they are not visibly affected. I should not like to do it myself. I do not think any conscientious man would do it, but I think it is the practice.

1495. It is quite likely, is it not, that those animals which have pleuro-pneumonia or have been herded with animals in which pleuro-pneumonia existed, might be sent over to this country?—I do not think that pleuro-pneumonia exists to any extent amongst young store cattle in Ireland. I think it is confined more to dairy cattle. I never saw a herd of yearling heifers with pleuro-pneumonia, nor did I ever see a two years' old heifer with pleuro-pneumonia.

1496. You think that these one or two years' old heifers are not affected with pleuro-pneumonia?—I never saw one affected with pleuro-pneumonia.

1497. Might not that arise from this principle, that you speak of farmers sending them out of the country or selling them in the market?—No, we keep a great many of them.

1498. Not affected with pleuro-pneumonia?—No, we keep them on; not the affected ones, of course.

1499. You stated that it was the general practice that animals affected with pleuro-pneumonia found their way to the market?—Not to the market; the butcher is brought into the house.

1500. That is with regard to dairy cattle?—Any beast that is diseased, the butcher is immediately brought at night, on the sly, into the stables, or into the farm, but the animal is not exhibited in a public fair.

1501. I could understand that with regard to the dairy stock, but how would that be with regard to the rest of the stock?—A store animal may be six years old, but I never saw the disease in a yearling or a two-year old.

1502. Those animals are affected with the disease, are they not?—It is possible that they are, if they are kept with other cattle, but generally speaking, they are not kept with other cattle. As I say, the disease is more prevalent amongst dairy cattle than amongst others.

1503. And

7503. And the dairy cattle are sent off to the butchers?—They are sold off for a very small sum to some very poor butcher.

7504. And they are taken away at night?—Yes; they are taken away at night.

7505. You think that the police could detect those cases better than they do?—I think they ought to do so.

7506. Mr. Dodson.] When you recommend the slaughter of an animal being made compulsory for pleuro-pneumonia, giving the owner the full value of the animal before the disease, would you allow him to keep the carcass?—The carcass in the case of pleuro-pneumonia would be worth very little; the hide would be worth something.

7507. The carcass of an animal affected in an incipient stage with pleuro-pneumonia would be worth something, would it not?—If I were allowed for an animal slaughtered for pleuro-pneumonia I would allow nothing for the carcass; I would bury it, skin and all.

7508. Is it not the case that in the incipient stage of pleuro-pneumonia the carcass of the animal is perfectly fit for food?—I believe so.

7509. And you would be slaughtering an animal fit for food if you slaughtered it at the commencement?—I was speaking of dairy cattle myself; I think it would be a great pity to destroy an animal worth 30 guineas in pleuro-pneumonia; it would be just as good for food if you did not know it. I remember going into one of the best butchers in Limerick, and seeing an animal which was marked "first prize." I knew perfectly well that that animal would have died of lung disease.

7510. Mr. Clare Read.] You would slaughter in all cases?—Yes.

7511. If it was a store animal and poor, you would bury it?—Yes; but if I had a stall-fed beast, fat and in good condition, and that beast was likely to be in pleuro-pneumonia, I think I ought to be allowed to send for a butcher, but at the same time it would be all the same if I was paid for it.

7512. Mr. Barclay.] It would be all the same if you got the full value by way of insurance?—If I got the full value of the animal after slaughter, I should have no claim for insurance.

7513. But I am speaking of those dairy animals you had in view, which are generally very thin and of very little value for food?—A dairy animal is of very little value for food.

7514. Mr. Dodson.] In compensating a man for an animal slaughtered, you would deduct from the compensation given him, any value that he got for the carcass, would you not?—Certainly, if he disposed of the carcass.

7515. Mr. Barclay.] Taking one of your own animals, worth say, 15 £ to the butcher, what would he be likely to give to you?—That is to say, if I disposed of it on the stealthy principle that I have explained, the skin of my animal would be worth 30 s., and I suppose he would not give me more than 2 £.

7516. Mr. Tipping.] Is your district mainly an export district or a dairy district?—It is a dairy district and a feeding district; we do not export ourselves, but a great many graziers who do export, buy from us.

7517. You have spoken of the filthy condition of the cattle trucks?—Yes, decidedly.

7518. Have you had much experience in seeing those trucks?—I go about my county and about the country generally.

658.

7519. Are you speaking of your own district or of Irish railways generally?—I am confining myself to the south principally.

7520. Do I understand you to state that, according to your knowledge, a good deal of disease is propagated owing to this neglect in the cleansing of the trucks?—It is increased materially by the filth and neglect and abuse that they meet with.

7521. Who professes to look after these trucks; is there no inspection, or whose duty is it to see that these trucks are in good condition?—I fancy there is an inspector at all the ports of embarkation; but whether they carry out their duty or not I do not know.

7522. Have you seen anything of the steamers which convey the cattle to this country?—I have had no experience except from being an eye witness on accidental occasions when I have gone on board these steamers.

7523. But you have seen much more of the railway trucks than you have of the steamers?—I have seen them both, and I think the confinement and want of ventilation on board the steamers is very unhealthy.

7524. Are you of opinion that there is neglect on the part of the carrying agents, whether by rail or steamer, which in your opinion intensifies the chance of cattle arriving diseased in this market?—I believe it is the fact.

7525. Mr. Callan.] What railway do you allude to principally?—I did not single out any particular railway.

7526. What is your nearest station?—I live on the Cork Direct line.

7527. That is the Cork and Limerick Railway?—Yes.

7528. Do your remarks as to the filthy condition of the trucks refer to the Waterford and Limerick line?—Yes; but not exclusively to that line.

7529. The Great Southern and Western?—Yes, and the Great Southern and Western.

7530. You stated that the trucks of the Great Southern and Western Railway, which is the principal carrying company in Ireland, are so filthy and so ill cared for that they tend to produce disease?—I have seen very filthy trucks upon the other line as well.

7531. What was the station you spoke of where the stench was bad enough to give a man pleuro-pneumonia?—That was at St. Patrick's Well.

7532. Does it proceed from the dung, or from the trucks?—From an accumulation of filth and dung in the trucks.

7533. You spoke of very high charges being made; what are the charges?—I do not know.

7534. Do you ever send cattle by railway?—Very seldom.

7535. Then your experience of railways is very limited?—I am speaking with regard to charges.

7536. You stated from your own knowledge that the trucks were filthy in the extreme, and yet you state that you have had very little experience of them?—I was speaking as to the charges.

7537. You spoke of some of the steamers being very filthy; what steamers did you refer to?—I have never seen any except in Cork.

7538. What company was that?—The Cork Steamship Company, I believe.

7539. Then your evidence is that the Cork Steamship Company have neglected to carry out the Orders in Council?—No, I do not say that; I say that the ventilation of those steamers and

R n

the

Mr.
W. Bolster.
19 May
1873.

Mr.
W. Dolister.
—
19 May
1873.

the care of the cattle on board should be better than it is.

7540. You complained of want of ventilation?—I complain of the want of ventilation and the dirt.

7541. Did you ever ship cattle yourself?—No, never.

7542. You complain of the state of the steamers although you never ship cattle?—Yes, I have seen the state of things which I describe.

7543. You come here representing a farmers' club, do you not?—Yes.

7544. Of what does that club consist principally, of farmers or graziers?—I do not see the distinction between farmers and graziers.

7545. I see a very great distinction between them: what number of cattle do you keep?—I suppose 150.

7546. How many do you export?—I never export any.

7547. Therefore, you have no knowledge whatever of the export trade?—Not in my own experience.

7548. Have you had much experience in fattening cattle for the market?—I have.

7549. You are not what one would call a stock-master, you are more of a dairy farmer than a stock farmer, are you not?—I am both.

7550. But you are more of one than the other?—I am more of one than the other; I am more a dairy farmer than a stock farmer.

7551. Will you kindly tell us how you arrive at your estimated loss of 4 l. per cow from foot and mouth disease?—I know that in the dairy next me, where they get foot and mouth disease pitched in the dags and in the legs, 15 of those cows dropped their calves prematurely from the disease, and there were a number of other things; their dags were rendered useless for milking, and 17 out of the 50 upon the farm have gone from the farm, two of them have died, and those had to be replaced at 26 l. a head.

7552. How much milk do your cows give on the average?—Twelve British quarts on the average.

7553. Is it the fact that the cows produce more butter and less milk after having had foot and mouth disease?—I do not believe it. I have heard a man before a judge in Limerick, swear that cattle were better after they had had foot and mouth disease than they were before they got it, but nobody believed him.

7554. Have you seen the memorandum of the committee which has been produced here?—Yes.

7555. Which controverts this man's statements?—Yes.

7556. Is not the grand jury of the county of Limerick a resident body in the county?—They are not all resident in the county.

7557. Are they not practically a resident body?—Yes.

7558. Largely interested in cattle?—Some of them are and some of them are not.

7559. Did you attend the last assizes of the county of Limerick?—No.

7560. Are you aware that the grand jury of the county of Limerick passed a resolution, and communicated it to the Government through their foreman, Sir David Roche, condemning the present restrictions and Orders in Council with regard to the foot and mouth disease?—I have heard of such a resolution.

7561. Is it not the fact that Sir David Roche, the foreman of the grand jury, communicated

with the principal persons in the county?—I heard of the resolution, but I did not hear of that.

7562. Are they not more largely interested in the general well-being of the county, and in cattle as a matter of pounds, shillings, and pence, than you are yourself?—As a matter of exportation they are, but not otherwise.

7563. They are more largely interested than you could be, are they not?—I think a man like Sir David Roche, who exports all his cattle to Liverpool, would wish that there should be no restrictions at all.

7564. Do you not think that a man like Sir David Roche, who exports so largely to Liverpool, must have a better knowledge of the requirements of the trade than you can have, who never exported a beast in your life?—I do not think that Sir David Roche personally has any practical knowledge of it.

7565. Have you ever crossed in those steamers to Liverpool?—Never.

7566. Therefore you have not seen this alleged ill-treatment?—I have seen cattle ill-treated while being put on board; but I have heard from people who were going across that the smell was very bad and the ventilation very defective.

7567. You have spoken of the leniency of the magistrates as tending to increase disease; in how many cases could you speak of the magistrates having inflicted a nominal fine?—I can only speak to one, but I have heard of more.

7568. And upon that one case you found this general assertion?—I have heard it from the magistrates themselves.

7569. Mr. P.M.] Some evidence has been given from Ireland with regard to the care the dealers there would take to keep out the disease if the matter were left in their hands; do you believe that it would be prudent to leave the repression of those contagious disorders in the hands of the cattle dealers, and the proprietors of cattle in Ireland?—No, I do not think it would; I would sooner see the law as it is myself.

7570. You do not think that the interest which those people have in stock would be such as to lead them to attempt to put an end to these disorders by submitting to restrictions on their trade?—I do not think it would.

7571. And therefore you are of opinion that it is still desirable to rely upon the action of the executive Government?—I should not like to see the restrictions extended beyond what they are at present, but I do not think the present restrictions interfere with anybody injuriously, either the exporter or anybody else; but I would not like to see them made more severe than they are now.

7572. So far from trusting in any attempt to check these disorders to the dealers or owners of stock, I think you said to-day that, to your knowledge, they evaded the present law?—I do not think I alluded to the dealers.

7573. I thought you told one of the Members of the Committee that you knew that cattle diseased with pleuro-pneumonia were sent into the market at night, in order to evade the law?—Not by the dealers.

7574. By the owners?—Yes, by the owners; but the cattle were not sent into a market, but sold to a poor butcher.

7575. Do you imagine the dealers to be innocent?—No, but I do not think dealers would buy diseased stock.

7576. Not if they know it?—They would be sure to know it. They are very sharp fellows; they would be sure to make inquiries in the district, and they would not buy them if they thought there was disease existing there.

7577. Mr. O'Connor.] You have very little foot and mouth disease in the south of Ireland, I believe?—I have not heard of it since December.

7578. That being so, there would be no particular object in closing fairs or markets?—I believe it would ruin the country if you did so, and make us all paupers, and stop all industry of every description.

7579. You would not have animals affected with foot and mouth disease slaughtered?—I think there would be no necessity for that.

7580. As a general rule the loss upon store cattle is very slight, is it not?—Very slight. As a general rule, with regard to fat cattle or store cattle, it is only a little waste of condition for about a month.

7581. The estimate you made was with regard to dairy cattle?—With regard to dairy cattle, and only when it attacks the dams and foals.

7582. I presume that any proposition for the slaughter of animals affected with foot and mouth disease, would meet with very great disapproval throughout Ireland?—It would be intolerable altogether.

7583. Mr. Kinnear.] You gave an instance of foot and mouth disease upon your own farm, which you said you could not account for?—That was so.

7584. And in your opinion it is capable of what may be called spontaneous origin?—I do not say spontaneous origin, absolutely. It might be brought in without any knowledge. My herdsmen might have brought it in, but my cattle had no communication with any other cattle.

7585. But you are of opinion that it is a highly infectious disease?—I have no doubt of it.

7586. If that be so, how do you think that restrictions would ever stamp it out?—I think it would be more likely to be stamped out by restrictions than if the cattle were left to go about in the country indiscriminately.

7587. We have had restrictions in force for some three years, have we not?—Yes.

7588. You admit that last year the disease was as bad as ever?—Yes; but now we have no foot and mouth disease at all.

7589. But that was not due to the restrictions, was it?—It may be due to the restrictions.

7590. You stated that the disease was worse in 1849 than it has been since?—In type it was worse.

7591. But it has been very much more prevalent of late years?—Yes.

7592. There were no restrictions in 1849?—No, there were not.

7593. Mr. Maxwell.] We have had restrictions on paper, but the restrictions, as I understand from you, have not been carried out?—The rules of the Privy Council are not sufficiently stringent as they are carried out; but they are quite sufficient if they were properly carried out.

7594. Mr. Kinnear.] If the rules are not carried out according to your opinion, how can the disappearance of disease arise from the restrictions at present?—Of course they are carried out to a certain extent all over the country, but they might be more rigidly carried out than they are.

7595. But still we have the facts before us 0.58.

that in 1849 the disease was prevalent and of a bad type, and that without restrictions it disappeared?

7596. You stated with regard to the carrying out of the restrictions that you would recommend the appointment of a number of local inspectors?—Yes, I did in my first examination, but I would not exactly stick to that answer. I think the police would be quite sufficient, if the authorities made them be more attentive to their duties.

7597. Do you think it is possible at present for the police, if they were ever so active, to keep up so complete a surveillance over the whole county as to detect every fresh case of outbreak?—I think they could; I think they can do a great deal.

7598. You have, I suppose, no knowledge of the proportion which a policeman bears to the acreage of his district, that is to say, how many acres there are to each policeman in the district?—I could not tell you at present; but I could find it out.

7599. From your knowledge, would not the acreage per policeman be very large?—The districts are made large; there is generally not more than five or six men in the same barracks, but they know the country so well that they have excellent means of getting information.

7600. You really think that there are sufficient of them to enforce restrictions?—I do.

7601. You stated that there were some cases of diseased cattle being taken by hutchers into Limerick market?—So I have heard; in fact, I know it. As I have stated before, the cattle are conveyed into the town by stealth and slaughtered, but they never appear in the market.

7602. Do you think there was any harm in that?—Yes.

7603. They were only affected with foot and mouth disease, were they not?—No, with pleuropneumonia.

7604. You have known these cases yourself?—I have known them to be taken to Limerick by stealth.

7605. I rather gathered from your answers that you are opposed to the crossing of short-horns with the Irish stock?—I am not opposed to it; I should be very sorry to be opposed to it.

7606. I thought you said that it rendered our cattle more liable to disease?—I believe that our cattle have not such strong constitutions now as they had before we crossed the breed.

7607. Notwithstanding that objection, you are not opposed to it?—Certainly not.

7608. Now with regard to inoculation, I understood you to say that when pleuro-pneumonia broke out upon your farm, you slaughtered the animals affected, and inoculated the rest?—No, I never inoculated mine; it was a friend of mine who did so.

7609. But you have faith in inoculation?—Yes, I have.

7610. In answer to a question from me previously, you stated that the virus was taken from a dead animal?—Yes, from the diseased lung of a dead animal.

7611. Do you know what the effect of inoculation would be upon a human being, if the matter were taken from a dead body?—Yes, I fancy I do.

7612. What would it be?—I suppose it would produce the same effect as upon an animal.

R 2

7613. But

Mr.
W. B. Butler.
19 May
1873.

Mr.
W. Belcher.
19 May
1873.

7613. But virus taken from a dead body would be more or less putrid matter, would it not, and you know what the effect of that would be death?—That would be so, but I have not the slightest knowledge of the effect upon the human body.

7614. Is it not likely that it would have the same effect upon a cow?—It did not have it.

7615. They were inoculated in the tail?—Yes.

7616. Do you know whether the tails dropped off?—Not in this herd particularly, but I have known cases in which the tails have dropped off, but that was from not having been properly treated.

7617. The virus in that case was also taken from dead animals?—Yes.

7618. You do not agree with Professor Simonds, I think it was, who told the Committee that no sane man would inoculate in cases of pleuro-pneumonia?—I do not agree with him. I speak from practical knowledge, of course, not from professional knowledge.

7619. You referred to Sir David Roche, and in answer to the honourable Member for Dundalk, you rather questioned whether he was able to form an opinion on the subject?—I do not know of any man more competent to form an opinion upon it, but that was not the way in which the honourable Member put the question; he wanted to contrast the opinion of our club with the opinion of the grand jury and Sir David Roche, and I naturally adhered to our opinion.

7620. *Chairman.* I understood you to state, that you do not approve of more stringent regulations, such as those recommended by Professor Baldwin, but that you do approve of the regulations at present in force with regard to foot and mouth disease?—Yes, I do.

7621. What you would recommend would be, that those regulations should be strictly enforced?—Yes.

7622. Are you aware that those regulations would oblige all animals affected with foot and mouth disease to be seized, if found in a market?—Yes, of course.

7623. Were you at Ballinasloe Fair last year?—No.

7624. I daresay you have heard that there were a very great number of animals suspected to be affected with foot and mouth disease there?—Yes.

7625. What do you suppose would have been the effect of stringently carrying out the Order upon that occasion?—The effect of stringently carrying out the Order would have been to prevent the occurrence of that evil.

7626. Would it have been possible to carry the Order out stringently, do you think, at Ballinasloe?—Yes, I do.

7627. *Mr. Clere Read.* Do you think that the diseased animals would never have got into the market?—I do not mean to say that a diseased animal might not have stolen into the fair at Ballinasloe, but not as a rule.

7628. *Chairman.* Two or three witnesses from Ireland have stated that it would be impossible to carry out those regulations stringently with regard to markets and fairs; is that your opinion?—I do not think that they would prevent the possibility of having diseased animals in such a fair as Ballinasloe.

7629. Let me read you what the restrictions

are, "That no animal affected with foot and mouth distemper, or the aphous disease, shall be moved alive from any lands, premises, or place while so affected, and no animal which has been in contact or herded with an animal so affected shall be moved from any lands, premises, or place, except for immediate slaughter." This wording would oblige this to be done; if there were foot and mouth disease at Ballinasloe, an animal which had it could be moved, and no animal which had come near an affected animal could be moved; do you think it would be possible to carry out such a regulation as that?—It would be a very difficult thing to carry out, I have no doubt. I do not see how you could possibly carry it out; if the present laws do not carry it out, I do not know what other laws could do so.

7630. I understood you to say, in answer to the honourable Member for Sligo, that you thought the stoppage of all fairs would be almost ruinous; what I want you as a practical man to tell me is this: inasmuch as you have recommended that the present restrictions should be stringently carried out, how would you carry out with regard to a fair like Ballinasloe such a restriction as this; that none of the animals which had been in contact with one that was found affected with foot and mouth disease should be moved, except for immediate slaughter?—I think they might be stolen to the fairs off the different farms without the restrictions being able to prevent them, even if carried out, but I do think that if any animal were found in a fair like Ballinasloe affected with disease, and the owner of that animal were brought before the proper tribunal and punished, it would not be likely to occur again.

7631. You have given it as your evidence, which is very important evidence, that you believe what ought to be done is to carry out stringently the present restrictions, and that the stringent carrying out of those restrictions would prevent any animal being moved from a fair like Ballinasloe which had come in contact with any animal which had had the disease; it appears to me that that would apply to an enormous number of the animals in the fair?—It would.

7632. Would you be prepared to carry that out?—I would, and further I would have no objection in the world with regard to removing cattle affected with disease, that you should make more stringent laws to prevent that; it is only with regard to shipping or exporting cattle or interfering with the trade of the country generally that I would not like to have the laws more stringent than they are at present.

7633. Do you ever attend Ballinasloe Fair?—No.

7634. What is the largest fair that you have ever attended?—I have attended the great Muster Fair.

7635. What is the number of cattle there?—5,000 or 6,000 cattle.

7636. Supposing foot and mouth disease were to be seen among a number of these animals in the fair, in order to carry out this restriction, would it not be necessary to prevent almost every animal being removed, except for slaughter?—No, it would not, because the foot and mouth disease does not go all through a county.

7637. But suppose the foot and mouth disease broke out in the fair, would not the carrying out of this Order mean that there would be great danger to almost all the animals in the fair?—No, I do not think there would, because they would

would not be in contact with each other at the same time, although they would be in the same fair; the great Munster Fair is a very extensive fair.

7638. You think that you might stringently carry out these Orders which involve all animals in contact, or herded with an animal found affected with foot and mouth disease in a fair, without seriously breaking up the fair?—I think any animal affected with foot and mouth disease coming in contact with a sound animal is almost certain to communicate the foot and mouth disease to it, but I am not for destroying an animal affected with foot and mouth disease.

7639. Mr. Mowat.] What difficulty do you think there might be in a large fair, such as the Munster or Ballinsloe Fair, in carrying out the regulations; suppose the regulations had been carried out for two or three months before the fair, is it likely that there would be a great number of animals affected with foot and mouth disease at the fair?—I do not think there would, but it might occur all the same.

7640. Mr. O'Connor.] In a large fair like Ballinsloe, would it be possible to discover the animals affected?—It would be totally impossible, except by a mere chance, to discover an affected animal in the fair; cattle sometimes foam at the mouth when driving, and appear to have the preliminary symptoms of foot and mouth disease.

7641. Chairman.] I think you stated that you had heard of no cases in which fines had been imposed under the Irish Act?—I stated that I knew one case in which a nominal fine had been imposed, and I have heard of many cases of nominal fines.

7642. I have a return here by Professor Ferguson which says that the fines levied in 1871 amounted to 86 £, and in 1872 to 230 £?—That is not so much perhaps, if you give the number of cases.

7643. Mr. Callan.] I think I understood you to say that you would not be in favour of such regulations as would tend to injure the general trade of the country?—I should not be in favour of any laws more stringent than the general law.

7644. Then you would not be in favour of such stringent regulations as would seriously interfere with the cattle trade of the country?—I would not.

7645. If the stringent regulations you would propose, if strictly carried out, would prove seriously detrimental to the cattle trade of the country, would you still be in favour of increased stringency?—Not if I thought they would prove to a very great extent detrimental to the trade of the country, but I do not believe they would.

MR. THOMAS VERDON, re-called; and further Examined.

7656. Mr. Barclay.] So far as your trade in this country is concerned, you are engaged only in fat cattle?—So far as regards this country in fat cattle only.

7657. You would have no objection to an animal affected with foot and mouth disease being exhibited in a fat cattle market?—None.

7658. The reason being that the animal is to be killed in a very few days?—Yes.

7659. The beef does not suffer in consequence of the disease, I believe?—In my opinion it does not suffer.

7660. Whereas, if the animal were to be allowed to live two or three weeks, it would lose in flesh considerably?—Yes, it would.

Q.55.

7646. But supposing the largest sales masters and stock masters in Ireland gave evidence that such restrictions would materially tend to the detriment of the cattle trade, would you yield to their representations?—No, I would not; I would have my own opinion.

7647. You said that you would not be favourable to such restrictions as would injure the cattle trade of the country?—I would not.

7648. Then if the principal sales masters and stock masters are of opinion that such restrictions would prove detrimental to their interests, would you yield to the opinion of what you would consider the best authorities?—I do not know about that; I consider the authority of other parties may be just as good as that of these sales masters.

7649. You think they are interested a good deal in the question, do you not?—Yes, I think they are interested a good deal, and I think men's opinions are sometimes affected a good deal by their interests.

7650. You are not interested in anything except in rearing, not in exporting cattle?—No.

7651. You are not directly connected with the cattle trade between this country and Ireland?—No.

7652. Mr. Wm. Johnston.] Could you give any reason for believing that there are cases of spontaneous generation of foot and mouth disease?—My own cases were such, but if you believe some of the witnesses who have been examined before the Committee, they will go so far as to say that hares and rabbits may bring it, and I believe some gentlemen will go so far as this, that a bird may bring it if he flies across a farm.

7653. Do you think that the farmers would willingly co-operate in stamping out the foot and mouth disease?—I think with regard to foot and mouth disease they would, but I think that with regard to pleuro-pneumonia they would not give you facilities for doing that for the reasons which I have before stated.

7654. Have you any opinion as to whether it is better to conduct the export of cattle in the holds or on the decks of steamers?—I have had no experience of that.

7655. Mr. Keenanagh.] Is it not the fact that with regard to the Munster fair, the cattle are all driven in at one gate?—No, there are two gates, I think; they are not herded together. Munster fair is held on a very extensive piece of ground.

7661. But seeing that it is going to be killed in two or three days it is of no consequence to the buyer that the animal is suffering from foot and mouth disease?—Not materially.

7662. Does it affect the price?—I am speaking of the fat cattle market only. In the fat cattle market, where the animal is to be slaughtered immediately, it does not affect the price materially.

7663. "Materially" would depend greatly upon the state of the disease?—Yes.

7664. Supposing the disease were visible, to what extent should you say it would affect the price of a 30 £ bullock?—The disease might be visible, and not affect the price at all. If the animal were unable to stand in consequence of having

Mr.
W. Bolster.
—
19 May
1873.

Mr.
T. Verdon.
—

Mr.
T. Vernon.
—
19 May
1873.

having been moved into the market while affected with the disease it would affect the price from about 10 s. to perhaps 15 s. or 20 s., because there would be the expense of removing the animal from the market to the place of slaughter.

7665. In point of fact a great many fat cattle are shown in the market labouring under foot and mouth disease, are they not?—Yes.

7666. By the present arrangement or arrangements recently in force it was very difficult to have fat cattle in the market which had left home perhaps three or four days without getting foot and mouth disease?—Very difficult indeed; I have seen cattle coming from all parts of Ireland and Scotland to Liverpool, and latterly (I am speaking of about a month ago) some of the cattle arriving were affected with foot and mouth disease in an incipient stage when exhibited, or when about to be exhibited for sale.

7667. Coming from what parts?—From Aberdeen and that direction to Liverpool.

7668. Would such cattle have been kept for a day or two in Liverpool?—The general course of cattle coming from the north to Liverpool is that they are sent from home upon the Saturday, and arrive in Liverpool on the Saturday night or Sunday morning; the Liverpool market being held upon the Monday.

7669. And the animals sometimes show foot and mouth disease in the market on the Monday; do they not?—In an incipient stage.

7670. You say that the price of beef is dearer in Liverpool than it is in London?—Yes; I may observe that I have brought the last four copies of the "Mark Lane Express" in which the prices are given at the various markets, which I take it will be sufficient evidence for Mr. Dent, who asked me the question.

7671. What quality of beef do you refer to in saying that the price is dearer in Liverpool than in London?—The best quality.

7672. The people of Aberdeen consign to the Liverpool market, do they not? They do.

7673. And they also consign considerably to the London market, do they not?—Yes.

7674. Do you think they would send past Liverpool, or to London, if the Liverpool prices were better?—I dare say a great many of them do not know the advantages of sending them to Liverpool.

7675. There are a good many consignors from Aberdeenshire to Liverpool, are there not?—There are some; not a great many, I think.

7676. Are they not informed from week to week of the state of the market?—They are.

7677. You send out circulars weekly to a great many of the salemen and butchers in the market, do you not?—We never send any circulars to Scotland at all, because, as I previously stated, the number of Scotch cattle that we sell is very trifling.

7678. Some of the salemen have connections in Scotland, have they not?—They have.

7679. And they send out reports?—Yes, and many of the Scotch consignors send large consignments.

7680. Nevertheless there are large consignments of Scotch cattle come into London?—Yes, there are.

7681. The price of meat varies, does it not, from market to market?—Latterly there has not been much fluctuation, but the tendency has been upwards.

7682. There are constant fluctuations, are

there not, from week to week in the price of meat?—At certain parts of the year there have been violent fluctuations.

7683. So that it might happen that you have meat dearer one week in London, and another week dearer in Liverpool?—Yes. I may mention that I was in the London market this morning, and I counted upwards of 30 men from Manchester and Liverpool buying cattle.

7684. What description of cattle were they buying?—One man, a Liverpool man, bought 40 cattle at 32 l. 10 s. each, from Mr. Gillett, and another man, a Manchester man, bought a lot of Scotch cattle, for which he gave 52 l. 10 s. a piece. I asked him why he came up here, and he said, "I cannot get anything at all at the price, either in Liverpool or Manchester." He told me that this day.

7685. That was prime quality cattle?—Yes.

7686. Have they such in Ireland just now?—Yes.

7687. Are they keeping them at home?—They are sending them, but not in very large numbers.

7688. They are not keeping them at home?—No, they are sending them just as they have them ready.

7689. The regulations in Liverpool are not preventing their being sent?—The restrictions in Liverpool have diverted a great deal of traffic; many people who were in the habit of sending cattle to Liverpool send them now to other markets.

7690. Where do the Irish cattle go at present?—There is not so much divergence at present; the majority of the fat cattle from Ireland are now sent to Liverpool.

7691. The demand being not quite equal to the supply, they are coming to London?—They come to Liverpool.

7692. The regulations do not affect the total supply in the market?—There are a number of people who formerly supplied Liverpool with cattle and with sheep, some of them from Scotland, and these were very hardly dealt with by the strict operation of the restrictions being enforced. When once these people's cattle were seized in Liverpool, they ceased sending cattle there at all.

7693. Is it the fact that some of the Manchester buyers or dealers between Manchester and Ireland are buying in Ireland direct, without the intervention of Liverpool salemen?—It is to a small extent.

7694. That is the natural course of the development of trade, is it not, where the producers and the consumers endeavour to dispense with intermediate people as far as possible?—No, I do not take it to be the natural course of the development of trade.

7695. Do you think that Manchester dealers would come to Liverpool and buy of the intermediate people instead of going to Ireland and importing direct?—I may observe that I am a cattle salesman, and, of course, I look upon the best means of disposing of cattle, as being to give them to cattle salemen to sell, and I do not think it is to the advantage of a producer, as a rule, to do otherwise; he is not so intimately acquainted with their value as a salesman would be, and he cannot therefore make so much of his cattle himself as he could by putting them into the hands of a cattle salesman.

7696. I quite agree with you, but the point I

was aiming at was this, whether the people in Ireland were not consigning to Manchester salesmen direct, instead of consigning to Liverpool salesmen?—No, they are not; there are no salesmen in Manchester except Liverpool salesmen, who have places of business in Liverpool and in Dublin.

7697. Where do the Irish fat cattle go to?—A great deal of them go to towns where they are consumed, being purchased by dealers who go over from England direct to the producer.

7698. Your opinion is that the Irish farmers are not doing so wisely in selling their cattle to these people upon the spot as though they were to consign them to cattle salesmen in Liverpool?—That is a cattle salesman's view of the question.

7699. I presume you would not have much objection to a fat animal labouring under pleuropneumonia being exposed in a fat cattle market? I would have a very great objection to it.

7700. Why?—Because in order to arrive at the fat cattle market, the animal must have been in a place where it was likely to come into contact with other cattle.

7701. Where?—For instance, if an animal was moved in a railway truck where there were other cattle, or if it was put into a yard waiting to be shipped where there were other cattle, I think it might possibly affect those cattle; and I suppose you are aware that upon a steamboat there is no distinction made in the loading of fat or lean cattle. Fat cattle might be placed in direct contiguity with lean cattle, and a fat beast affected with pleuro-pneumonia might possibly affect a lean animal.

7702. Then you would specially object to the removal of an animal going to market more than to the fact of its being in the market?—I would allow an animal to be moved for immediate slaughter under restrictions, and I would make it the interest of every owner who has pleuro-pneumonia upon his land to give information and to get rid of the disease.

7703. But so far, after it gets into the fat cattle market, it is not of so much importance to the public, assuming that it got there?—Assuming that it got there it may not be of so very much importance.

7704. Assuming that being in a fat cattle market, it is to be slaughtered within a week?—Within less than a week generally.

7705. Could you suggest any practical measure which would satisfy the public, for ensuring that all cattle exhibited in the fat cattle market were slaughtered within a limited time?—I should prefer to give the matter a little consideration. I might, at a future time, be prepared to make such a suggestion, but I should not, without taking a little time to consider it, like to answer that question.

7706. There is nothing at present in any fat cattle market with which we are acquainted, to prevent an animal labouring under foot and mouth disease being taken out of the market and being sold just as a store animal?—There is. Besides the law (57 sec. of Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act) which prohibits the exposure for sale of any animal affected with disease. The Liverpool market is a Chartered market; there is an Act of Parliament for it, and there is a bye-law which directly prohibits the offering for sale of any animal as a store animal.

7707. But assuming that I have an animal about half or three quarters fat, that bye-law

would not prevent me from exhibiting it on the Liverpool market?—Unless it came under the knowledge of the manager of the fat cattle market at Liverpool it would not. You can evade any law.

7708. Supposing I call it a fat animal?—You can evade any law.

7709. There is nothing to prevent any fat animal being taken out of the market as a store animal?—Except the bye-law. The bye-law says you shall not take out and exhibit for sale in the market any animal for store purposes.

7710. But I am talking about the man who buys?—I say that it would be breaking the regulations. What is laid down for sellers must, by implication, be laid down for buyers also.

7711. There could be no penalty inflicted upon a person buying half a dozen cattle in the Liverpool fat cattle market, and taking them to his farm and keeping them for three months?—I apprehend not.

7712. It would be advantageous, leaving out of account the risk of disease, for a man occasionally to buy such cattle and keep them for a month?—I do not think that the question is directly applicable to Liverpool, for this reason: Liverpool is not anywhere near a grazing district, and it is not frequented by any people, as a rule, except people who come to purchase fat cattle for immediate slaughter.

7713. I understand, as a rule, it is a store cattle market, but there is nothing to prevent exceptional cases from taking place?—Nothing that I can tell you, except that bye-law.

7714. And there is nothing to prevent the farmers from doing so, leaving out of account the risk that they run?—Nothing that I know of.

7715. Now, referring to the case of your position in Ireland, speaking of store cattle, you expressed the opinion, I think, the other day, that there should be no restriction upon animals affected with foot and mouth disease, even although they were store animals, do you think it would be fair or right, or a proper arrangement in the public interest, to allow a man whose cattle are labouring under or affected with foot and mouth disease, to take them and expose them in the market?—I am not aware of any one in Ireland who would do such an act, because I look upon the fact of his doing so as being one which would tend directly to injure himself.

7716. Supposing a case of foot and mouth disease appears on a farm say to-day, and the farm is within three miles of the market, do you think the farmer would or would not try to expose the remainder of the cattle in the market the next morning?—I do not think any farmer in Ireland or any store feeder that I am acquainted with would.

7717. Why?—Speaking for myself, if I bought cattle from any person, and those cattle went wrong, and I ascertained, as I would do certainly, if there had been anything upon his land before in the shape of disease, I should never buy from him again, and as far as I am personally concerned, and as far as large cattle graziers and large cattle feeders in Ireland are concerned, I do not think that any man who was in the habit of dealing with them would ever attempt to sell cattle which were in any way affected with disease knowingly.

7718. You think that people in Ireland have a strong feeling that honesty is the best policy?—I am quite sure of it.

7719. Supposing

Mr.
T. Verdon.
29 Mar
1873.

Mr.
T. Verdon.
19 May
1873.

7719. Supposing that such were not the case, the question with which I started is this: do you think it is right that the farmer, if he was foolish enough to do it, should be allowed to expose cattle labouring under foot and mouth disease in the public market?—I do not think that any man who had any interest in his cattle would do so.

7720. That is not an answer to my question; I say if he were foolish enough to do it, it appears to be a proceeding not altogether inconceivable, that some farmers should be foolish enough to wish to get clear of their beasts if they were affected with disease?—No honest man would do it; that is my opinion.

7721. Were you at Ballinasloe Fair last year?—I was.

7722. Did you see foot and mouth disease there?—Yes, I did.

7723. Where did that come from?—I believe I am borne out in my opinion by the largest stock owners in Ireland, that every owner who did send cattle to Ballinasloe believed that when they left home they were perfectly healthy, and unfortunately some of them on the road to Ballinasloe did contract the disease; that was their misfortune not their fault. I do not think that the people who had the misfortune to bring these cattle, and whose misfortune it was to have their cattle affected with the distemper, could have done anything except what they did do, and that was to bring them to the fair and show them there and try to dispose of them.

7724. How far had they to bring them to the Ballinasloe Fair?—The cattle which supply Ballinasloe Fair are fed principally in the province of Connaught, which is a very large district, and some of them would come 60 miles, some of them 15, and some of them 10, just as it might happen.

7725. Were they brought up on the morning of the fair?—No; these cattle that came from a long distance would be driven along the road at the rate of about eight or nine miles per day.

7726. No more?—No; there are no people in the world so careful of their cattle as the stock masters in the west of Ireland in bringing them into the fairs, in order that they may look to the best possible advantage when they arrive there.

7727. Those are the large people?—These are the large people, who mostly frequent Ballinasloe Fair.

7728. Then your theory is that the foot and mouth disease broke out on the road to Ballinasloe Fair?—My belief is that no one sent cattle to the fair knowing that they were affected with foot and mouth distemper.

7729. Then I infer that you would not allow a person to take cattle or any part of his stock amongst which foot and mouth disease existed, and exhibit them in a fair or market?—I would not allow him to do it if I could reasonably prevent it, certainly.

7730. Would you fine a man if the disease appeared amongst his cattle, and if it could be shown that he had diseased animals at home?—I think any man doing so is liable to an action at law. I believe the common law gives you a very effectual remedy at present without any further legislation.

7731. Do you find it an easy thing to recover damages and prove your case?—I never had occasion to prove a case, but there was evidence given before a Committee of the House of Commons as to a case of a similar nature; the case was that of

Malcolmson versus Macdonogh, and in the Blue Book you will find everything connected with that particular case which bears upon the question you ask me.

7732. I did not mean to dispute what is the law of the case, but I was asking you, as a practical man, whether you think it at all easy to bring home a conviction against your seller in a case of foot and mouth disease?—I think I could.

7733. After you had brought the cattle through the market?—If I thought it necessary or desirable if I bought cattle from any one which I believed were not healthy at the time he sold them to me, I do not think I could have much difficulty in establishing a case, and in recovering compensation if I suffered loss.

7734. Take the case of foot and mouth disease; the cattle are brought possibly to the market in railway trucks, and then travelled along the road and appear in the market without any evident appearance of foot and mouth disease upon them; you take them home, and the next day the foot and mouth disease makes its appearance; do you think it would be easy to prove where the animals contracted the disease, or whether they did not contract the disease after they left the seller's premises?—I think it would be most difficult to prove, and therefore if I could not prove it clearly I would have no action.

7735. That was what I was coming to; whether it was an easy matter?—No; that applies to all mercantile concerns; there are a great many things which it is very difficult to prove, which if you could prove, would put you in a very different position.

7736. Then this remedy is a very problematical one?—Precisely so, just the same in all law cases.

7737. And you would apply a penalty against all persons who exhibit animals from an infected herd in the market?—As regards hoof and mouth disease, I take that to be so trivial that I would never think of looking for a remedy or for compensation from a man who sold me cattle affected with foot and mouth disease. If I knew a man to sell me cattle knowingly affected with pleuro-pneumonia, or that I could trace that he knew to be infected, I would go any lengths to take proceedings against him, and I would be quite certain to recover compensation from him.

7738. That is supposing you could prove your case?—I would have no difficulty respecting pleuro-pneumonia; I could find out from general local knowledge and from the man's neighbours, whether there was such a thing existing in the neighbourhood, as Mr. Malcolmson did in the case of Mr. Macdonogh.

7739. Take a case of pleuro-pneumonia: supposing a farmer suspects that pleuro-pneumonia exists in three animals in a herd, and sends them to market, and so gets rid of them, the pleuro-pneumonia remaining latent probably for a fortnight, how would you prove such a case as that against the seller?—If a man was not sure of it, I do not see how he could prove it, but if you could prove that he lost any cattle, or prove that he had any knowledge of it in any way, you could recover; but if you could not prove that he had any knowledge of it, it might be very difficult to proceed against him.

7740. Why would not a farmer expose animals labouring under foot and mouth disease in a market?—Any one who knows anything about foot and mouth disease knows that if the disease

is left to take its course in store stock or fat stock it subsides very quickly, and the only loss that is occasioned is by the removal of cattle when they are so affected. The movement of cattle affected with foot and mouth disease is the greatest evil; it is in this way, the feet become very sore, it is as if you have a small hurt upon your shin; if you stayed quiet for a few days it would go, and no evil results would follow, but if you walked about and took exercise the great probability is that erysipelas or inflammation of some kind might set in, and you would suffer very considerably; it is precisely the same with cattle affected with foot and mouth disease.

7741. You do not think that the disease is at all serious, provided that the cattle are allowed to remain upon the farm?—I do not.

7742. The results of foot and mouth disease vary very considerably, do they not?—Generally they do.

7743. So that one animal may suffer very little, and another animal may suffer very severely?—I have seen cases where you could scarcely perceive it.

7744. And you have seen other cases in which it was considerable?—I have seen other cases in which the disease was severe.

7745. Where the animal would be considerably affected?—I have seen cases where an animal would be considerably affected with it, but not very seriously.

7746. How much would the price be affected in a severe case?—If an animal was a store animal, in my judgment I would not attach any importance to its being affected with the foot and mouth disease. If it was a fat animal it would put back the animal from three weeks to a month, and there would be a loss by that of feeding, which a grazer, as a rule, does not value very highly.

7747. You say that you would not reckon even a severe case of foot and mouth disease upon a store animal of much importance?—No; I would not reckon it of much importance.

7748. How much would you put down as the loss upon that animal?—About 10s.

7749. A good many cattle change hands upon less profit than that, do they not, in Ireland?—I dare say they do.

7750. Perhaps half a crown?—I never buy any cattle from a dealer, and I have very little knowledge of the profit they realise, nor the loss they suffer.

7751. You think that dealers would consider 10s. not a very large profit?—I have no doubt they have sometimes 10s. profit.

7752. And they have sometimes 10s. loss?—I suppose so.

7753. Mr. *Clare Read*.] What is the difference between the regulations in force in the Liverpool Market, and those in the Metropolitan Market?—I am not aware that there is any very special difference in the law as applied to Liverpool and London. I do not know of my own knowledge that there are any special regulations with regard to the Metropolitan Market. I assume that the law applies equally to both places, but the head of the Veterinary Department will answer that question better than I can.

7754. I understood you to say, that in consequence of the restrictions in the Liverpool Market, cattle do not come there in such great numbers as they formerly did, and that the supply comes in larger numbers to London?—I

will endeavour to explain the difference between the law as applied in Liverpool and in the Metropolitan Markets. The law, as applied in Liverpool until a recent period, was this: If cattle were detected in the Liverpool Market (this is until a recent period) affected with foot and mouth disease, no matter how valuable the beasts might be, they were placed in quarantine and detained until the veterinary surgeon who had charge of them pronounced them to be cured. During that time many of these cattle that were fed on grass, and fed on very good land, in consequence of being confined in very close sheds, lost a great deal of their condition, and when they were given up to the owner they were of considerably less value than when they were put into quarantine.

7755. So that in this case they really did suffer something from the foot and mouth disease, although as a rule they do not?—I am giving you the circumstances; they were cattle which had been fed upon the very richest land in Ireland, and were then put into nasty sheds and fed upon hay and water, as they could not get anything else, so that I think it is a very reasonable conclusion to draw that they did suffer a great deal.

7756. How often was that done, and for how long a period?—It was done from the first time the law was put in force, which was on 14th of August 1871, until a regulation was made at the request of a number of people largely interested in the trade by the Privy Council.

7757. Upon the 20th of June 1872, there is an Order which applies to Liverpool, which allows cattle to be taken while suffering under foot and mouth disease, under certain restrictions, to slaughter houses in the borough of Liverpool, so this Order has been in force just 11 months?—This late Order has been in force just 11 months, but the other Order was in force from August until that Order was issued.

7758. Consequently your grievance, that you talk about has not existed during the last 11 months?—It has not existed during the last 11 months.

7759. And notwithstanding all that, the Liverpool market does not recover its numbers?—Any one who has had mercantile experience knows that a trade once diverted from a fixed channel is very difficult to be restored to it, and that is our case in Liverpool.

7760. How did it come to pass that during the cattle plague regulations the Metropolitan Market was closed against all stock except foreigners, and that for a considerable period it was virtually shut up against English cattle?—I apprehend that if you took the returns of cattle (I cannot speak to it as a fact, but it is my belief) exhibited in the Metropolitan Market previous to the rinderpest and since, you will find that the returns of cattle exhibited in the Metropolitan Market at present are considerably less than they were before.

7761. What becomes of the cattle; there are more cattle now than there were then; is it not this, that instead of going to those large markets they go direct to the consumer?—I apprehend that that is so.

7762. For instance, we in Norfolk send our cattle straight away to Manchester, and your district, instead of sending them to London, and thus the cattle are dispersed all over the country?—I take it that that is so.

S s

7763. Is

Mr.
T. Fordon.
19 May
1873.

Mr.
T. Vardon.
19 May
1873

7765. Is there any diminution in the number of fat cattle exported from Ireland?—I should say not.

7766. Do not you think that they are increasing?—Yes, I do.

7767. Are they not sent somewhere to this country?—They are sent somewhere in this country generally.

7768. Have you any decrease in the number of fat cattle that you sell?—Personally we have not, because our case and the case of large cattle salesmen is rather exceptional; there are business arrangements connected with it which I do not presume the Committee would care to hear about, but there are business arrangements connected with the sale of fat cattle, and with the consignments which we receive, which would not affect people in a large way as cattle salesmen.

7769. Do not a great number of salesmen in Manchester and Liverpool go to Dublin and buy their cattle there, and sell them to butchers, instead of bringing them into the Liverpool market?—A great many butchers from Manchester go direct to Dublin, and a great many people in Liverpool also go to Dublin for cattle.

7770. Therefore that may be one reason why there are not so many cattle in the Liverpool market as formerly?—That may be one reason.

7771. The butchers go across frequently and buy them direct?—The butchers go across frequently and buy them.

7772. What is the charge for selling cattle in Liverpool?—In Liverpool and Dublin it is 2½ per cent. upon the gross sale.

7773. Whereas in London it is about 4s. a head?—Yes; but I may observe that 2½ per cent. covets a guarantee. We pay cash the day of the sale, and we frequently sell nine-tenths of the cattle which are given us to sell, on credit.

7774. Do you not know that those terms apply precisely to the London salesmen; that if I send a lot of cattle up here they charge me 4s., even if the animals fetch 33l. or 34l., and they take all the risk?—I know no London salesman who would let any beast go from its stall without being first paid for it.

7775. What would the 2½ per cent. amount to?—Upon 20l. it would be 10s.

7776. I believe the average price of a good bullock would not be less than 23l.?—Yes, that would be 12s. 6d.

7777. Would that beast be sold at the London market upon a commission of 4s.?—It would.

7778. Mr. Barclay.] Does the 2½ per cent. include any other charges?—Nothing beyond commission and guarantee.

7779. Mr. Clare Read.] I suppose you have often diseased cattle left in the parks at Liverpool; that is to say, cattle which take the disease in the parks and cannot be removed?—No, we do not.

7780. Have you never had a case in the Liverpool lairs of cattle falling down with foot and mouth disease?—The lairs in Liverpool are used only by the small cattle dealers. The large salesmen have very extensive parks.

7781. In these parks have you never had a case of foot and mouth disease, where, as I understand, you congregate them there sometimes two or three days before the market?—Yes, occasionally, but not often.

7782. What do you do with them?—They are removed according to the Order in Council. We (and all the large Liverpool salesmen do the

same) employ a veterinary surgeon to come round and inspect the cattle, and any cattle which the veterinary surgeon certifies to be affected with foot and mouth disease are removed in fleets, according to the Order which you have just read, to be slaughtered.

7783. So that you clear the parks from Saturday until about Thursday?—Yes.

7784. Do you think that if there was any diseased stock in those parks there would be sufficient time for them to be cleansed and purified?—Yes, I think there would. There are a great number of parks, and the whole of them are not occupied each week; the grass is always kept very good in them.

7785. I see that in the memorial which you signed and sent to the Right Honourable Chairman you say that scab is a transient disease?—Yes, it is.

7786. Why is it a transient disease?—Because I would consider that any shepherd who would allow his flock to be infected with scab, and to remain so was a worthless servant. Any sheep that I ever met with in the course of my life I could always cure in about a month. I never had a case of scab which lasted more than a month.

7787. That does not make the disease transient, although the cure may be quick. Foot and mouth disease you say is transient because it is soon over without your doing anything, but surely scab, unless cured by proper dressing, will not die out?—But any man who cares anything about his property would at once direct that his sheep be dressed, and if his shepherd could not cure the scab in a fortnight or three weeks or a month, at furthest, the first thing he would do would be to discharge him; it can be cured at an expense of about 3d. per sheep.

7788. I can perfectly understand that the animal can be easily cured, but is that any reason why it should be shown in a market?—I do not think any one with sense would let his sheep come into the market with scab.

7789. Are you not aware that scabby sheep come into the markets in Ireland in great numbers?—I am aware that they come into the markets in the west of Ireland; I have seen scabby sheep frequently in Ballinacree Fair; I have purchased them myself; I might add that I got them for a little loss.

7790. Such an animal might be the means of infecting thousands of other animals?—It might possibly, not probably.

7791. That would be no harm, I suppose?—I do not say so.

7792. Then why do you wish scab disease to be taken out of the Act?—Because the punishment which is inflicted is, I think, a great deal more than is commensurate with the crime, if you may call it so.

7793. We hear that the infliction is a penny a head?—I say that the cure of the disease would cost you a penny or twopence a head, and if you have scabby sheep in the Liverpool market, they have a law to confine them and keep them for three or four weeks until they are cured.

7794. Still I cannot see that you have yet proved to us that the farmers should be permitted to take these scabby sheep into fairs and markets, and infect hundreds of others?—I do not think any sensible man would do so.

7795. There may be stupid men, foolish men, and dishonest ones?—I do not know that there

is any great harm if a man has scabby sheep in bringing them into a market.

7794. You do not think there is?—No.

7795. Do you think there is no harm in infecting other people's sound sheep?—I would not like that to be done to myself.

7796. But you have no objection to have somebody else do it, if it were not done to you?—But I would not object to buy them if I saw them in a fair.

7797. That is because you might get them cheaper, but your neighbour who bought the next lot might pay the full price, and infect his own flock as well?—The first thing anybody ought to do when he gets home after buying sheep should be to dress them.

7798. Why is that?—Because if there is scab latent in the system it will be prevented, and for a very small expense, and the prudent farmer should always insure his flock from being infected.

7799. You mean that scab is so common a disease in Ireland that it is worth any man's while to go to the expense of dressing his sheep?—I mean to say, that any sheep which I buy I always dress when I get them home.

7800. To prevent the disease?—To prevent the scab. I say as a preventive measure; you do not take preventive measures unless you have good reason for doing so.

7801. I think you stated that foot and mouth disease always originated in the east, and went westward, in Ireland?—I did.

7802. Is not the cattle trade in Ireland almost all from the west to the east?—The cattle trade to England, of course, comes from the west.

7803. So, of course, it is in the wake of the cattle trade; the disease never gets into the extreme west district; we have heard here to-day that neither foot and mouth disease, nor pleuro-pneumonia, has ever been in Kerry; I suppose there has been no stock that goes into Kerry, or passes through it?—Kerry is in the west.

7804. And I say that foot and mouth disease has never reached the wilds of Kerry?—I do not know much about the wilds of Kerry.

7805. The transit of stock being principally in Ireland, from the west to the east, that is, towards England, the greatest number of cattle are congregated in the east, at the ports, and there you find foot and mouth disease more prevalent?—The cattle are brought from the west towards the east, and are shipped to England.

7806. And so there are hardly any cattle that go from the east into the extreme districts of the west, you do not find either foot and mouth disease or pleuro-pneumonia are carried into the extreme west?—The largest congregations found of cattle at any one place in Ireland are to be found in the fairs in the west of Ireland.

7807. They all come to the east from the west, do they not?—No; for instance, the gentlemen who feed store cattle, and sell them at Ballinasloe, attend very large fairs, which are held at Bellingh and at other places in the County of Mayo, so that there is a congregation of cattle there.

7808. But when they are congregated in the west, they are kept in the west for a short time, and then they come to the east?—And then they come to the east.

7809. That is the case in England, that where there is no thoroughfare traffic or no importation of cattle, you escape foot and mouth disease and pleuro-pneumonia to a great extent?—There are

plenty of places that I think are not great thoroughfares of cattle in England where you have plenty of pleuro-pneumonia and foot and mouth disease, scab, and everything else.

7810. Take, for example, the extreme west of Wales and the north of Scotland, where there are no cattle passing to and fro, you do not hear of foot and mouth disease and pleuro-pneumonia in those districts?—No, that may be so.

7811. You would not be surprised to hear that we in Norfolk get a great deal of the disease in consequence of cattle coming into our county from all parts of the United Kingdom?—My impression all through is that we get the disease from England; it is the dealers coming over from England who bring the infection with them; and it was from the exportation of calves from England to Ireland that the disease was introduced there at first.

7812. But you have the disease there now, have you not?—Yes, we have the disease there now.

7813. If cattle were to go from England to Ireland, or from Ireland to England, they would in all probability have it in both places all alike?—Yes.

7814. Mr. Dent.] You have not had so much experience in the store trade, have you?—Yes, as large as any man in Ireland.

7815. You do not import store cattle into England, do you?—We buy a great number of store sheep in England, which are fed upon various properties in Ireland.

7816. Have you any experience of the importation of store cattle from Ireland?—I never imported any.

7817. Can you tell us where those poor animals which I see exhibited in Yorkshire come from, because none of the Irish witnesses will acknowledge them?—I believe they come from Tyrone and Donegal.

7818. Will you give us your idea of legislation with respect to the cattle diseases; first, with regard to foot and mouth disease?—I would have no legislation with regard to that.

7819. You would allow animals to be exposed in the market and moved upon roads; and leave the farmers to deal with it themselves?—I would.

7820. With regard to pleuro-pneumonia, what legislation would you suggest with regard to that disease?—I would make very strict regulations with regard to that.

7821. What regulations would you make?—I would inflict a penalty of a considerable amount which would be a deterrent penalty upon any farmer who knowingly brought any animal affected with pleuro-pneumonia into a fair. I would make it a rule that he was bound to declare it as soon as that disease manifested itself in his herd. I would order the herd to be slaughtered, but I would also give him full and perfect compensation for any animal slaughtered.

7822. Would you slaughter the whole herd or only the animals affected?—I would slaughter the animals immediately in contact that were likely to disseminate the infection.

7823. Supposing a man had 50 animals in a field, and they were attacked with pleuro-pneumonia, would you slaughter all the 50?—The first thing I would do would be to slaughter the one that showed the disease, and I would place the others under strict surveillance, and if a number of them manifested the disease I would have the whole of them slaughtered and give the

Mr.
T. Fendos.
—
19 May
1873.

Mr.
T. Fardou.
19 May
1873.

the owner full compensation, because no one will admit that his cattle have the disease, if the disease is to be a personal loss.

7824. Probably you think, like the witness before you, that giving compensation would be no inducement to persons to be careless about the disease?—I am sure it would not.

7825. You would take most stringent measures with regard to rinderpest?—Yes, I would.

7826. How would you deal with the foreign trade; would you allow animals coming from a foreign country, either Spanish or Portuguese cattle, for instance, if they were affected with foot and mouth disease, to be moved all over the country without any hindrance?—Spain and Portugal are unscheduled countries, and cattle coming from those countries, when they come here, are allowed to be treated as English or Irish animals are, and I would continue that regulation. I would allow them to be treated just as if they were English or Irish cattle.

7827. But if they had pleuro-pneumonia, you would slaughter them?—I would slaughter the whole cargo if they were affected when shipped.

7828. And you would deal with all unscheduled countries in the same way?—All unscheduled countries where necessary precautions are taken to protect their own animals.

7829. The scheduled countries are those from which we fear that rinderpest may come?—Scheduled countries are those where rinderpest or diseases that are fatal are known to prevail; for instance, Russia, no cattle ought to be allowed to come into the country from Russia, since they are liable to bring in rinderpest.

7830. Mr. Dedon.] But supposing a cargo of cattle arrives from a scheduled country, and they were found to have foot and mouth disease, what would you do?—A cargo arriving from a scheduled country, must of necessity be slaughtered at the port; if they are sent to London they are landed at Deptford, and they are then slaughtered within a certain number of days.

7831. Would you continue that legislation?—I would keep certain countries scheduled to prevent the importation of fatal diseases.

7832. Mr. *Clare Read*.] Do you consider pleuro-pneumonia a fatal disease?—Very much so.

7833. Are there not a certain number of countries from which we import cattle, in which there is a great loss from pleuro-pneumonia?—I am not aware of that. We import cattle from Spain and Portugal, and I never heard of any case of pleuro-pneumonia occurring amongst those. We sent out and inquired, and we could not find an instance in which disease existed there.

7834. Are you not aware that in the Netherlands, which is an unscheduled country, there is an immense amount of pleuro-pneumonia?—I have nothing to do with the Netherlands; I do not know about it.

7835. But we will suppose that you do know that pleuro-pneumonia was very rife in the Netherlands, what would you do there?—I would place that country in the schedule. I would not import any cattle from those countries in which disease was known to exist.

7836. *Chairman*.] Did I understand you that if there were some affected cattle coming from scheduled countries, you would have them slaughtered?—The law at present, with regard to cattle coming from a scheduled country, is that they must be slaughtered, whether they have the disease or not, within a certain number of days, and I would keep it so.

7837. Mr. *Clare Read*.] And you would extend the schedule to those countries where pleuro-pneumonia existed?—I would extend the schedule to countries where fatal diseases existed, and I call rinderpest one, and pleuro-pneumonia another.

7838. *Chairman*.] You would not extend it to countries where foot and mouth disease existed?—I would not.

Thursday, 22nd May 1873.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mr. James Barclay.
Mr. Jacob Bright.
Mr. Callan.
Mr. Clay.
Mr. Dent.
Mr. William Johnston.
Mr. Kavanagh.

Mr. Lusk.
Mr. Monsell.
Mr. O'Connor.
Mr. Pell.
Mr. Clare Read.
Mr. Ridley.

THE RIGHT HONOURABLE WILLIAM MONSELL, IN THE CHAIR.

Mr. THOMAS VERDON, re-called; and farther Examined.

1839. Mr. Kavanagh.] In your examination on the last day you stated that a higher range of prices prevailed in Liverpool, and the neighbouring markets, than in London; can you give the Committee any instances of that?—I can. I can show you the reports which appear in the recognised organ of the agricultural community, the "Mark Lane Express." I begin with Monday, 28th April, and the reports are published in that journal each evening, and the highest price quoted for prime Scots and shorthorns is 6s. per 8 lbs., that is 3d. per lb., and the same thing prevailed with regard to sheep. These are London quotations for live stock.

1840. Will you just show the difference between the prices charged in the different markets?—Upon the same day a report of the Liverpool Market does not appear here, but Salford Market is quoted, and the quotation is given for best cattle 9½d., that is 3d. difference. The week following, 5th May, the London quotations are for prime Scots and shorthorns 6s. per 8 lbs., that is 9d. per lb., and the same day in Liverpool the quotation is 9½d.; all through the northern country the same high range of prices prevailed. At Salford, upon that day, the quotation is for best beasts 9½d., again making the same difference as between Liverpool and London of ½d. a pound. Then, upon 12th May, the highest quotation in London for prime Scots and shorthorns is 6s. 2d. per 8 lbs., that is 9½d. per lb.; and upon the same day in Liverpool, the quotation for the prime cattle is 9½d. to 10d. per lb., making a difference of ½d. per lb. between London and Liverpool. On 19th May, the London quotation, given in the same newspaper, for the prime Scots and shorthorns, is 6s. 4d., that is 9½d. per lb.; in Liverpool the quotation is 9½d. to 10d. per lb., and in Salford the quotations for the same day is 10d. I think that clearly shows that a higher range of prices has prevailed in Liverpool than in London, and in other markets which are quoted.

1841. Chairman.] And now prevails?—Yes, and has for some time back; I could give that for a long period.

1842. Mr. Kavanagh.] If you referred to the prices in last Monday's "Times," that would be 0.8s.

farther corroborated?—Yes, but the prices are rapidly rising in London, and I have no doubt that before the autumn they will be as high in London, in consequence of the provincial buyers coming here from elsewhere.

1843. In reference to this rise in price, is it not the fact that one farthing per pound upon an average ox weighing nine score pounds per quarter, or 720 lbs. gross, equal to 90 stones London weight, is equal to 15s.?—Yes.

1844. And ½d. per lb. is equal to 30s.?—Yes, it is.

1845. And ¾d. per lb. is equal to 45s.?—Yes, it is.

1846. And 1d. per lb. is equal to 3l. per head?—Yes.

1847. Therefore a beast weighing 720 lbs. at 9d. per lb., would realize 37 l.?—Yes.

1848. And at 10d. per lb. would realize 30 l.?—Yes.

1849. With regard to that difference in the price obtained in Liverpool or Salford, or even in Birmingham, where there are no cattle salesmen, would not the difference more than pay the 2½ per cent. commission?—It would leave a very handsome profit to the owner of the cattle.

1850. The charge of cattle for railway carriage from Liverpool to London is 11 s. per head, is it not?—Yes, it costs 11 s. to bring an animal either from London to Liverpool, or from Liverpool to London.

1851. And the companies charge 1 s. a waggon, do they not, for disinfecting and cleansing in addition?—The railway companies always charge 1 s. for disinfecting each cattle truck each time it is used.

1852. Is 2 s. 10 d. about the cost of transit between Liverpool and Salford?—It is for cattle.

1853. Have you not for many years, at certain seasons, sent cattle to London by desire of your customers upon their own account?—Yes, for many years we were in the custom of doing so.

1854. That is about 10 years ago, is it not?—Yes, we have not sent any for the last seven years to London for sale.

1855. In fact, as you stated in your evidence, all the trade is from London towards the north?—All

Mr.
T. Verdon.
—
22 May
1873.

Mr.
T. Verdon.
25 May
1873.

—All the trade now is from London towards the north.

7856. Are there many troops or men-of-war ships in or about Liverpool?—There are a considerable number.

7857. How are they supplied with meat?—The ships are supplied from London by a contractor, and the troops are at present supplied by a contractor who has the contract until the first day of June. This contractor at present supplying the troops resides in Liverpool, but the contract has recently been taken at a very much reduced price from that which it was being served at by a London contractor.

7858. Who is now supplying this meat?—A man of the name of Fraser is at present supplying the contract in Liverpool, and a firm of the name of Henry Ash, Israel & Sons have taken the contract to supply the troops in the northern district.

7859. *Chairman.* Did Mr. Fraser tender, do you know?—He did, and he told me himself that the tender he made was at a very reasonable figure; it was about 10 s. per cwt. over the price that Israel & Sons took the contract at.

7860. Mr. Keworth. Where do these cattle come from; are they delivered dead or alive?—The custom with Mr. Fraser was either to buy the cattle in Liverpool or in Manchester, and he was obliged to deliver those that were for the troops alive at certain places; for instance, the Manchester contractor was obliged to drive in the cattle each morning alive, and they were inspected each morning by the commissary, and a soldier is placed over them to prevent them being removed or changed, and they are slaughtered by the soldiers at the expense of the contractor.

7861. How is it that no local man has undertaken this contract?—Because the prices that the local men could afford to supply the meat at were considerably more than the men residing in London has taken it at; a man residing in London has taken the contract at a price that the local man could not possibly take it at and save himself from loss, without speaking of profit.

7862. Is it fair to ask whether the London contractor has not since asked to be relieved of his contract?—He has endeavoured to sell it, and has offered a considerable sum of money, I am informed by some of the people in Liverpool, to whom he made this offer, to take the contracts off his hands.

7863. Is it not the fact that so long as you recollect, in fact during all your term of business, the charge for commission in Liverpool for selling stock has been the same?—It is.

7864. And that the charge in London has been the same?—It has been the same as long as I can recollect, and as long as I have been in business.

7865. Therefore it would be an unfair deduction to make from your evidence, that the fact of the supply of meat having decreased in Liverpool Market was due to the high commission, as compared with London?—That would be a very unreasonable deduction.

7866. Is it not the fact that under your system the purchaser pays no commission?—The purchaser never pays any commission.

7867. Is it not also the fact that the market charges in Liverpool are less than elsewhere?—They are less than in any market in the United Kingdom, and the accommodation is better.

7868. And you are still of opinion that had it

not been for the market restrictions in Liverpool, there would have been there now as large a market as there is in London?—I believe that we were progressing at such a rate that had we not been trammelled by restrictions we would have had nearly as large a market in Liverpool as the Metropolitan Market.

7869. Could you give the Committee any statements or statistics with reference to the increase of the market since the year 1851?—Yes, I can; I have a vouched return which is signed by the chairman of the Cattle Market Company.

7870. Will you give the Committee the statement?—In 1851 the number of cattle and sheep exhibited in the Liverpool market was 42,000 cattle, and 319,000 sheep. In the year 1841 the number was 58,000 cattle and 277,000 sheep. In the year 1851 the number of cattle exhibited in the Liverpool market was 115,000 cattle, and 347,000 sheep. In the year 1861 the number of cattle exhibited in the Liverpool market was 166,000 cattle, and 452,000 sheep and lambs. In the year 1871 (in this decade the cattle plague appeared, and restrictions were imposed) the number of cattle exhibited for sale was 106,000, and 453,000 sheep and lambs. I have also prepared an accurate return, vouched from the Cattle Market Company's books of the number of cattle exhibited in the Liverpool Cattle Market from the year 1869 down to the 31st March in the present year, each year compared, and for the sake of contrast there are the same number of weeks in each year. (*The same was handed in. Vide Appendix.*)

7871. Will you give the Committee a statement of that return?—In the year 1869 the number of cattle exhibited was 128,608, and in the year 1870 the number was pretty much the same; 126,000 in round numbers. In the year 1871, which was the first year in which the Act of 1869 was applied to Liverpool, the number was 106,000, and in the year 1872, the number had fallen off to 99,000. The returns for the 1st June in the years 1870 and 1871 are very similar in the numbers shown each week. Upon the 15th August, in the year 1870, the number of cattle was 2,400, not upon the 14th August 1871 it was 2,370. The 14th August 1871 was the day that the restrictions were put in force in the Stanley Market for the first time. Upon the 21st August the number had fallen to 1,586. Upon the 28th August, which was the second week of the restrictions, the number had fallen to 995, and on the 11th September the number was 1,306, and so on, showing a decreased number to the extent of 30,000 cattle for the year 1871, compared with 1870.

7872. Are there any other returns that you wish to hand in?—There is another return of the number of cattle, sheep, and lambs slaughtered and consumed within nine miles of the Liverpool Exchange, in the year 1872. The number amounted to 91,497 cattle, and 345,676 sheep, so that there is a very small proportion more than the actual requirements exhibited for sale in the Liverpool Stanley Market, which used to be the great exposition market for all the north of England. (*The same was handed in. Vide Appendix.*)

7873. There is little more exhibited for sale in that market than Liverpool consumes itself?—Scarcely any at all.

7874. Consequently other towns have to look elsewhere?

elsewhere?—Other towns have to look elsewhere. I have here a return of the gross number of every kind and description of cattle imported into Liverpool, which I was asked to supply. (The same was handed in. Vide Appendix.)

7875. Some question was asked you with reference to the authenticity of this requisition which was presented to the mayor of the borough of Liverpool, signed by a great many gentlemen?—Mr. Dent asked me what was the date of it; he said there was no date to the document, and the date is supplied now by the town clerk and vouched.

7876. Will you hand that in?—I will. (The same was handed in. Vide Appendix.)

7877. Have you any more statistics with regard to the market at Liverpool, which you wish to put in?—I have put in all those papers.

7878. As far as your firm are concerned in Liverpool, you are not at all desirous of obtaining a monopoly of the cattle trade there, are you?—Certainly not.

7879. It is your direct interest to make the market as large as possible?—It is, decidedly.

7880. In fact, the larger the market is, the greater your chance of permanent and continued prosperity?—The larger the number of people attending the market, and competing with us, the greater our chance of success.

7881. You think that where there is a fair field of competition, a man who has industry, ability, and capital, will always be more prosperous than a man possessing the same advantages would be without competition?—I am quite sure of it.

7882. Is it not the fact that your business and the business of most of the leading salesmen has increased since the restrictions were put in force?—The business of the firm with which I am connected has very considerably increased, and my impression is that the business of all the large salesmen has considerably increased.

7883. Therefore it can be no interested object which actuates you in recommending that these restrictions should be removed?—Certainly not.

7884. You think that the tendency of these very high prices has been to cause more or less of a monopoly, and to prevent men of small or moderate means continuing in the butchering trade?—I do.

7885. What is your idea with reference to the prospect of the prices of meat; do you think that we are likely to have a higher range of prices?—I think, from every information which I can collect, and from every information which has come into my possession, we are likely to have a higher range of prices, for a considerable period, than we have had for very many years.

7886. And you think that from this high range of prices, and the distress which it occasions, it will be very likely that we may expect disagreeable manifestations in several of the Lancashire and Yorkshire towns?—From the feeling which I know exists in Lancashire and Yorkshire towns, I quite expect to see very disagreeable demonstrations against people who are selling cattle, hockens, and people of that kind; we have had such demonstrations there already.

7887. In fact, upon the whole, it is your opinion that those restrictions have had very much to do with enhancing the price of meat?—I believe it.

7888. Now I should like to ask you some questions with regard to Mr. Jenkins's report, 488.

which has been very widely circulated in the country, and which I think has not been, upon the whole, very favourable to Ireland any more than his evidence; I will refer you to the different paragraphs in the book, and ask your opinion upon them; with reference to his statement at page 191, in 1872, he speaks as to the severity of the disease, does he not?—Yes, he does.

7889. In your opinion, is the statement there correct?—The statement that he makes is, "I refer to the increased liability of stock to recurrent attacks. This fact is quite patent to those who go about the country and ascertain the experience of the agricultural community. Veterinary surgeons are doubtless right when they state that this recurrence was well known in 1839 and 1840; but the difference is this, that whereas in those days an animal which had had the disease two or three times might have been considered worthy of a place in the British Museum or the Royal Veterinary College, now such instances are probably well known to the majority of English farmers."

7890. You do not agree with that statement?—Not at all.

7891. Is it not the fact that Mr. O. C. L. Murphy, of Brecon, Llanecor, county Merthyr, who feeds more than 1,000 cattle each year, and stall-feeding 150 cattle, has assured you that he never saw a case of a heast being attacked twice?—He told me that he never saw it, and could not find out an instance of it within his knowledge, although he had taken very great trouble to do so.

7892. Mr. *Clare Road*.] When did Mr. Murphy say so?—Within the last 10 days; I quite admit that I have seen it myself. I have seen it twice myself in the same animal, but I am only giving you the experience of a very large feeder who never has seen its recurrence, but I do not dispute the fact that it may occasionally affect an animal twice.

7893. Mr. *Kewenagh*.] You do not understand that Mr. Murphy states that it is impossible for a heast to get the disease twice?—No, he only states it as his experience, that he never knew a case or could find a case, although he took great pains to ascertain it, where an animal had had the disease twice. His opinion was that so far as his experience went it could not happen.

7894. I merely put that to show that Mr. Jenkins is in error when he states that the fact that animals have had the disease two or three times is very commonly known?—It is my experience, and I have had a very large experience, very much larger than most men have had, that I have met very few instances where a case has occurred twice.

7895. Mr. *Clare Road*.] Mr. Jenkins, I think, says that a recurrence of the disease in the same animals has only occurred very recently indeed?—No, he does not say that; he says that "veterinary surgeons are doubtless right when they say that this recurrence was well known in 1839 and 1840." Those are Mr. Jenkins's words.

7896. Mr. *Kewenagh*.] Mr. Jenkins says that it is a common thing?—Yes, he says that it is a well-known thing.

7897. Now with regard to page 199, in the second paragraph, Mr. Jenkins there advocates the right of entry; are you of opinion that the right of entry into premises for the purpose of discovering foot and mouth disease would be objectionable?

Mr.
T. Forden.
12 May
1873.

Mr.
T. Vernon,
21 May
1873.

jectionable?—I think it would be most objectionable, and a very likely means to propagate disease.

7898. Do you consider that the mode of examination conducted by the police is objectionable?—Highly so.

7899. And you are of opinion that more harm than good is done by this sort of examination?—I am, decidedly of that opinion.

7900. Are you aware that the right of entry does exist in Ireland?—Yes, I am, and I am also aware that it is very seldom exercised; it does not exist in England.

7901. *Chairman.* Does the right of entry do harm in Ireland?—It is very seldom exercised; but if it were generally exercised, and policemen went about from farm to farm, they would be the means of carrying infection with them, and thereby propagating disease.

7902. *Mr. Keenan.* You are of opinion that this sort of examination which is carried on by the police tends rather to spread the disease than otherwise?—Yes, because you cannot by any means get policemen, or ordinary people of that kind, to take the proper precautions to disinfect themselves.

7903. How is inspection carried on in the Liverpool market?—The inspection which is carried on in the Liverpool market, is conducted in this way: two veterinary surgeons enter the market, they are accompanied by five or six policemen, they go round from lot to lot through the market, and open the mouths of any cattle that they suspect, and very frequently they open the mouths of cattle which are not at all affected. Occasionally they do examine cattle which are infected; the means which they have of disinfecting themselves I do not consider at all sufficient; if those animals which were healthy before their examination, were to be kept alive and moved about, there is no doubt that these animals which they examined would be very materially affected with foot and mouth disease.

7904. Now with regard to Ireland, Mr. Jenkins, in page 201, states that "the disease prevails near all the ports, more particularly Dublin, Drogheda, and Waterford;" do you agree with him in that?—I do.

7905. You believe that the reason that disease prevails there is because it is brought there from England?—Yes, I do.

7906. Have you not seen English calves in some of the fairs; Mullingar, for instance?—I was in Mullingar at the fair upon two occasions this year, and I took the trouble to count the number of calves each time that I was there, and to ask the people where they brought them from, and they all told me that they were English calves. In one fair there were 60 odd, and in another fair there were 40 odd.

7907. And that, you think, accounts sufficiently for the fact that the disease prevails, in the east first, and that it then goes to the west, according as the cattle come from a diseased country?—Yes, precisely.

7908. Now to go on to page 202, in the second paragraph; do you agree with what Mr. Jenkins says with reference to the disregard of the law by railway companies in disinfecting their trucks?—I quite agree with him there. I believe that the railway companies in Ireland do not disinfect their trucks as they ought to do.

7909. In your judgment, would washing with water be a sufficient disinfecting for railway

trucks?—If you could insure that the railway trucks were thoroughly washed with water, it would be a very good disinfectant, particularly if there was a little carbolic acid mixed with the water.

7910. You think that that would be a more reasonable way of disinfecting than to oblige the railway companies to whitewash the trucks?—Yes, I believe it would. The reason that whitewash is used is that it can be proved whether they are disinfected or not by any casual observer. I believe that that is the only object of requesting whitewash to be used.

7911. Now with regard to the fairs in Ireland, you have attended Mullingar Fair, have you not, two or three times a year for the last 15 years?—I have a great many times; I have attended that fair twice this year, and for a great many years before I have attended that fair.

7912. Have you seen any unhealthy beasts offered for sale there?—I never saw one.

7913. With regard to Ballinasloe Fair, Mr. Jenkins refers to it on page 205 of his book; do you consider that that is a very fine fair ground?—It is perhaps the finest in the world.

7914. Do you think that it could be improved by the erection of a whole lot of pens through it?—Not at all.

7915. Do you think it would be possible to put pens there?—It would be quite impossible.

7916. Through the whole of Garbally Park?—Garbally Park is one of the finest domains in Ireland, and the sheep fair is held within the park, and I should think that it would be very detrimental to the appearance of Garbally Park, and that it would be useless to erect a number of sheep pens there.

7917. Is it not the fact that Irish cattle being sent to fairs are taken very good care of, and are very carefully driven by experienced men from their homes?—It is the fact.

7918. Have you known instances of gentlemen, owners of cattle, walking with their cattle themselves?—You could hardly imagine the great attention and care that the stockmen in the West of Ireland pay to their cattle in moving them to a fair. I have seen a gentleman possessed of a very large property, I may mention his name, Mr. Shaw Taylor, he was the high sheriff of one of the western counties, and I met him once upon the road, and he told me that he had been three days walking along with his cattle, going to Ballinasloe; I should think that his property was worth from 10,000 l. to 15,000 l. a year.

7919. Cattle are seldom driven more than eight or 10 miles a day, I believe?—Rarely, more than eight or nine miles.

7920. And are very well taken care of at the end of the journey, are they not?—As well as it is possible to take care of cattle.

7921. I do not think your experience agrees with that of Mr. Jenkins?—It is in direct opposition to Mr. Jenkins's statement.

7922. *Mr. Clare Read.* What was Mr. Jenkins's statement?—He assumes that cattle are not fed and watered before they are brought to Ballinasloe.

7923. The cattle are always lodged in parks, are they not?—They are lodged in the very best parks in the neighbourhood of Ballinasloe, where there is plenty of grass and water given to them.

7924. *Mr. Barclay.* How are the animals fed while walking to the fair?—Fields are taken on each

each side of the road, and I have seen as many as 12 carts following 100 cattle, all laden with hay, for their consumption during the journey.

1933. Mr. Keaneygh.] You have of course attended a good many English fairs as well?—Yes, I have very often.

1936. Would Ballinacree Fair contrast favourably with the English fairs?—The English fairs would contrast very unfavourably with Ballinacree.

1937. After cattle are purchased, is not the same great care taken of them for the owner's sake, that they are re-parked and watered, and get plenty of hay?—Of course; I never went to Ballinacree Fair to purchase cattle that I had not made arrangements long beforehand to have yokes taken, and to have all the means of attending to the cattle on the road home. This is the general custom.

1938. Therefore you do not agree with Mr. Jenkins's statement about the treatment of cattle?—Certainly not.

1939. Now let me refer you to a case of disease reported in his book among Mr. Rafferty's cattle; I believe it is referred to by the Honourable Mr. Maury, who was the inspector; do you know the gentleman who sold these cattle and the gentleman who bought them?—I know Mr. Rafferty very well, and I know Mr. Samuel Garrett, a relative of the gentleman you examined here; it was he who purchased the cattle.

1940. Did you see the same cattle in Ballinacree Fair in January?—Yes.

1941. Were they not purchased by Mr. Connors, who sold them in January at £ 1. 17 s. 6 d. over the October prices?—Mr. Connors purchased those cattle a few days after the October Ballinacree Fair from Mr. Rafferty, and he kept them until January, and then resold them in January at £ 1. 17 s. 6 d. increase to Mr. Garrett again.

1942. Mr. Bursley.] What was the price of them?—£ 16 was the price of them in Ballinacree in the first October fair, I think.

1943. Mr. Clere Read.] £ 1. 17. 6. profit for three months' keep?—Yes, but three months' keep is not of so much value as you would imagine, because the land of these people is lying idle after the Ballinacree Fair, and a man loses nothing much by keeping the cattle three months.

1944. Mr. Keaneygh.] Do you know Mr. Burton Perce?—Yes I do, very well.

1945. Had he 270 hecats in the last Ballinacree Fair?—I believe so.

1946. With 70 men in charge of them?—He had 70 men in charge of them; I know that, as a fact, there were 70 men in charge of the 270 cattle.

1947. I was asking you about the difference between English and Irish fairs, and how they contrast with each other; you have been at Maaham Fair, have you not?—I have been there very often.

1948. I believe you bought 600 lambs there?—I bought 600 lambs last September in Maaham Fair.

1949. Did you see any inspection there?—Not there.

1940. Do you recollect of whom you bought the lambs?—I do not perfectly. I bought one lot from a gentleman of the name of Chapman, and I bought the others of a gentleman of the O.S.

name of Robinson; both of them were gentlemen, who live upon their own property in Yorkshire.

1941. You say there was no inspection there?—I say no; there were plenty of lambs affected with foot and mouth disease exhibited for sale in the fair.

1942. Mr. Pell.] Maaham is one of the largest sheep and lamb fairs in Great Britain, is it not?—It is one of the largest in England, but not in Great Britain; there are larger fairs in Scotland, Falkirk, Inverness, and Lanark, for instance.

1943. Mr. Ridgely.] Were there foot and mouth disease among the lambs you bought?—About half of them had it when they arrived in Liverpool.

1944. Where did you move them to?—I moved them to places that I took to keep them on, and I have never sent them over to Ireland yet, in consequence of the infection, and they are in the parks now.

1945. Whereabouts?—Twelve miles off from me, on grass, for which I pay myself, although I have plenty of grass at Liverpool. I put them into those places so that it might not be said that I was the means of bringing foot and mouth disease into Ireland.

1946. Was that your own doing?—It was quite my own doing. They got well of the disease very shortly, but I would not remove them.

1947. Chairmen.] You imposed a restriction upon yourself?—Certainly, it was for self-preservation.

1948. Therefore you rather approve of restrictions?—But I would impose the restrictions myself if there was in my judgment any occasion to do so.

1949. Mr. Clere Read.] Were those sheep diseased when you bought them?—About one-half were when they got home.

1950. When you bought them were they suffering from foot and mouth disease?—I observed about 30 of them, when I bought them, had it; and the day after, on inspecting them when they arrived home, I said to my man, "I think more than half of them have the foot and mouth disease," and he said, "The whole of them will have it before a week, sir."

1951. I suppose you gave something less for them in consequence of their being diseased?—Not a penny.

1952. Mr. Keaneygh.] At page 208 of Mr. Jenkins's evidence, he refers to a blackfaced ewe that was diseased in the fair of Ballinacree; is it not the fact that most of those blackfaced ewes are exported from Scotland?—It is; there are a great number of blackfaced ewes imported and sold in Ballinacree which come from Scotland. We do not encourage the blackfaced breed, and it is not extensively bred in Ireland.

1953. So that it is as likely as not, or more likely, that the disease which appeared in the sheep at Ballinacree came from Scotland?—It is a great deal more than probable.

1954. Now I must refer you to the last paragraph, about a statement in respect to Mr. Russell's cattle; do you consider that a gross fabrication?—It is perfectly inaccurate; there is not one word of truth in the whole of it.

1955. You have some letters which accompanied that statement, which I asked Mr. Jenkins to read, from the sub-constable?—I have.

1956. Mr. Jenkins stated that that document was a very vague one; perhaps you could read

Mr.
T. Ferden.
22 May
1873.

Mr.
T. Fenton.
—
22 May
1873.

to the Committee the letters which accompanied it; I had not them at the time?—I may mention that I went to Mullingar Fair, and I there met Mr. Russell, a gentleman who owns the land, and I saw four or five of the magistrates who reside in that immediate locality. Amongst others, I saw Mr. Richard Steele Featherstonhaugh, of Reek View, Killluhan, and I brought Mr. Russell to him and, in his presence, I asked him, "Have you ever lost any cattle, or have any cattle, during your occupation of these lands, died?" he told me that he had lost none during the last 11 years, not one animal having died on his farm. He told me also that he had had foot and mouth disease upon that farm, but that the cattle were attacked with a very mild form of the disease, and that at the expiration of 14 days he did not think the animals had received any considerable injury.

7957. You have got the letter which accompanied this statement, I believe?—I have. I asked Mr. Russell, "Would you have any objection to write a letter to Mr. Featherstonhaugh and state the case?" and he said, "Not the least;" and I have here a letter from Mr. Featherstonhaugh. The letter is as follows. It is dated 5th May 1873, "In consequence of the conversation we had in the late fair of Mullingar, I think it right to state that I had not as much as one death for the last 12 months in the cattle put on my farm in the county Longford, and that the report which appeared in the papers last October was quite untrue.—Yours faithfully, Thomas Russell."

7958. That corroborates the statement of the sub-constable, which Mr. Jenkins declared was so vague?—I asked five justices of the peace who reside in that locality, and they each of them stated that there was no possible foundation for such a fabrication as that circulated by Mr. Jenkins in the "Journal of the Royal Agricultural Society."

7959. Now if you refer to page 209, I think Mr. Jenkins says there that Ballinacree Fair may be taken as a good starting point from which to trace disease to England, and so on; is it not the fact that not more than 1,500 cattle sold in Ballinacree Fair went to England?—My belief is that that is the case.

7960. Is it not also the fact that more than half that number were fat cattle, that is to say, cattle which went for immediate slaughter?—They were.

7961. You could show that from the returns for Liverpool?—One of the Papers which I have handed in will show that at that particular time there was no material increase.

7962. You do not agree with a statement upon page 210, I believe?—The paragraph is this, "Arriving in Dublin upon the Friday evening, I ascertained that cattle from Ballinacree would probably reach North Wall in a more or less continuous stream during the night and the next day, and as many as possible would be put on board the steamboats timed to leave for the various English ports by the morning and evening tides on Saturday. The probability of their being fed and watered in the receiving yards belonging to the various railway and steamboat companies is, as will presently be seen, very small indeed, except in the yard belonging to an English railway company; you do not agree with the general sense of that paragraph?—No, I know it is not correct.

7963. Now, with regard to Liverpool, Mr. Jenkins makes a good many statements upon page 217. I think he states that among many other things, there are no water troughs upon the landing quays of Liverpool. You must be very well acquainted with the Liverpool Market?—I am.

7964. Could you show the Committee the state of things which existed?—This is a map which you will see is vouched and authenticated as being prepared by the Liverpool Borough Engineer, and all those that are marked there are cattle troughs. (The Map was handed in.)

7965. Mr. Pell.] Is there a competent supply of water in those troughs, or is it only a trough without water?—There is a half-tap to them, and I never yet saw a trough without water in Liverpool.

7966. Mr. Clere Read.] When were they put up?—About 15 or 20 years ago. There is not one trough which has been erected within the last 10 years, and there are at least 20 of them.

7967. What is the length of that portion of the docks at Liverpool which is used for landing cattle?—The Irish steam trade is concentrated from here to here; an occasional steamboat lands there, and consequently there is a water trough there, and occasionally a steamboat lands there (pointing to the Plan). Wherever a steamboat has discharged cattle, or has been in the habit of discharging cattle, the Corporation has created water troughs, and you will see that the concentration is about the docks where the Irish cattle are landed.

7968. There is a pretty good supply of water troughs in that place where the cattle are usually landed?—Yes, there are a great deal more than are used, and more than is required.

7969. Mr. Kewenau.] You consider that the arrangements for landing foreign cattle in Liverpool are satisfactory?—As perfect as anything in the world can be, I think.

7970. Therefore you do not agree with Mr. Jenkins's statement upon that head, upon page 218?—His statement is exceedingly inaccurate; it is perfectly inaccurate.

7971. You know from your own personal knowledge that every statement in that paragraph is inaccurate?—I know it from my own personal knowledge.

7972. Mr. Jenkins, at page 233, states that he was told, I believe, that cattle carried upon deck on a steamer were worth 1*l.* a head more at the end of the voyage than cattle carried in the hold; do you agree with him there?—If I had valuable cattle going by sea; for instance, if I had show cattle, I would write specially desiring that they should not be placed upon deck. I have shown this paragraph to a great number of the largest cattle feeders in Ireland who ship cattle to England, and they say that they never heard such a statement made by a sane man.

7973. You do not agree with his further statement about the crowded state of the hold and the bad ventilation, and a lot of chemical terms which he uses?—All his statements are very inaccurate respecting the steamers.

7974. In page 241, he refers to the general question of fairs in Ireland; you would be of opinion that fewer fairs might be an advantage?—I agree with Mr. Jenkins in this, that a less number of fairs would be desirable.

7975. But you think that it would be a ridiculous rule to make, that all cattle fairs and markets

markets in Ireland should be subdivided by pens of different sizes?—It would be perfectly impracticable.

7976. Mr. Jenkins goes on, in page 249, with a number of recommendations which I do not think I need trouble the Committee with?—In some of them, I may say, I agree with him perfectly, but some of these recommendations I entirely dissent from.

7977. Do you agree with him with reference to recommendation No. 1?—I do not.

7978. I must refer once more to Cheshire; do you know anything about the Hundred of Wirral; is that in Cheshire?—It is.

7979. Have you seen any report from the Agricultural Society there?—I have seen a report which was written by a Mr. Burnham, who was secretary of the Wirral Agricultural Association, and in that report he gives a very laudable account of the farming condition, and the general agricultural economy of the hundred.

7980. In Mr. Burnham's report upon the Hundred of Wirral, he bears out your general evidence with reference to the county of Chester?—He does, and he refers to an article which appeared in the Journal of the Royal Agricultural Society of England to corroborate his own statement. I cannot give you the dates, but I can get the book and show it to the Committee, if it is required.

7981. You have read Professor Baldwin's evidence, have you not?—Yes, I have.

7982. Will you state to the Committee what is your general opinion with regard to the recommendations and statements which he makes?—I entirely disagree with the majority of his recommendations.

7983. There are one or two points in Professor Ferguson's evidence which I think you have something to say about, and the first one, I think, is No. 4861 in the evidence of the 1st of May?—Professor Ferguson is asked, "Are there no veterinary inspectors in the provinces of Ireland?" And his answer to that is, "There are only 60 veterinary surgeons regularly graduated (meaning by that members of the Royal Veterinary College) in the whole of Ireland, and the majority of those are in the large towns, particularly those towns which are thickly inhabited, and which are seaport towns; of those there are 10 or 12 in Dublin, and there are a number more in Belfast, but speaking from my knowledge, according to the last Veterinary College list, I do not believe that there is a single graduated veterinary surgeon in the whole province of Connaught."

7984. Have you any remark to make with reference to that statement?—I believe that in the province of Connaught the cattle are singularly healthy, and that they can get on very well without any veterinary surgeons.

7985. Mr. Deat.] That accounts for their being no necessity for veterinary surgeons?—No doubt.

7986. Mr. Kavanagh.] One of the witnesses, a Mr. Fisher, in answer to Question 5190, refers to the length of time after which he believes that traces of the disease could be discovered?—Mr. Fisher is asked, "Could you, or any other farmer, tell whether a least had had the disease by the touch, after it has recovered?" And his answer was, "I could tell myself for some weeks afterwards, having been a very close observer of it 0.58.

for so many years." If by that he means to imply that he could tell the disease within a fortnight or 21 days, it would agree with my experience, but if the animal has recovered at the end of a month, I do not think, particularly in store cattle, you could know that the animal had had the disease, except in exceptional cases.

7987. Mr. Poll.] Are you talking of horned cattle?—I am talking of horned cattle.

7988. Not of sheep?—The same thing, I think, applies to sheep; it depends generally upon circumstances; some of them have it worse than others.

7989. Mr. Kavanagh.] I think at Question No. 6000, in Mr. Jenkins's evidence, he is referring to the recommendation that he makes about how Irish fairs should be carried on, and he quotes Holland as an example; you know something about Holland, do you not?—I have been there.

7990. Do you consider that there is any analogy between Holland and Ireland?—No, none whatever. The question is this: "Then in the case of a place where there is no green, there would be a difficulty?" And his answer was, "In the case of a place where there is no green, where the fair is held in the street, you might adopt the Dutch plan, which is simply having posts and rails with a series of rings at proper distances; that would have the same effect; it would prevent a diseased animal rushing all round the fair and infecting a large number of others." You could not possibly apply that in Ireland; the cattle would pull up any of these temporary posts.

7991. You do not think it would be possible to tie up a quantity of wild store cattle?—No, it would be quite impossible.

7992. I will merely ask you, are you not now, in the evidence which you have given, expressing the views of nine-tenths of the leading members of the grazing community?—I believe that I am expressing the opinions of nine-tenths of the gentlemen engaged in feeding cattle in Ireland.

7993. Mr. Clare Bead.] When do you say the restrictions were put in force in the Liverpool market?—The first application is marked upon the Return with double lines.

7994. There was another Order issued which came into force upon the 1st of July 1873, by which cattle might be removed?—Yes, you will see that marked; it has rather improved since then.

7995. Since August 1871, when you say there were some heasts stopped, were there any sheep stopped?—There were sheep stopped; they examined all the sheep very carefully; a gentleman from Scotland, a Mr. Gihson, had 10 or 12 sheep taken upon that particular day, as being affected with scab.

7996. But not stopped on account of foot and mouth disease?—No, they were stopped as being affected with scab.

7997. Can you in any way account for the wonderful reduction in the number of sheep; I think we have not had that put in evidence?—Mr. Deat, I think, has very satisfactorily accounted for it himself in some of his letters, which he has written upon that special subject, and I think that clearly proves the correctness of his argument.

7998. Where do the sheep come from?—The breeding of sheep has been discontinued.

7999. Where?—In Ireland, and I think in Scotland.

Mr.
T. Verdon.
—
29 May
1873.

Mr.
T. Vernon.
—
22 May
1873.

Scotland. You will see that the number of sheep has been gradually decreasing.

8000. Mr. Dent.] I am not aware of having written more than one letter upon the subject?—I saw one letter of yours in the "Times," in which you called attention to the farmers not continuing to breed sheep.

8001. I think my letter was specially about cattle rather than sheep?—Then I was under a misapprehension.

8002. Chairman.] What is the reason given by Mr. Dent, as you suppose?—Mr. Dent says that people have given up breeding sheep, and he calls the attention of the public to the fact, and he says that the farmers are injuring themselves greatly by that course, and I quite agree with him.

8003. Mr. Clure Read.] You perhaps did not see my reply to Mr. Dent's letter, in which I contradicted Mr. Dent?—I did not.

8004. You do not support my view of the story?—I did not see it.

8005. There is a very remarkable reduction in the number of sheep; you have directed our attention to the reduction in the number of boats, but the numbers of sheep are these: In 1868 the number is 606,000, in 1870 it is 503,000, in 1871 it is 453,000, and in 1872, during the chief part of which year the restrictions of which you complain had been in a great measure removed, the number was only 359,000?—I believe that less people in Ireland, and it is from Ireland that that supply chiefly comes, are engaged in breeding sheep, and I think if you look at the Return of the number of sheep imported, you will find that there is a considerable diminution.

8006. But it is rather important that although you show a reduction in the number of cattle exhibited in the Liverpool market, yet there has been a considerable increase in the number of cattle exported from Ireland into Liverpool?—That is what we complain of, that owing to restrictions we cannot offer them for sale in Liverpool.

8007. Why do they go?—They used to stay in Liverpool, and until these restrictions were put in force Liverpool was the great exportation market of the north of England, and these cattle are devoted to other places where the restrictions are not so strictly enforced as they are in Liverpool.

8008. Then the English people have the benefit of this larger supply, notwithstanding the limited number that come into Liverpool?—They have the benefit of a large supply of store cattle. I do not think that the number of fat cattle exported from Ireland has at all increased in proportion to the number of store cattle exported from Ireland.

8009. I suppose the Irish farmers find it is more profitable to sell store than fat cattle?—If they were allowed to sell fat cattle without any restriction they would not, but they are allowed to sell store cattle without any restriction. This is not as it should be.

8010. Have not the English farmers exactly the same restrictions in the Liverpool market as the Irish farmers?—There are no English farmers there. I do not believe that in the many years I have attended the Liverpool market I ever saw a hundred cattle that were fed in England sold in Liverpool.

8011. Mr. Peck.] Have you seen no fat cows?—No.

8012. Mr. Clure Read.] What is the difference between the restrictions which now exist in the Metropolitan Market and in Liverpool; is it not just this, that you are allowed to take your cattle away to private slaughter-houses in Liverpool, while if they are diseased in the Metropolitan market you cannot?—At present it is so, but for a year it was not so, and that year has done irreparable injury to Liverpool market.

8013. I see from your Return there is still a sort of gradual diminution in the amount of cattle and sheep which have been shown in Liverpool during this last four years?—I endeavored to explain to the Committee, as well as I could, that trade once diverted from a particular channel it is very difficult to restore it. The restriction, as these Returns clearly show, did divert the trade, and it takes some time before it returns. When the restrictions are removed our trade will return.

8014. You do not think that the extra expenses in Liverpool had anything to do with the increase?—In the early part of my examination Mr. Kavanaugh went very fully into the matter, and you will see that there is a complete answer to that.

8015. Is there any more dead meat imported into Liverpool now than there was?—No.

8016. You know that there is considerably more imported into London?—I know that, but I think that the importation of dead meat into Liverpool is nil almost. There is a Return of the animals which are slaughtered in Liverpool, which I have just in, and there is also a Return of the unwholesome meat that was exhibited for sale in Liverpool which has been seized. There is a very specific Return in this report compiled by the sanitary officers of the borough of Liverpool (prefacing the same), and if the Committee wish to ask me any questions with regard to that I should be happy to answer them. There is a considerable quantity of meat which has been seized. I made inquiries where that came from, and I was told that it was principally Cheshire meat; over 100,000 lbs. weight in 1872.

8017. Mr. Barclay.] I think you intimated, in the course of your examination, that the black-faced ewe which was exhibited at Ballinacree came from Scotland; how do you know that it came from Scotland?—It is quite as likely that it did come from Scotland as that it did not.

8018. What would be the length of the journey from Scotland to Ballinacree Fair?—I should say four days.

8019. Do you think that that animal came in four days?—It would only take 20 hours to come to Dublin, and then allowing considerable time for delay, it could come in less time than four days.

8020. What is the length of the period of incubation of foot and mouth disease?—About 20 or 24, or 26 hours, as the case may be.

8021. Is not that pretty conclusive evidence that, if that black-faced ewe had foot and mouth disease, it had not foot and mouth disease when it left Scotland?—No, because Mr. Jenkins said that it was so well developed that it was worthy to be photographed, so that it was not of recent occurrence.

8022. But I thought you did not accept Mr. Jenkins as an authority?—Very likely he was mistaken; he probably did not know much about it.

8023. Therefore,

8023. Therefore, after all, your insinuation about the black-faced ewe coming from Scotland was rather gratuitous?—I only take it as it was stated.

8024. Mr. Ridley.] Do you know if there are any store cattle coming from the Liverpool market which go into Northumberland?—We have a bye-law which we endeavour to enforce as rigidly as possible, which prevents any store cattle being offered for sale in the Liverpool market.

8025. Is there no separate store cattle market in Liverpool?—None at all; I never knew of any store cattle within my knowledge being sold in the Liverpool cattle market.

8026. Are there many store cattle which come through Liverpool?—An enormous number.

8027. Do you happen to know where most of them go?—They go to Market Harborough and Leicester, and to places in that direction, along the Manchester, Sheffield, and Lincolnshire, and Great Northern Railways; those are the principal places which they go to.

8028. You think that there are not many of them find their way to the Newcastle market, for instance?—I do not think that any person bringing cattle to Newcastle would ever bring them to Liverpool.

8029. Mr. Peck.] With regard to the effect of foot and mouth disease, is your experience such as to lead you to believe that the effect of the foot and mouth disease in sheep will pass away in the course of a few weeks?—My own experience is this, that if you drive sheep affected with foot and mouth disease along the road for any distance, you may retard the recovery of these sheep for almost any period; but if you take them upon your own park and they are not troubled with and not disturbed, they may recover in two or three weeks.

8030. Have you made any observation about sheep which have never been moved off a farm, and have you observed how long they have been before they have shaken off the effects of the disease?—I can give you a practical instance of that. I bought ewes in Banagher Fair, in the month of September last year, and after they arrived home they all became affected with the foot and mouth disease. They were quite well, and took the run about the 20th of October.

8031. Should you be surprised to hear that that is very contrary to my experience as a sheep breeder, and who never buy any sheep except the tape?—I am only giving you my experience.

8032. You stated that you bought some lambs at Mutham Fair, and that some 30 of these were affected with foot and mouth disease when you bought them?—Certainly.

8033. Are there no inspectors there?—I did not see one; there may have been plenty of inspectors, but I am giving you my experience, and I did not see one, and I did not hear of one being there.

8034. Were not your drovers more concerned about the presence of the police than of the inspectors? I suppose you had to take these sheep over a road and over a railroad?—They were driven down to the railway station, which is at Ripon, and were put into a railway truck, and taken away and brought to Liverpool.

8035. That was done in open violation of the statute, was not it?—That was done as everybody else did it.

8036. You were more fortunate in the absence

of policemen than in the absence of inspectors?—I am telling you of my experience of English fairs.

8037. And this evidence goes to show that the disease is imported into Ireland to a larger extent than it is exported from Ireland into England?—Decidedly. I know that cattle after their arrival in this country frequently contract the disease, and then it is said that they have brought it with them.

8038. Is it not a fair deduction to say that those who purchase cattle for Irish people, and buy them diseased in this very inconscientious manner, are likely to introduce the disease into Ireland?—I do not understand the question.

8039. If you bought cattle for Ireland, having the disease in England when you bought them, and then move them into Ireland, is it not natural to suppose that the result of such a reckless course would be to introduce the disease into Ireland?—I have not sent any of these animals into Ireland. I bought them with the disease, but I thought that it would be highly imprudent to move them, and at very great expense to myself I took a number of packs and kept them there, and they are there yet.

8040. So they have not gone to Ireland?—I have not moved them; not one of them has yet been sent to Ireland.

8041. Mr. Callan.] With regard to Mr. Jenkins's assertions, you have frequently crossed the Channel and seen the cattle conveyed in the Drogheda, Dundalk, and Dublin steamers?—Very frequently; 30 or 40 times each year.

8042. Have you seen the assertions in this pamphlet of Mr. Jenkins, circulated at the expense and by the authority, I believe, of the Royal Agricultural Society of England (producing the Report)?—I have seen the pamphlet, but at whose expense it is circulated I do not know.

8043. It is circulated in the Journal of the Royal Agricultural Society?—It was there that I saw it.

8044. That pamphlet contains grave charges with regard to the steamers engaged in the Irish cattle trade?—Yes.

8045. It is circulated with the sanction of the Royal Agricultural Society, and published by them?—It states that it is the Journal of the Royal Agricultural Society.

8046. With respect to all the assertions in Mr. Jenkins's book with regard to the Irish steamers, is there one single particle of foundation for them?—There is one which there is some slight foundation for, and only one, and that one is, that I think it is possible they might exercise a little more care in cleansing and disinfecting the steamers than they do. I have put that in as one of the answers to the queries which I had given from the Royal Dublin Society.

8047. But not with regard to whitewashing?—No, I think there is no necessity for whitewashing. I do not think that the whitewashing does any harm to the ships, but that is a matter for their opinion, not mine.

8048. Mr. Chas. Read.] You do not disprove or contradict Mr. Jenkins's statements with regard to the state of the railway trucks?—No, I said distinctly in evidence that he was perfectly correct about the railway trucks.

8049. Mr. Callan.] And equally incorrect with regard to the steamers?—And generally incorrect with regard to the steamers.

Mr.
T. Verscho,
22 May
1873.

8050. Mr. Barclay.] Will you tell the Committee how the disinfection of steamers might be improved?—If they took very great care to wash the holds with water in which there was a fair amount of carbolic acid, and if they took care to rub the stanchions and other parts with dry cloths, I think you could not possibly have a more perfect disinfection.

8051. Was that done before, or were the steamers at all cleaned out sufficiently before the Order in Council came into force?—They were cleaned out tolerably well, but not quite so well as it was desirable they should be. I have known instances of them in a hurry taking cattle in without taking the trouble of cleansing and disinfecting the vessels, but not often; in fact, I might say that that occurred very rarely.

8052. Mr. Caffes.] So rarely that it attracted your attention?—So rarely that it attracted my attention, and I may say that I am in the habit of seeing the cattle discharged from the steamers; I inspect them myself very carefully, and if I saw cattle coming out in a dirty state from the steamers, I would write to complain of it, and I have taken the trouble to find out how many times I have complained in the last two years, and I think I have done so only two or three times.

8053. Mr. Barclay.] Do you speak of the loading of cattle again at Liverpool into the steamers without cleaning them out?—No; I say that I have seen a steamer arrive at Liverpool from Ireland, discharge her cattle, and sail away out of the port of Liverpool without disinfecting or cleansing; it is possible that they may have done it upon the voyage; I could not say that, but generally, in fact I may say always, as soon as they discharge the cattle, they wash the steamer,

clean out the manure, and prepare the vessel to receive a cargo of goods; but I have seen a vessel come in, discharge her cattle, and sail away without any delay.

8054. Did she load goods?—No, she went back to Ireland for another cargo of cattle and sheep.

8055. There was nothing to prevent the steam company from cleaning out the vessel upon the return voyage, or upon the arrival at the Irish port?—Nothing whatever if they wished to do so.

8056. They may have done so?—They may have done so.

8057. Mr. Caffes.] Are you aware that they did not do so?—No, I do not say so. I think it is likely they did do so.

8058. You have only complained twice in three years that the steamers were not properly cleansed?—I wrote two official letters to the directors of some steam packet companies, complaining of the way in which the cattle were delivered.

8059. Are you aware that the yearly dispatch of steamers from the ports of Waterford, Dundalk, and Drogheda, is 2,000 or 3,000?—I believe so.

8060. So that out of that large number of voyages, you have only had two cases in which you complained?—That is my experience; but I had not cattle each voyage.

8061. Mr. Clive Read.] You did not send cattle all those 2,000 or 3,000 times, did you?—I did not, of course. I give it as my experience that I have only complained twice out of all the cattle I have received, and I have received a very large number consigned to our firm for sale.

MR. DENT TOOK THE CHAIR.

MR. RICHARD WALSH, called in; and Examined.

Mr.
R. Walsh.

8062. Chairman.] You are a Cattle Salesman in Dublin, I believe?—I am a cattle salesman and a large landowner, and grazer and occupier besides.

8063. In what county in Ireland do you own land?—In the county of Dublin and in the county of Meath.

8064. Your trade is principally in fat cattle in Dublin, I believe?—It is.

8065. Do you send fat cattle over to England?—Very rarely; not on my own account.

8066. Do you on anybody's account?—If my clients were not satisfied with the price I could get for them in Dublin, I would send them over to England.

8067. Are you of opinion that the present restrictions imposed by the law upon the trade in cattle should be maintained?—I would rather see foot and mouth disease out of the Act.

8068. Altogether?—Yes, as far as the interior of Ireland is concerned.

8069. What alteration or amendment would you recommend should be made in the law?—I would recommend that we should be left free in Ireland to do as we liked with regard to our own animals, as far as foot and mouth disease and scab in sheep went; we would be best pleased with that.

8070. You would put no restriction upon the

movement of animals affected with foot and mouth disease or scab?—I would not.

8071. You would leave it entirely to the agriculturist himself to take steps to prevent such diseases?—I would.

8072. Would you allow such animals to be driven into a fair, or driven along a public road?—I do not think that any stockowner in Ireland who knew his business, or was of any respectability, would attempt to drive his cattle when they were affected with foot and mouth disease.

8073. Are there not many stockowners in Ireland, just as there are in England, who are perfectly reckless about taking diseased animals into a fair or market, if they can get a price for them?—I do not think that they could get a price for them, because we do not think any animal is fit to be moved when suffering from foot and mouth disease.

8074. You do not think scab of much importance, do you?—No; I make it a rule, that if there is a speck of scab to be found amongst my sheep, there is instant dismissal for the shepherd.

8075. You would not object to sheep being exposed in a market affected with scab?—No, I think not.

8076. Why not?—Because I think scab of very trivial consequence. I make it a rule upon all

all my farms, and for all my friends who do business with me, that all sheep when they arrive upon the farm must be dressed.

8077. That shows that there is a great prevalence of scab, when you find it necessary to dress all sheep when you buy them, does it not?—No; there is a great deal of tick in sheep, and this kills them, and leaves the sheep in a much more comfortable state.

8078. But we, in England, dress our sheep about weaning time, and then again in the autumn?—That is the reason that I would dress every sheep when it comes into my possession, because I am not quite sure that they have got that dressing before or not.

8079. Will the dressing that will kill the tick cure the scab?—A dressing that will cure the scab will kill the tick.

8080. I asked you the other way; but what I understand you to say is, that you would leave foot and mouth disease and scab to be dealt with by the farmers, and not to be meddled with or interfered with by Government authority?—I would.

8081. What measures would you recommend should be adopted with regard to pleuro-pneumonia?—I would recommend the affected cattle to be slaughtered.

8082. Would you recommend that with regard to animals in contact?—I would not recommend that.

8083. I suppose you would declare a farm or field an infected district where there had been a case of pleuro-pneumonia, and not allow an animal to be moved out of it, except for immediate slaughter?—I would not.

8084. No doubt you would carry out the most stringent measures with regard to rinderpest?—I would.

8085. Of course, any legislation which takes place must be legislation for Great Britain as well as for Ireland, I imagine?—Yes, it should be.

8086. Therefore, how would you deal with cases of foreign importation; first of all, with respect to scabby sheep, and animals affected with foot and mouth disease, coming from foreign countries?—We have no importation of foreign cattle into Ireland, except fat Spanish cattle, so that we are altogether an exporting country, with that exception.

8087. How would you deal with a cargo of Spanish beasts which arrived with one or two animals affected with foot and mouth disease; would you allow them to be taken into the market and dealt with in the same way as Irish or English cattle?—I would, if it were only foot and mouth disease.

8088. And the same if it were scabby sheep?—Yes.

8089. And in the case of a cargo of foreign animals, with one or two animals affected with pleuro-pneumonia, how would you deal with them?—I would have the whole cargo sold for slaughter.

8090. Whether they were store or fat beasts?—I cannot give any information with respect to store cattle.

8091. But as I understand, you consider the less legislation there is upon these milder diseases the better?—I do. You asked me just now if I thought the farmers would drive their cattle to fairs and markets if they were affected with foot and mouth disease, and I said that I thought

they would not. I can give you two instances which occurred in last October. One case was that of Mr. Flanagan, of Roscommon, who is very well known to have the very best cattle that there are in Ireland, and he came to speak to me the day before the last fair of Ballinasloe. I have been in the habit of buying his cattle, I think, for at least 18 years out of the last 20. Once Mr. Read got a lot from him, and Mr. Garnett also, but I think I have had his cattle for 18 years out of the last 20, except upon those two occasions. Mr. Flanagan told me that he had observed one beast affected with foot and mouth disease the day he was leaving home, and he then determined not to send any cattle or sheep to Ballinasloe Fair; and he told me that he would take it as a favour if I would leave myself open to buy his stock, which numbered 110 heifers and 300 sheep, when they recovered, if I would go to his farm; and I said I would do so; and I said, I supposed there was very little fear of our not agreeing, as we had so often bargained together, and he said, "I will promise you it shall not be my fault if you come to me."

8092. A man dealing in first class animals like that would not think of sending them to fairs?—But these are store animals.

8093. There may be first class store as well as first class fat animals; we look upon it in England that the best store animals we get are Irish animals, but when we constantly see animals undoubtedly affected with foot and mouth disease brought into the markets in England, we cannot but think that the farmers would do the same in Ireland?—There is this difference, that you seldom get cattle from the breeders; they are bought in Ireland by the dealers for you, generally speaking.

8094. Are you speaking of the Irish cattle which come into England?—I am speaking of Irish cattle which come into England.

8095. And then getting into the hands of these Irish dealers, they are not so careful about sending them diseased into the markets as the farmers would be?—No, they are not, because they are in fact obliged to get the cattle off their hands as quickly as they can.

8096. And they do not care to whom they pass the disease so long as they can get the cattle off their hands?—I think that their object is to dispose of their cattle as soon as possible.

8097. Could you offer any recommendation for the improvement of the cattle trade as between England and Ireland, to make us feel more certain of getting sound animals from Ireland, seeing that the English grazier is most anxious now, and considers it of the greatest value to get good animals from Ireland?—I think that any man of standing would be very glad to see you English gentlemen come over to Irish fairs and buy direct, as we Irish graziers do.

8098. Without the intervention of middlemen?—Quite so.

8099. The trade has gone very much into the hands of middlemen, has it not?—The trade was always in the hands of middlemen; it is quite legitimate, I think, for fat cattle dealers to come to the Irish markets and bring those animals here.

8100. I have asked all the Irish witnesses from what part of Ireland do the wretched cattle which we see in Yorkshire come, and they will none of them acknowledge them?—Numbers of them come from Kerry, and some come from

Mr.
R. Walsh.
—
22 May
1873.

Mr.
E. Walsh
22 May
1873.

Cork, and a great many of them come from the north of Ireland, and the northern part of Mayo; those are the counties which they come from principally.

8101. Mr. *Clare Read*.] You are aware that very frequently cattle start from Ireland, we will say from Ballinacree, in a perfectly healthy condition, and that by the time they arrive at the east of England they are affected with foot and mouth disease?—I am quite aware that cattle have left Ireland in a perfectly healthy state; and I have known them to be affected, or at least some friends of mine have told me that they were affected, upon their arrival in England the next morning; and I can strengthen that by saying that I have frequently bought cattle in a perfectly sound state one day, and found them affected with the disease the day afterwards.

8102. The animals catch the disease in the transit somehow or other, do they not?—They do.

8103. You would not buy either sheep or cattle affected with foot and mouth disease in fairs, would you?—If I had to take them any distance to walk them I would not.

8104. If you had to walk them 10 miles?—If I had a farm close by the train I would not object to it so much; it is the walking that increases the fever.

8105. Would you object to walking the animals 10 miles?—Yes, very much, or to the half of that distance.

8106. You would not agree with Mr. Verdon, who spoke of some sheep, 30 of which were affected with foot and mouth disease when he bought them, and he drove them 10 miles to a railway station?—But lambs are very light, and they can travel better when they are affected with foot and mouth disease than cattle can.

8107. Do not lambs suffer very much more from foot and mouth disease than older sheep?—No, I do not think they do.

8108. Do not lambs have the disease in their mouth, which older sheep do not?—No, the older sheep have a sore mouth as well.

8109. My experience is that lambs of late years have had the disease developed in their mouth, whereas I never saw that in old sheep?—I have seen it in old sheep; I have seen the blisters in their mouths.

8110. Now, with regard to pleuro-pneumonia, if we took stringent means to eradicate that disease by compulsory slaughter, you would have compensation paid to the farmers?—Of course I would.

8111. Supposing we should get rid of pleuro-pneumonia what precautions would you take against its re-importation; would you have all those countries in which pleuro-pneumonia existed (take for instance Holland) put into the *Scheldale*, and have the cattle coming from those countries killed at the water side?—If we were thoroughly rid of the disease I think it would be very desirable to do so.

8112. And that if we do once get rid of pleuro-pneumonia, we ought to take some more stringent precautions to keep it out?—I think we should be perfectly justified in preventing its recurrence.

8113. The time of the incubation is so long in the case of pleuro-pneumonia that detention for 12 hours at the port of landing is a mere farce, is it not?—I think that inspection has totally failed in my own country.

8114. What is your opinion with reference to the state of the cattle steamers between England

and Ireland?—I went about half a dozen times to look over the steamers, and I thought they were in a very good condition.

8115. What have you to say with regard to the lairs and landing places?—I do not know anything about the landing places in Liverpool.

8116. And with regard to the wharves where they are embarked at Dublin; what have you to say to them?—I think they are very deficient indeed.

8117. You think that the lairage is deficient?—There are some very good fields and lairs near the North Wall, but I think the yards were in a very filthy state as far as I saw them.

8118. Mr. *Messell*.] Is not the North Wall itself in a very filthy state?—Yes, part of it.

8119. And the lairage round about the North Wall, where you see cattle herded in great numbers before they are embarked in Ireland, are hardly lairs at all?—If you mean the yards and the sheds around the yards, I think they are in a very wretched state; but there are some little parks and sheds which are not connected with any railway company, but belong to individuals, and I think these are very well kept.

8120. Mr. *Clare Read*.] Do you not think it probable that if infected cattle were put into those yards, and no precaution taken to disinfect them, they would be very likely to infect the next lot that came there?—If you ask me what causes foot and mouth disease, I can give no reason for it; I have had it come in a most mysterious way, and I have had it stop in a most mysterious way.

8121. But you have no doubt that it is a highly infectious and contagious disease?—I suppose it is contagious, but I have had so many instances of cattle being put into the same railway truck, and one lot taken out five miles away from another lot, and one lot not taking the disease at all, and the other lot having it the next morning, so that it has puzzled me completely.

8122. But you never traced the cattle which escaped sufficiently long to know whether they had the disease or not?—Yes, often; they are cattle of my own breeding.

8123. But not cattle of your own rearing?—I have known cattle of my own rearing, on my own farm, which have never had the disease, although the disease was there, and they were in contact with the cattle which had it.

8124. Do you mean individual cattle or whole lots of cattle?—Individual cattle. I do not call 20 a lot; that is the most I rear.

8125. There are some animals which escape the disease, just as there are some human beings who escape scarlet fever or other epidemics?—There are.

8126. What state are the railway trucks in, as a rule?—The trucks are not well cleaned at all; but I think the worst thing we have to complain of is the very great delay that there is in the transit of cattle when once the railway companies get them into their possession. I think that is a very great hardship for the cattle owners.

8127. Is there not sometimes very great difficulty in getting cattle away from Ballinacree?—Naturally it would be very hard to guard against that. I do not blame the company for that, but I blame the company for not sending forward a train when it is loaded, and there is a vast deal of time wasted upon the road, which I think should not be the case at all.

8128. Is

Mr.
R. Wolfe.
22 May
1873.

8128. Is there much delay in the junctions?—We have not so many junctions in Ireland as you have here, but there is a great deal of unnecessary delay at the stations. I do not see why they should keep cattle waiting at them four or five hours.

8129. I suppose Mr. Flanagan's instance was not the only instance of foot and mouth disease breaking out just before a fair?—I do not know that, but a Mr. Brown, of Galway, of whom I have heard, said, the week before Ballinasloe Fair, that he had not got foot and mouth disease, but that it was coming into the cattle; he is rather a nervous man; he was rather frightened lest his cattle should take the disease in the Fair of Ballinasloe, and he asked me if I would go down and buy them upon the land, and I fixed a day and went down, and he told me that the disease had appeared upon one farm, and he said, "There are 700 sheep upon my farm, which I am quite prepared to sell you; they are quite safe," and I bought those sheep. The fair was 10 days afterwards at that time; it was, as well as I remember, the 25th of September. He said he would run the risk, and see whether those cattle took the disease or not, and if they did, to ask me after the fair to go and buy them when they were well. The disease did not come until after the fair, and he sent 80 bullocks, and 90 heifers which I bought, to the fair, and Mr. Gerrard bought the 80 bullocks in the Fair of Ballinasloe. The heifers had not apparently any disease when I bought them.

8130. But they had afterwards?—Yes.

8131. Are you of opinion that Ballinasloe Fair should not be held in consequence of the prevalence of foot and mouth disease in the neighbourhood?—I think it would have been desirable to postpone the fair last October, as the disease was so prevalent in the country, till the disease got over.

8132. Notwithstanding that, you would have no precaution taken against foot and mouth disease?—No, I would not.

8133. And no sort of restrictions?—I would leave it to the good sense of people to do what they thought was best for them; but if my private individual opinion was given, I should say it would have been best to have postponed the fair when the disease was so prevalent last year.

8134. Mr. Berkeley.] Scab in sheep is caused by carelessness upon the part of the owner of the sheep, is it not?—I think that the removal of the sheep in September and October, driving the sheep to the fairs, and cooling and sweating again, day after day, will produce scab, although they are perfectly healthy and free when they leave the farm.

8135. Will that produce it suddenly?—No, it will break out in about a week or 10 days.

8136. Scabby sheep are occasionally shown in the market, are they not?—Yes.

8137. Those sheep must have the scab before leaving home?—Yes, and some of them very badly.

8138. Nevertheless, the owners do exhibit them?—Yes.

8139. I suppose the foot and mouth disease breaks out sometimes amongst dealers' stock after the market?—It must, and I am quite sure it does.

8140. They drive these animals along the high ways, and exhibit them in other fairs?—Dealers

drive cattle very little in Ireland now, as a rule.

8141. What do they do with them?—They put them in the train from place to place.

8142. But you have to move them from the trains to the fairs and markets, and to the shipping places of the steamers?—Yes, of course you have.

8143. Do the dealers sometimes exhibit them in the fairs?—Not the large dealers.

8144. I am speaking of the small dealers?—The small dealers may buy cattle at one fair and bring them to another.

8145. Do you think it quite right and proper that these small dealers should be allowed to exhibit cattle affected with foot and mouth disease at small fairs?—I have never seen cattle affected with foot and mouth disease except at the two last fairs of Ballinasloe.

8146. What do the dealers do with the foot and mouth diseased cattle that they have?—The principal dealers bring the cattle to both England and Scotland.

8147. That is the small dealers?—The small dealers bring them, as I say, from fair to fair, but I have never seen nor known of any one knowledge that a dealer having a lot of cattle affected with foot and mouth disease exhibited them, nor do I know a case in which a dealer got the foot and mouth disease into his small lot of cattle.

8148. Take the statement to be this, that Irish dealers do bring those cattle across to Scotland, and bring them about from fair to fair until they contract foot and mouth disease; would you think it desirable to allow them to exhibit them in fairs and markets?—I am not giving my opinion as to what I would do in your country, but as to what I would do in my own country. I would say, let the interior of the country be left entirely to the farmers and owners of the land; do what you like at the ports.

8149. Do you think it a question of justice or fairness that those dealers should be allowed in this country to exhibit cattle in a market which they know to be labouring under foot and mouth disease?—If the English or Scotch people object to it, I would not allow it.

8150. Do you think the English or Scotch people ought to have an objection to it?—I have heard that it is not so much the English or Scotch farmers who are opposed to it, but that it is the veterinary surgeons who are in favour of restrictions in England.

8151. You are assuming that the English farmers are very much of your own opinion, and have very little objection to foot and mouth disease?—I have been told so, but I do not know of my own knowledge.

8152. Mr. Caffery.] Is not Connaught the principal rearing place for stock in Ireland?—Yes, it is.

8153. Are you acquainted with all the large breeders in the province?—I am.

8154. Leinster is a great province for fattening, is it not?—Yes, it is.

8155. And you are acquainted with all the principal stockmasters in Leinster?—Yes.

8156. You have spoken with them upon the subject?—I have.

8157. Do they agree with you in the evidence you have given?—Generally I think they do.

8158. You are in favour of the removing of cattle, and in favour of non-restriction, with regard to foot and mouth diseased cattle in Ireland, U v and

Mr.
R. Walsh.
22 May
1873.

and of leaving them to be dealt with according to the wishes of those interested in the trade of Ireland?—Yes.

8159. Are you in favour of leaving it to England to legislate for itself?—Yes, I am.

8160. Do you think it would be sufficient, if there is to be inspection, to have that inspection at the port of embarkation?—Yes, I do.

8161. Do you think that a fully qualified person at the port of embarkation could prevent those cattle, in which disease has become developed, from being shipped?—I think he could.

8162. The inspection lying in a narrow compass would be more effectual than the inspection by the police, which has been spoken of, in country districts?—I do not know what the police could do with cattle removed to the ports of embarkation at all.

8163. Do you think that inspection would be a sufficient safeguard to prevent the exportation of disease, where it had become developed?—Where it had become developed, but I have not much faith in inspection.

8164. I am referring to cases where it had developed in transit from the interior?—Yes.

8165. *Chairman.* Would you have different legislation for cattle diseases in England and in Ireland?—If I were asked my own opinion I would not.

8166. I rather understood from your answer to the last honourable Member that you would rather wish to deal with certain diseases, as the Irish farmers wished, irrespective of the wishes of the English or Scotch agriculturists?—What I meant was that it would be only justice to consult their wishes; if they wish for restrictions in England I do not see why they should not have them.

8167. But supposing that in England the agriculturists wished to have restrictions put upon the movement of stock affected with disease in England, and that similar restrictions were not carried out in Ireland, the English farmers might possibly say, We must treat Irish animals as foreign animals, and slaughter all animals affected at the port of embarkation as we do with foreign animals?—Certainly, that might be so.

8168. I suppose you would prefer a uniform system of legislation for the two countries to any other system?—Yes, I should.

8169. *Mr. Colman.* You do not apprehend the difficulty which the honourable Chairman has raised?—No, I do not.

8170. *Mr. Clare Read.* Would it not be possible if you had free trade in foot and mouth disease in Ireland, that we should insist upon the quarantine with regard to Irish cattle coming here?—I think quarantine would ruin the Irish trade altogether.

8171. Then it would be much better and cheaper to have a uniform legislation, and treat

Ireland as a portion of the United Kingdom rather than as separate from it?—I have given you my answer that I do not think that restrictions can in any way stop the progress of foot and mouth disease; I think they have not done so hitherto.

8172. Does the cattle market in Dublin increase or diminish in its numbers?—The number has very much increased of late years.

8173. How much has it increased within the last two or three years?—It has increased one quarter in the last three years and very close to double in the last 15 years.

8174. Is that for consumption in Ireland, or for exportation to England?—It has increased in both respects very much.

8175. Is that market for fat or for store cattle?—For fat cattle.

8176. *Chairman.* The export of fat cattle from Ireland into England is an increasing trade, is it not?—Yes, it is.

8177. And if the cattle have not gone to Liverpool, they have gone somewhere else?—Yes.

8178. *Mr. Barclay.* Do dealers from the interior of England come over to Dublin?—Yes, in great numbers; the principal places that cattle are sent to from Dublin are Manchester, Liverpool, Sheffield, Wakefield, Newcastle, Birmingham, Leeds, and the Pottery country.

8179. *Mr. Clare Read.* Do not the butchers, or the dealers from the different towns you have mentioned, come over to Dublin and take the cattle straight away to their own places?—Not the butchers; but the dealers do.

8180. Instead of going to Liverpool, as they formerly did?—No, a large number of cattle go by Liverpool to the dealers.

8181. Is it not an increasing trade for dealers to come from Manchester, Salford, Sheffield, and all the towns in the Pottery districts, direct to you, to buy cattle from you, and take them straight to those markets?—It is.

8182. Rather than to buy them at the Liverpool market, as they used to do?—They are more numerous now than they were.

8183. So that the Liverpool loss may possibly be your gain?—I think it has something to do with the Holyhead trade; they have a very direct route to go by Holyhead by the north of England.

8184. *Mr. Barclay.* The dealers prefer the cattle going round by Holyhead as compared with going by Liverpool, and standing in the Liverpool market?—Yes.

8185. Are those cattle in the Dublin market consigned to salesmen in the Dublin market, or do the farmers come with them?—They are all consigned.

8186. *Chairman.* Is there any other point which you wish to bring before the Committee?—No, I think not.

Monday, 9th June 1878.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mr. James Barclay.
Mr. Jacob Bright.
Mr. Clay.
Mr. Dent.
Mr. William Edward Forster.
Mr. Kavanagh.

Mr. O'Connor.
Mr. Pell.
Mr. Clare Read.
Mr. Bidley.
Mr. Tipping.

THE RIGHT HONOURABLE WILLIAM EDWARD FORSTER, IN THE CHAIR.

Mr. JOHN ALGERNON CLARKE, called in; and Examined.

8187. Mr. Clare Read.] You are a Farmer in Lincolnshire, I believe?—Yes, I am.

8188. And Secretary to the Central Chamber of Agriculture?—I am.

8189. You were present, were you not, when the Report of the Contagious Diseases (Animals) Committee was adopted and amended by the Central Chamber of Agriculture?—Yes, on February the 4th, of the present year.

8190. Those resolutions have been handed in, and are before this Committee, and I will put a few questions upon them. Can you give the Committee any idea with reference to the number or importance of the representatives who were present on that occasion?—I think about 30 of the chambers were represented upon that occasion out of 54.

8191. What is the whole constituency of the chambers?—There are about 17,000 members at the present time.

8192. Are they distributed almost all over England?—There are four or five counties which have no chambers.

8193. Generally speaking, there is one in each county, is there not?—Generally speaking, there is one in each county, and in several counties there are two or three.

8194. Were those resolutions adopted mostly unanimously, or were there divisions upon some of the minor ones?—There were divisions upon one or two minor points, particularly the clause referring to sheep-pox, which was afterwards agreed to.

8195. First of all the Council consider that the Act has failed to accomplish its object, and then they go on to suggest certain remedies. With regard to the first remedy, "The Council are of opinion, that in dealing with cattle diseases, a uniform action in counties and boroughs should as far as possible be enforced throughout Great Britain." What is the precise meaning of that statement?—Would you allow me to observe, that the whole of these recommendations follow the important declaration in the first paragraph, namely, slaughter or quarantine, so that they are in fact subsidiary considerations which are numbered in the Report.

8196. Will you read that first paragraph?—"The Council consider that the Act has signally failed to accomplish its objects, and that no measures adequate to deal with contagious or infec-

tious diseases can be adopted, until the fresh importation of disease is prevented by the slaughter or quarantine of all foreign animals at the ports of debarkation."

8197. And then, provided that is done, the Council suggests these following recommendations, which are numbered in the Report?—Yes.

8198. Will you give the Committee your ideas upon that point of slaughter or quarantine?—The feeling of the meeting which passed this resolution was that slaughter or quarantine by legislative enactment was necessary on several grounds. One was that inspection is unsafe; animals, for instance, may leave a farm in Holland upon Monday morning, may be shipped from a Dutch port on that Monday night, and may arrive in an English port on Tuesday morning, and be sold in London on Wednesday. As the natural period of incubation of foot and mouth disease is often considerably longer than that time, a mere detention of 12 hours at the port of landing is not sufficient to arrest the entrance of the disease.

8199. Of course, in the case of pleuro-pneumonia, detention is perfectly useless?—It is perfectly useless in the case of pleuro-pneumonia. We think that measures ought to be enforced by law, because the agriculturists represented at that meeting are not satisfied that the discretion to slaughter or to admit animals should be left to the Privy Council.

8200. You mean with regard to scheduling countries?—Scheduling countries, or admitting animals which have been in the same vessels with diseased ones. The agriculturists have not sufficient confidence in the provisions which might from time to time be made. If I may give an instance of the ground of that want of confidence, I would adduce what occurred at the Smithfield Club Show in 1871; about 70 animals in that show were found affected with foot and mouth disease; all those animals were detained and slaughtered in London, but all the rest of the animals in the show, some standing side by side with those diseased animals, were allowed to go down to all parts of the kingdom, just as the owners might choose.

8201. By whose authority?—By Order of the Privy Council.

8202. Was anything said about its being impossible to stamp out disease by internal sanitary measures,

Mr.
J. A. Clarke.
9 June 1878.

Mr.
J. A. Clarke.
9 June 1873.

measures, so long as fresh coningla is imported from abroad?—Yes; the speakers at the meeting represented that it was impossible to stamp out or suppress such a disease as foot and mouth disease, if the seeds of it were continually re-admitted by importations from abroad; and that is my own conviction upon the subject.

8203. I suppose you have had a considerable amount of experience, as a farmer, amongst cattle?—I have had a great many losses by foot and mouth disease, and also from pleuro-pneumonia.

8204. Have you any further observation to make upon these two first sentences of the Report?—No, except that I am not satisfied that the option of slaughtering or quarantine, or the admission of animals berried in the same vessel with diseased animals, should be left to the Privy Council, on the ground that the arrangements at present existing are perfectly unsafe, as, for instance, the position of the Hall foreign cattle market, which has been allowed to remain quite unsafe for its purpose several years after the passing of the Act for the prevention of the introduction of contagious diseases.

8205. Was there any difference of opinion at this large meeting of the Central Chamber of Agriculture, upon the desirability of foreign cattle being killed at waterside markets, or kept in quarantine there?—There was no difference of opinion whatever upon the subject.

8206. Provided that was done, then followed these ten recommendations?—Yes.

8207. And the first is with regard to more uniform action in counties and boroughs?—I understood that recommendation to mean that counties and boroughs should be obliged to follow out the provisions passed by a central authority, and not left entirely to their own discretion, or left as much as they are to their own discretion.

8208. That there should be greater stringency applied to the whole country?—Yes.

8209. And not so much option left to the small local authorities?—That was what was intended.

8210. Was anything said about diminishing the number of local authorities?—I do not remember that there was.

8211. Then with regard to Ireland, I suppose that paragraph which relates to Ireland means that the same regulations which are in force in Great Britain ought to be extended to Ireland?—I understood paragraph 2 to recommend that whatever means are adopted in Great Britain for the repression of disease, should also be followed out in Ireland, and that then the two countries should be treated as one and the same. If that is not done, then restrictions similar to those on foreign importations would be necessary in the case of Irish importations.

8212. Now with regard to the recommendation as to cattle plague and sheep-pox, I think you stated that there was a considerable amount of difference of opinion with reference to the recommendation in regard to sheep-pox; was there any difference of opinion with regard to this recommendation as to cattle plague?—The representatives at the Central Chamber were quite unanimous with regard to cattle plague, and two chambers (I think not more than two) thought the measure unnecessary in the case of sheep-pox, but at a subsequent meeting it was carried by a very large majority that sheep-pox should be included in the same treatment as cattle plague.

8213. The third recommendation, I see, wishes to extend the slaughtering power of the inspectors to animals which are not actually in contact with diseased animals?—The recommendation says "adjacent places"; we did not define the term "adjacent places," we thought it was understood.

8214. That it should be left to the inspectors of the Privy Council, and not to the local inspectors?—To the inspectors of the Privy Council.

8215. I suppose it was considered to be necessary to take more stringent measures for the immediate stamping out of any fresh outbreak of disease?—That paragraph does not contemplate a condition of affairs when the disease is already covering half the country, but it is applicable to the first outbreaks.

8216. Have you any observation to make upon the fourth recommendation?—No, except that it is intended to apply more stringent and effectual treatment to foot and mouth disease, sheep-scab, and glanders. The fourth recommendation also has reference to early outbreaks, and does not contemplate a condition of affairs when the country is full of those diseases.

8217. Then with regard to Clause 5, which is principally with regard to disinfection, what observation have you to make upon that?—That the present regulations for the disinfection of public conveyances are utterly inefficient; we wish for something more effectual to be enacted.

8218. By whose authority?—By the authority of the Privy Council obliging the local authorities to carry them out, I suppose.

8219. It is stated here that "Any vehicle used for the conveyance of any animal which may, within forty-eight hours of its removal from any such vessel, lair, truck, or other vehicle, be found infected with any contagious or infectious disease, should be treated as infected places;" how would the inspector be able to trace the animal after a lapse of 48 hours?—Forty-eight hours were named, but I do not know that there is any particular reason why that exact interval should be fixed; of course it means a couple of days. I do not know how the inspector would trace the animal.

8220. Mr. Dent.] But in a case of that kind you propose that those lairs, trucks, and vessels should be treated as infected places, and that they should be twice disinfected instead of once; therefore it is a very important provision. Supposing animals to come to a market and be removed away again, probably by railway, and then it is found out within 48 hours that they are affected with foot and mouth disease, how are you to trace that to the truck or vessel in which they are brought?—That was intended as the very longest period, but it says, "within forty-eight hours;" it need not necessarily be the whole of that time before a case is discovered, but that a vessel or truck shall be liable to that treatment if the thing were detected; probably it would be very much earlier than 48 hours.

8221. Mr. Clare Read.] The disease might be detected in the course of one hour, I suppose?—It might be, in the course of one hour.

8222. Then comes Resolution No. 6, which suggests the stoppage of fairs and markets for store stock, during the months of June and July, in counties where foot and mouth disease exists; is there much difference of opinion upon that point?—There is not the slightest difference of opinion upon that point except with reference to the

the particular months which should be included, but the balance of opinion is in favour of June and July as the interval when cattle are for the most part in pasture, and the fairs which happen to be held in June and July might be interrupted for that period with less damage to business than at any other period.

8223. This restriction is not supposed to apply to fat stock, is it?—It applies to the movement of all animals whether fat or otherwise, but a licence is provided for, so that any animals could be removed by licence, supposing there were no disease amongst them.

8224. As during the time of the cattle plague?—As during the time of the cattle plague.

8225. Then the 7th Resolution refers to the ventilation of the holds of ships; was there any opinion expressed with regard to the bad ventilation on board ships bringing cattle?—The ventilation of ships was generally condemned. The object of this paragraph is not to recommend the carriage of store animals on deck, because it is believed that at times it would be very detrimental to those animals, but that it would be preferable to bringing store animals which we wish to keep healthy, in the present pestilential and ill-ventilated holds of vessels.

8226. Recommendation 8 says, "That two places of landing should be provided at every port into which cattle are imported;" is that in case one of the landing-places should be an infected place?—That is to give an opportunity for an infected lot being disposed of without interfering with the landing of others.

8227. Clause 9 says, "That with regard to store animals, there should be required a veterinary certificate of health from the port of embarkation, and that, when such animals are landed, such certificate should be endorsed by a duly qualified inspector;" does that apply to Irish stock?—That applies to Irish stock, but it is not intended to apply to Continental cattle, which are provided for by the first paragraph, under the system of slaughter or quarantine.

8228. Are those all the regulations which were proposed to be imposed upon Irish stock, provided that they had the same regulations in Ireland as in England?—And a detention of six hours for animals coming from Ireland, in order to rest them and give them food and water, and perfect the inspection.

8229. Then Clause 10 is not for the purpose of restricting the trade from Ireland in any way, but simply for the purpose of humanity?—On the contrary, I suppose it would benefit the trade by enhancing the value of the animals when they arrived at the market in England.

8230. *Chairman.*] How many chambers are there in connection with your Central Chamber?—Fifty-six.

8231. And what is generally the constitution of those chambers?—They consist of persons who, I suppose, would be described as leading farmers and leading agriculturists; perhaps one-fourth landowners, and the rest tenant farmers.

8232. What constitutes membership of a provincial chamber?—Being elected a member, and paying an annual subscription.

8233. What constitutes being a member of the Central Chamber?—The same; but the Central Chamber is a representative society, to which all the affiliated chambers send representatives.

8234. Can you tell me the number of members of the different chambers?—No, I cannot do that; 0.58.

I can tell you the total; the last return was 17,000 members, both provincial and central.

8235. What is the number of each?—The members of the Central Chambers are under 200; it is a small body, but the main constitution of it is something like that of the Associated Chambers of Commerce; its council consists of members representing the various provincial chambers.

8236. What is the subscription necessary to constitute a man a member of a provincial chamber?—I suppose 10s. or a sovereign, and in some cases it is as low as 5s. a year.

8237. With regard to this report; was it finally agreed to as it stands now, on February the 4th?—Yes, it was.

8238. As regards the first paragraph, I understand you to state that you consider there ought to be a change in the present system with regard to foreign imports, obliging the slaughter or quarantine of all foreign animals at the port of landing?—Yes.

8239. By that, I suppose, you mean the slaughter of all fat stock, and the quarantine of all store stock?—The idea is, instead of attempting to define what is a fat and what is a store animal, the option should be left to the importers.

8240. What length of quarantine should you require?—I believe that a week would be quite sufficient to detect foot and mouth disease, but the balance of opinion amongst the members is for a longer period; 10 days or a fortnight, but my opinion is that a week would be quite sufficient.

8241. I understood you to state that you based your opinion in favour of that resolution upon two or three grounds; one was what you have heard some other gentlemen say, but I think I must ask you from your own experience, upon what experience which you have had yourself do you base that opinion?—The first case I alluded to, was that of the slaughter of certain animals at the Smithfield Club Show.

8242. But your statement refers to the regulations with regard to the import of foreign animals, not with regard to the regulations as to home animals. You have stated that you think the regulations with regard to foreign animals ought to be changed to a very serious extent, and that instead of any animals being allowed to go into the interior they should all be slaughtered unless they were subject to a quarantine of at least a week, and I ask you the grounds upon which you base your recommendation for such change, and you give me, not any experience with regard to foreign import, but with regard to home animals at the Smithfield Club Show. What I want to ask is, upon what facts with regard to foreign animals do you base this recommendation?—I alluded to the fact that animals from Holland can be imported in so short a time as to give no chance of detecting foot and mouth disease, should it exist.

8243. You are aware, no doubt, that such a recommendation would be considered by a large number of persons connected with the importing interest, and also with the consuming interest, as dangerous and unnecessary?—Yes; I am aware of that.

8244. Then you would not be surprised at my asking you for actual facts which would convince you that it is necessary, not for what you think may have happened, or what might happen?—There is the fact, that in 1869 an immense quantity of foot and mouth disease was introduced by the

Mr.
J. A. Clarke.
—
9 June 1873.

Mr.
J. A. Clarke.
9 June 1873.

the freedom of inland movement allowed to animals affected with that disease.

8245. Could you give me any case in which you have reason to believe that that happened? — I was not a witness of any case, but there were many cases reported at the time.

8246. Could you give any cases to the Committee? — I could give cases at Stockton-on-Tees and Newcastle, and other cases.

8247. We shall require to trouble you again to give the particulars; at the present time you have not the particulars before you, I suppose? — I have the particulars, but they are from reports in the newspapers.

8248. I understood you to state that you thought discretion ought not to be left to the Privy Council with regard to the foreign import; do you mean that discretion should not be left with reference to what countries should be scheduled? — I meant that the option should not be left to the Privy Council to rescind that order which condemns animals in the same cargo with affected animals to be slaughtered.

8249. The Privy Council has at this moment the discretion as to what countries it should schedule, and what it should not; you did not mean your remark to apply to that, did you? — Yes, I did; but I meant more than that.

8250. What was the other point which you meant to include? — The discretion to condemn and to slaughter animals in the same cargo with affected animals; as that has now been done by Order, it might, I suppose, be rescinded by Order.

8251. What you object to then is not the mode in which the Privy Council have exercised that discretion, but to the fact that they have that discretion? — I object to the fact of their having that discretion; but of course my objection is based upon the manner in which it has been exercised in past times.

8252. Upon what experience do you base that objection? — The Act of 1869 came into operation on 9th August, I believe; but the Privy Council still allowed animals, for two months after that time, to come inland, when they had been in the same vessel with animals affected with foot and mouth disease.

8253. Then you base your recommendation that the discretion should be taken away, upon the fact that the Privy Council allowed two months to intervene in the case of foot and mouth disease, before they subjected the whole foreign import to this regulation? — That is one reason.

8254. What other reason is there? — Another reason is the discretion exercised in the case of the Smithfield Club Show of 1871 to which I alluded, in which precisely the same policy was followed.

8255. What is your charge as regards the Smithfield Club Show? — Because the Order (and I say the Order because, whether the thing had happened or not, the policy was the same) with regard to the holding of the meeting was, that if any case of foot and mouth disease broke out, the animals so affected were to be slaughtered, and the rest were to be treated as if no disease had occurred in the yard.

8256. Are you aware that in 1870 the instructions sent by the Privy Council were to this effect: That no animal which had been in contact with an animal which had had foot and mouth disease, should be removed, except under the care of some person approved by the inspector to take

charge of such animal; that it should be removed merely for slaughter; and that a certificate of such slaughter should be forwarded to the office?

— Yes; and I believe that the animals not affected were detained a short time, about 12 hours, I think, and then allowed to go into the country.

8257. But what I am informed is, that that Order did not apply merely to those animals which were affected, but to those which had been in contact with them; are you aware of that? — I am not aware of that; but it was not practically carried out; at any rate, the animals were allowed to go into the country.

8258. Then I understand that the reason why you would take from the Privy Council the discretion of scheduling, and also the power of ordering that animals should or should not be slaughtered which were in the same vessel with animals affected, was mainly based upon this fact which occurred at the Smithfield Club Show? — That is one ground, and also the other cases which I have referred to, of which I am to produce the particulars to the Committee on their next meeting, with regard to Stockton and Newcastle.

8259. I understand those to be cases in which you consider that inspection at the port does not answer; I do not understand those to be cases in which you accuse the Privy Council of want of discretion? — I think the Privy Council ought to have stopped the animals which came in the same vessel with the diseased animals.

8260. I understood you to state before, that the cases you were going to bring from different parts in the kingdom, were cases in which the disease had come in, avoiding detection. I did not understand you to state that those were cases in which the rule of the Privy Council had been broken, of ordering all animals to be slaughtered when one was found infected? — In those cases the admission of the animals was followed in a few days by an outbreak of disease; I do not undertake to trace any one animal from a cargo.

8261. But I think that that answer rather relates to the previous question. I asked you the reason why you wished that all animals should be subjected either to slaughter or quarantine, and you stated that you would bring facts for stating that upon which I should have an opportunity of examining you hereafter; and you also stated that you thought discretion should be left to the Privy Council, and upon my asking you your reason, you based that opinion mainly upon the Smithfield Club Show; will those cases also prove that the Privy Council have not carried out their rule of ordering the animals to be slaughtered when one animal was found to be affected? — It is done now by order at the port.

8262. As regards your charge against the Privy Council of not using their discretion, and ordering animals affected with disease, and those in contact to be slaughtered; do you base your opinion upon anything else except the fact that for two months after the passing of the Act they did not make that regulation, and also the fact which you stated with regard to the Smithfield Club Show? — There is also the fact that sheep coming in the same vessel with infected animals were allowed to come into the country; it is not long since an order providing that sheep coming in the same cargo with infected animals should be slaughtered at the place of landing has been passed; I forget the date of the Order.

8263. When do you think that it was ordered that

that sheep which were found in a vessel where there was foot and mouth disease were ordered to be slaughtered?—I forget the date of it.

8254. I am informed that it was soon after the passing of the Act; do you consider that it was a long time after the passing of the Act?—I think it was a considerable time after the passing of the Act that such sheep were admitted into the Metropolitan Market, from which sheep were allowed to be removed inland.

8255. I must remind you that you are proposing a very important change upon what you consider to be facts brought to your knowledge by the experience of the working of the Act. It is hardly a sufficient answer for you to state that you think it was done some time after the passing of the Act?—I do not remember the date.

8256. Perhaps you will be prepared with the date when you come up again?—Certainly.

8257. Then, with regard to all these other recommendations, they are all based upon the first paragraph, that every foreign animal should be subject to slaughter or quarantine?—I should like to say that that Report was framed and the recommendations made dependent upon the two first paragraphs, upon the ground that we considered it would be a very great hardship to have to submit to sanitary measures for home stock unless the two former paragraphs were carried out.

8258. You are aware, doubtless, that foot and mouth disease has existed in England for a long time?—I am; it broke out first in 1859.

8259. To what do you consider the late outbreak to be owing?—I think it was mainly owing to the introduction of the disease at Stockton and Newcastle in 1869.

8260. Why do you think so?—Because a considerable number of diseased cargoes arrived at those ports in 1869, and when the animals which were in the same vessel, but not affected with the disease, were allowed to move in all directions inland, their arrival was immediately followed by outbreaks of disease.

8261. Do you know the names of the vessels bringing those cargoes?—I can produce them at the next meeting.

8262. At what time of the year did those cargoes arrive?—I think it was in the months of July and August 1869, I am not quite sure. I think February was the earliest. The cases to which I refer, in Stockton, occurred in the month of July.

8263. When did the Act pass?—It came into force in the month of August of that year.

8264. Then the introduction of foot and mouth disease from abroad in that year you consider to be owing to the vessels which arrived before the passing of the Act?—Yes, certainly.

8265. Are you, then, really of opinion that the outbreak of foot and mouth disease, and its prevalence in the country, is owing to that importation?—I do not think that there was any known foot and mouth disease before that time; I think that it had been extinguished in the country.

8266. How long do you think foot and mouth disease had been extinguished in the country?—That I do not know.

8267. You think that the disease was practically extinct in the country when those cargoes arrived?—I think it was.

8268. For how long do you think it had been extinct?—For several years.

8269. For how long do you think England had

been clear of foot and mouth disease previously to the arrival of these cargoes?—I think the foot and mouth disease was mainly exterminated during the prevalence of the cattle plague regulations in 1865 and 1866.

8270. You would subject all foreign animals to this slaughter or quarantine?—I should, upon the ground illustrated by the cases that I have named, that the Privy Council orders were not in advance, but behind the time at which their powers should have been exercised.

8281. But you are aware that what you are proposing would be considered by very important interests a very great inconvenience; do I understand you to base your recommendation upon the supposition that the Privy Council were not quick enough in doing what they did, rather than upon what the Privy Council do at this moment?—Certainly; what has been may be again.

8282. Then the fact that you have no reason to find fault with the present regulation does not induce you to think that it would be unadvisable to make this change?—Pardon me, I did not say I could not find fault with the present regulations.

8283. But I understood you to say that what you did find fault with was the length of time, namely, two months, before these regulations were put in force?—It was partly the policy of the Veterinary Department in persisting in the policy of allowing animals herded with the diseased animals to go over the country so late as 1871, and I have no confidence that it might not be the case again.

8284. Have you any proof that that was done so late as 1871?—Yes, with regard to home cattle.

8285. But we are talking of foreign cattle. I am asking for your facts with regard to foreign cattle, as you are proposing a very important change with regard to them. I understand you to say that it was two months after the passing of the Act before a certain regulation was issued, which regulation you now approve of. Are you prepared to advocate a change which would be opposed by very important interests upon that account?—I am, because that would not be sufficient. That order only applies to a cargo in which the disease is actually found; what I ask for is, that the slaughter or quarantine shall apply to a cargo in which there is no disease found, but might be.

8286. Then I understand that answer to mean that the regulation in regard to animals which are in the same cargo as a diseased animal, is not the reason why you advocate the change; you base it simply upon the ground that some cargoes may come in without the infection being discovered?—That is the chief reason.

8287. But I want to know whether there is any other reason but that?—I have no confidence that the present orders will be permanent. I cannot tell that there may not be a change in the policy pursued.

8288. Then you base that opinion upon the fact, that it was two months before that order was issued after the passing of the Act?—That and the treatment of the Smithfield Cattle animals.

8289. Therefore, I understand you to state, that you base that belief that the discretion would be badly used with regard to foreign animals upon something which you state happened with regard to home animals, and upon your statement that it was two months after the passing of the Act before

Mr.
J. A. Clarke.
9 June 1873.

Mr.
J. A. Clarke.
9 June 1873.

before the order was issued?—They are grounds I maintain for distrusting the permanence of the present regulations.

8290. You have spoken of disease which you think was introduced before the passing of the Act; have you any cases in which you believe that the disease was introduced after the passing of the Act?—I have no personal experience myself, but I believe I could produce witnesses who can testify to that point.

8291. You would subject the Spanish and Portuguese cattle to this regulation?—Certainly. Spanish cattle have brought foot and mouth disease over with them.

8292. With regard to Irish cattle, I understand you merely to demand that Ireland should be subject to the same regulations with regard to home disease as England is?—Yes.

8293. And that after that there should be no restriction upon Irish Import except a detention of six hours?—And certificates of health.

8294. Certificates of health from the ports of embarkation?—Yes.

8295. You are aware that there is a great deal of foot and mouth disease in Ireland?—An immense deal comes from Ireland now, or did until lately.

8296. Do you consider that there is more care taken in Ireland to prevent the export of diseased animals than there is in Holland?—That I am unable to say.

8297. Are you at all aware of the Regulations which are in force in Holland?—No. I know that there are regulations prohibiting the introduction of animals into Holland which are diseased.

8298. Are you aware of the regulations with regard to the prevention of the export of diseased animals from Holland?—I am not aware, but I think there is an inspection of the animals.

8299. But you are clearly of opinion that animals coming from Holland ought to be subjected to very much stronger regulations than animals coming from Ireland?—Certainly.

8300. Upon what do you base that opinion?—Because I can extinguish disease, or control it in Ireland if you give me the opportunity, but I have no power to meddle with anything in Holland.

8301. How would you extinguish or control the disease in Ireland?—As I would do it in England, I would stamp out all early outbreaks.

8302. Which of the recommendations would apply to that?—I think No. 4 would, but it does not go into it so fully as I should.

8303. Do you believe that Rule 4 could be carried out throughout England?—I should like to explain that; I should advocate stamping out or isolating for early outbreaks, and then I should say it certainly could be carried out, but not when the disease is affecting nearly every herd and flock in the country; it would be impracticable at that time.

8304. Are you of opinion that, within any reasonable time, we could expect foot and mouth disease to be stamped out in England by Rules 4 and 6, which I understand to be your chief rules applying to it?—Yes, I understand so decidedly.

8305. Do you consider that that is the general opinion of the farmers?—I believe it to be the opinion of the majority; but of course a great many farmers would like to be left alone; no

man likes to be submitted to sharp remedies in his own case.

8306. Would you not suppose that the success of such a plan depended upon its being generally obeyed?—It should be generally obeyed, and promptly and efficiently carried out.

8307. Did you attend to this matter during the cattle plague?—Yes; I lost a good many animals by the cattle plague.

8308. I suppose you consider that farmers would be very much more afraid of cattle plague than of foot and mouth disease?—No, I do not think that they fear the cattle plague much now.

8309. But when the cattle plague existed?—When the cattle plague existed they certainly did.

8310. Are you not aware that, notwithstanding that fear, and notwithstanding the immense danger of allowing any animal to exist which had the cattle plague, there was great difficulty in carrying out the Order for isolation and slaughter?—I am aware that a great number of farmers concealed cases as long as they could, hoping that they would be able to upset it by medical treatment.

8311. Do not you think that they would be more likely to do that with regard to foot and mouth disease?—An enlightened farmer certainly would not; but there are many who might.

8312. What proportion of the farmers do you think have arrived at that state?—I should be sorry to hazard an opinion upon the subject.

8313. But my reason for asking such a question is, that the success of such a plan depends upon general obedience, which you interpret to be general enlightenment?—That is one reason why we would endeavour to satisfy farmers, and get them to accede to it by guaranteeing that no more seeds of disease should come in from abroad.

8314. You think the bribe offered them by the 1st paragraph would induce them to work the 4th and 6th paragraphs?—I do.

8315. Would you at this moment think that there is as much danger of importing foot and mouth disease from Holland as there is from Ireland?—Certainly not, as far as my information goes at the present time.

8316. Still you are prepared to subject the Dutch trade to much more stringent regulations than you are the Irish?—Yes, certainly.

8317. Now with regard to the 6th recommendation, which is, that during the months of June and July the movement of animals should be prohibited; why are those months chosen?—As the two months in which the least interference with grazing and marketing would result.

8318. Why is the period of two months suggested?—One month was thought not to be long enough.

8319. Why are two months thought to be long enough?—Two months were thought to be as long as we could fairly carry that process into operation without unduly interfering with trade.

8320. But I suppose you would consider that even during those two months there would be considerable inconvenience to trade?—Very considerable indeed.

8321. What ground have you for thinking that a period of two months would be effected for stopping the disease?—The experience of similar regulations with regard to stoppage of traffic in the cattle plague time.

8322. How does that experience show that a stoppage

stoppage of two months had that effect?—It was for a longer period than two months.

8323. I ask you upon what grounds you consider that the inconvenience which the trade would be subject to during two months would be of any use?—I think the longer the stoppage of animals was in exercise the greater would be the effect, but I think that period would produce a marked repression of the disease.

8324. But I understand you to consider that the 4th and 6th recommendations would completely stamp out the disease, otherwise you admit that it would be unfair to treat the Dutch cattle more stringently than the Irish?—I think Regulation 6 is a necessity in the first instance, because it would be folly to begin by stamping out until the disease were at a low ebb.

8325. Do you think that the Regulations 4 and 6 would stamp the disease out of England now?—I do not think they would be sufficient to stamp the disease out, but they would repress it in a very great measure.

8326. I understood you to state that the recommendations that you proposed would stamp out foot and mouth disease. I understood you also to state that you thought that stamping the disease out in England and Ireland would be a ground why you might fairly subject the foreign cattle to much more stringent regulations than the Irish; now I ask you why you think that Recommendations 4 and 6 would stamp out the disease?—I think, in the first place, that Recommendation No. 6 would tend to curb the spread of it, and that No. 4 would tend to stamp out early outbreaks.

8327. I also understood you to state in reply to a former question, that you did not expect that it would entirely stamp out the disease but that it would reduce it?—My own private opinion is in favour of going a little further than these recommendations. I think they would be effectual to a certain point, but I want something which is pointed to in Clause 1, viz., uniform action.

8328. Would you not consider that if any disease was left lurking in the country we should be liable to a fresh outbreak?—Certainly, we should be.

8329. Then supposing the disease was lurking in the country, upon what grounds would you subject the foreign trade to this severe restriction?—Because we should have the machinery ready for stamping out an outbreak in the country directly it occurred.

8330. You would crush it out by Recommendation 4, I suppose?—Yes, and also by something to be accomplished under Recommendation No. 1, namely, uniform action directed by the central authority.

8331. What uniform action would you recommend?—What I would recommend is not exactly expressed in these recommendations.

8332. What would you recommend?—I should recommend a system of isolation to be enforced by the central authority by means of inspectors.

8333. I think I understand that never to imply, that, in order that the foot and mouth disease should be really stamped out, you think still stronger measures should be taken than those that are proposed?—The recommendations that I would suggest are not exactly expressed, but they may be obtained in recommendations Nos. 1 and 4.

8334. In No. 1, I do not see that they are in 0.58.

the slightest degree expressed; it merely states that there should be uniform action; that merely seems to state that the regulations which have been issued by the Privy Council should be enforced in all places?—My meaning is that No. 4 should not be somewhere applied and somewhere not, but that it should be uniformly applied.

8335. You think that if every local authority was ordered to carry out Recommendation No. 4 that would be sufficient?—I could hardly say sufficient, because there is something in the machinery for carrying it out which would be a matter of detail not expressed here.

8336. The reason for my asking the question is this; you have stated that all these restrictions are dependent upon the restriction of the foreign trade; you also state, as the ground of these restrictions, that you believe they would stamp out the home disease; now I find that you, individually, consider that these recommendations are not sufficient to stamp out the home disease?—I mean that they do not express the detail of the matter; they contain the whole of what I wish, but it would be necessary to define them in detail.

8337. How do they contain what you wish; Recommendation No. 4 states that a special enactment would be necessary to carry it out; what other recommendation do you think would be necessary to stamp out the disease?—Nothing beyond what is contained in Nos. 4 and 6, and No. 1, with the exception of the details of carrying them out.

8338. What do you mean by details?—The appointment of qualified inspectors throughout the country; that is my own personal view, but I did not think that it would be asked for me to give it.

8339. Appointed by whom?—I suppose by the Privy Council.

8340. But although that is a matter of detail, it is a matter of very important detail; do you think it will be necessary that there should be as many of inspectors appointed by the Privy Council throughout the country?—I do not know whether by the Privy Council, or by the local authorities.

8341. You would have confidence in local authority appointments?—If they were under this uniform action I would.

8342. What do you mean by uniform action?—If they were under the obligation to appoint them.

8343. Would you be satisfied with an Order from the Privy Council that they were to appoint inspectors?—I imagine that it would require an Act of Parliament; that the present Act would not be sufficient.

8344. Would you consider it would be sufficient that there should be an Act ordering the local authorities to appoint inspectors?—If it were accompanied by regulations.

8345. But what regulations; everything here depends upon the regulations?—I have not given sufficient consideration to that part of the subject.

8346. You come here as the representative of a most important society requiring the most important changes, and I can hardly take that answer. I understand that you do not consider these regulations would be sufficient unless they were put in force by a force of inspectors appointed locally, or by the Privy Council; now I ask you in what way you would make that appointment, and you state that it is a matter that you have not seriously considered; have you no suggestions

Mr.
J. A. Clarke.
9 June 1873.

Mr.
J. A. Clarke.
—
g June 1873

suggestions to make upon that point?—I suggest that it should be done by the central authority, by the Privy Council.

8347. Do you imagine that your constituents throughout the country would approve of the appointment of inspectors by the Privy Council?—I think they would rather be left alone, of course; but I believe that they would agree to it, and approve of it, if accompanied by paragraphs Nos. 1 and 2 for slaughter or quarantine of foreign animals.

8348. How should these inspectors find out the existence of foot and mouth disease?—The inspectors must have a power of entry.

8349. You would give them a power of entry?—Yes, certainly.

8350. Am I to understand that you think the farmers generally throughout England would submit to a system of central inspection, with power of entry, and a power of isolation in all cases of animals affected with foot and mouth disease?—I think they would, on condition that the slaughter or quarantine were carried out, but they would rebel against it without.

8351. But you think the fact that all animals were slaughtered or quarantined at the port of landing, would induce them to conform to the regulations?—Yes, I do.

8352. Are you aware of the strong regulations that were in force during the time of the cattle plague?—Yes, I am.

8353. I have already asked you whether the farmers were not more afraid of the cattle plague than of foot and mouth disease, and you acknowledge that they were; what makes you think that the farmers would conform more to the regulations now than then?—Because they would see some hope of the policy being successful.

8354. Of what policy being successful?—The farmers would have some hope of having their herds and flocks kept clear of disease.

8355. You think that there is this change in their opinion, that whereas they were not willing to subject themselves to this inconvenience to prevent the spread of cattle plague, they will be willing to do it to prevent the spread of foot and mouth disease?—There is a change come over the views of the farmers, undoubtedly, and I think that they would be willing to submit, both in the case of foot and mouth disease and cattle plague, at the present time, to such regulations.

8356. I understood you to object to the discretion given to the Privy Council with regard to foreign import; I was right in that, was I not?—Yes, you were.

8357. With regard to the third recommendation, I understood you to state, in reply to the honourable Member for Norfolk, that you thought the definition of "adjacent places," should be left to the discretion of inspectors appointed by the Privy Council?—I think it has been defined; I am not sure, but we took it that it was understood.

8358. In that case you would leave the discretion to them?—Yes, I would.

8359. Now, with regard to the 5th recommendation, I also understood you to state that the time during which a fair or yard should be liable to be termed an "infected place," should be decided upon by the Privy Council?—Yes.

8360. Then in that case you would leave the discretion to them?—I would leave the determination of this time to them; we said 48 hours,

but I do not see any particular merit in the 48 hours.

8361. Do you think the time ought to be more or less?—I think it is quite sufficient, but it was put as the extreme time, so that the Company or the proprietor of the vessel or the truck might be liable to be called upon if the thing were traced; I should be quite willing to have the time reduced.

8362. What would you have the time shortened to, because everything depends upon the time; the inconvenience is measured by time?—I am very well satisfied as it is.

8363. You yourself do not lay any stress upon Section 5?—No, not upon the 48 hours; I want a sufficient time; but I do not know that two days is absolutely necessary.

8364. You are satisfied with this recommendation as it stands?—I am.

8365. Mr. *Clare Read*.] Two days being the maximum period?—Two days being the maximum period; it is the extreme to which we thought we could go.

8366. *Chairman*.] You think this recommendation is good as it stands; who is to determine whether an animal is found infected with a contagious or an infectious disease?—It would be open, I imagine, to the owner of the animal to complain, or an inspector, or an assistant inspector.

8367. But to whom would you give the power of declaring a place to be infected?—To the local authority.

8368. With regard to Recommendation No. 10, with reference to animals coming from Ireland, do you confine that recommendation to Ireland?—Yes, I do.

8369. You would not apply it to animals coming from Scotland by sea?—I should have no objection to that, but it was not thought necessary.

8370. Is there any foot and mouth disease in Scotland?—I believe so.

8371. Then why would you apply that recommendation to Ireland, and not to Scotland?—I have no particular reason for it; I should be quite willing to apply it to Scotland.

8372. But you must recollect that these are very important recommendations, made by a very important society. I cannot suppose that your society has made these recommendations without considering the matter all round; animals come by water from Scotland, and they come by water from Ireland; why have you named Ireland and not Scotland?—Because an immense number of store animals come from Ireland by sea, and I believe the principal trade from Scotland, by water, is of fat animals, which are not required to be in a particularly healthy condition afterwards.

8373. With regard to Recommendation No. 9, how would you carry that out?—I do not think it would require anything but a veterinary inspector at the port of embarkation, and at the port of landing, to inspect the animals.

8374. I understood you to state that you thought a week would be sufficient for quarantine?—I think it would be as much as would be practicable or advisable to carry out.

8375. How long do you think an animal may have pleuro-pneumonia lurking in it without showing itself?—A good many weeks.

8376. Do you not consider pleuro-pneumonia a much more dangerous disease than foot and mouth

mouth disease?—It has not done a fourth part of the mischief.

8377. Would you consider that a quarantine of a week would be of any advantage as regards pleuro-pneumonia?—It would arrest a great many of the acute cases, but I do not think that it would intercept pleuro-pneumonia from entrance into the kingdom.

8378. Then I think we may deduce from that answer that your desire for slaughter or quarantine, especially for quarantine of animals, is based much more upon foot and mouth disease than it is upon pleuro-pneumonia?—Certainly.

8379. You stated something about the Hull foreign cattle market, and that you thought that what had happened there was a reason why animals should not be admitted into the interior?—Yes. I think if the Privy Council have left such a dangerous arrangement as that at Hull, and I understand at many other places (at least it is stated so in the *Veterinary Register* for 1872) to exist up to the present time, we ought to have something more to depend upon, and I should like an arrangement for slaughter and quarantine to be enacted by law.

8380. But your complaint there was with regard to the mode in which the slaughter was carried out; what is your complaint with regard to Hull?—My complaint is, that the discretion which the Privy Council exercised in that case proves that we cannot depend upon it; and it might be the same in other cases.

8381. You recommend that all animals should be slaughtered; I ask you for your reason, and you give as your reason the way in which certain animals have been slaughtered; how does what happened at Hull induce you to recommend that all animals should be slaughtered?—It is one ground for believing that the discretion of the Privy Council has not always been exercised in the best manner.

8382. But the Privy Council have used their discretion at Hull; did they order the animals to which you refer to be all slaughtered?—Certainly they did.

8383. Then I am to understand that, because you consider that the Privy Council did not properly carry out the regulation with regard to the port of Hull, therefore you would make an important change, and order all animals to be slaughtered?—I do not know that all animals at the Hull Foreign Cattle Market are slaughtered.

8384. What is your complaint about the Hull Foreign Cattle Market?—I think that it is too near the English market to be safe.

8385. But that is no complaint against the system of scheduling or non-scheduling?—No, it is a complaint against the Privy Council for having allowed such a dangerous system of things to exist.

8386. Whether that be true or not true, I ask whether that is the reason in your mind for making the very important change of ordering all animals to be slaughtered?—Yes, because instead of depending upon a discretion which could be exercised in that manner, I should be depending upon an Act of Parliament which could not be altered.

8387. But as regards ordering all animals to be slaughtered, there would require to be some mode in which that should be carried out?—But I understand that the plans for the markets and
0.58.

the mode of doing that would be laid before the public.

8388. I understand your first paragraph to say that you consider that all animals should be either slaughtered or quarantined at the port of landing. I naturally suppose that to mean that, instead of the present power of admitting some animals into the interior, all animals should be slaughtered, you give as the reason for saying that, the manner in which some animals have been slaughtered. Now I want to know what that has to do with the fresh regulation of ordering all animals to be slaughtered?—That of itself would not be a sufficient reason.

8389. Has it anything to do with it?—Yes, I think it has.

8390. What has it to do with it?—It is an argument for me when I say I wish to depend upon a rigid enactment, and not upon a discretion which may be varied from time to time.

8391. Would you introduce into a Bill, which was brought in to the House of Commons, from time to time a plan for each market?—No, I do not think that would be necessary.

8392. Then I want to know in what way this question affects the question of non-scheduling or scheduling certain countries?—It shows that the Privy Council have gone on regarding as not dangerous what has all the time been very dangerous, and that is an argument for me when I say I do not wish to depend so much upon the Privy Council, but upon an Act of Parliament.

8393. What you deduce from that, is a recommendation that all the animals should be subject to slaughter, in the same manner as they are at Hull now?—I suppose the discretion of the arrangements would be left to the Privy Council in that case.

8394. Then again, I say, why does the fact that you consider that the discretion of the arrangements with regard to Hull was not rightly used, induce you to say that the Privy Council should have taken from them the discretion of allowing animals to come into the interior, but that they should still have a discretion with regard to the mode in which the slaughtering of the animals should be carried out?—I think that the case of Hull is not alone sufficient; but I merely gave it as one ground of complaint against the Privy Council.

8395. Still that was one of the arguments which induced you to concur in this recommendation, that all animals should be slaughtered at the port of landing?—That was one of the considerations.

8396. Mr. Deaf.] The slaughter of animals from scheduled countries, in the case of Hull, did not prevent the cattle plague from getting into the country?—I do not think it is possible to guarantee absolutely that it shall not get into the country.

8397. Not even by compulsory slaughter at the port of landing?—Not absolutely.

8398. And the same would, of course, apply to foot and mouth disease?—The same would apply, of course, to foot and mouth disease.

8399. Have you considered how it would be possible to arrange for the quarantine of animals at the ports of embarkation, or to provide accommodation for the animals?—I think it is quite practicable.

8400. That there would be sufficient lairage or pasture at the port to quarantine any considerable quantity of animals?—I should first of all limit
x x x the

Mr.
J. A. Clarke.
9 Jan. 1873.

Mr. the number of ports to which store animals might
J. A. Charles. be brought by sea.

9 Jan 1872. 8401. You would limit the ports to which store
stock should be admitted?—Yes; with a view of
simplifying the quarantine.

8402. You would also limit the ports at which
fat cattle should be admitted, would you not?—
I suppose that would be necessary.

8403. Would you allow fat and store cattle to
be imported at the same ports?—I should allow
it, but I should think it would be safer not to
do so.

8404. You would do away with all the distinctions
between scheduled and unscheduled
countries?—Yes, certainly.

8405. Do you think that the result of your
proposal would be entirely to do away with the
importation of store cattle from abroad?—I do
not think it would; but I should not mind if it
did.

8406. Upon what ground would you not; are
store cattle so plentiful in England at this present
moment?—I think they would be if the foreign
animals were kept out.

8407. How would you increase the number of
store cattle in England by keeping out the foreign
stock?—I base the whole of that expectation
upon the repression of disease.

8408. You have promised to bring us proofs
that foot and mouth disease was introduced in
1869 by foreign cattle; but, as I understand, you
are not able to trace the importation of foot and
mouth disease into this country since that time
by foreign cattle?—I believe I could produce
witnesses who would give you evidence of that
in many cases. There is great difficulty in tracing
outbreaks of foot and mouth disease to foreign
importations, when there is already a great deal
of it in the country, because it is always open to
objectors to say that the animals caught it since
they landed.

8409. But do you think that you can produce
evidence before this Committee to show that, at
all events to any important amount since the
regulation for slaughter has been in force, any
serious importation of foot and mouth disease
from foreign countries has been produced?—I
think witnesses from Essex and Suffolk can be
brought forward to say that.

8410. Supposing all fat animals were slaugh-
tered at the port of debarkation, do you think
that that would be any hindrance to the trade in
meat in the country?—I do not think it would
when it once became a certain thing.

8411. Do you think it would be possible to
send meat to all the centres of consumption at
all seasons of the year?—I am sure of it.

8412. Have you had any experience in Lin-
colnshire in sending meat up to the Metropolitan
Meat Market?—Yes, I have.

8413. At all times of the year?—Yes.

8414. Beef and mutton?—Not much beef,
principally mutton.

8415. Have you not found any difficulty?—
Not the slightest.

8416. You say you think that there would be
an increase in the quantity of store stock in the
United Kingdom. I presume by that you think
that farmers would breed more store stock than
they are doing at present?—I am quite sure
of it.

8417. Are not the high prices of cattle and
sheep causing a considerable increase in the

breeding of stock in the United Kingdom?—
They are.

8418. Do you attribute the diminution of store
stock in the United Kingdom to the existence of
disease, or do you attribute it to the very dry
seasons which we had two or three years ago?—
Mainly to the prevalence of contagious disease,
but the draughts of 1868 and 1870 had, I believe,
a very serious effect.

8419. But the diminution of store stock was
principally in sheep, was it not?—It was; sheep
are more rapidly increasing at the present time.

8420. That diminution in sheep took place, did
it not, before there was any outbreak of foot and
mouth disease worth mentioning amongst sheep?
—Yes, certainly it did.

8421. It has been only since last year that
there has been any serious amount of foot and
mouth disease amongst sheep?—During the last
two years.

8422. And during the last two years there has
been a considerable increase in the number of
sheep bred in the United Kingdom?—I think there
has been a considerable increase in the number
of sheep bred in the United Kingdom in spite of
the disease.

8423. You say that the main decrease in store
stock was in sheep, and that that took place before
there was any large amount of contagious disease
amongst sheep; that does not look as if the ex-
istence of contagious diseases had checked the
breeding of store stock?—The high prices have
checked that of course, but I believe the increase
would have been very much greater had it not
been for the contagious diseases.

8424. You stated that there was a very great
change of opinion amongst farmers with regard
to foot and mouth disease?—Yes, I did.

8425. Do you speak of that from your experi-
ence of farmers or of members of the Chamber of
Agriculture?—From both.

8426. Do you think that there has been any
decrease in the recklessness of the farmers in
buying stock?—I think that it is as great as ever,
if not greater; as the farmers think that it is of no
use being careful.

8427. In the West Riding of Yorkshire
there were only 31 cases last week, and the cases
were fearfully numbered by thousands, so that
the disease is dying out; there have been no special
restrictions in the West Riding of Yorkshire,
except the prohibition against bringing diseased
animals to fairs and markets, and the disease
has apparently almost died out; do you think
that that is in favour of more stringent restric-
tions, such stringent restrictions as you are pro-
posing?—I think the decrease is to be accounted
for by the long housing of the stock; last year
and the year before there was a decrease in the
spring, and when the cattle have been a little
time in pasture, I imagine you will have more
of it.

8428. There is always a decrease at this time
of year, no doubt; but the decrease is more
marked this year than it was last year, or
the year before?—There are fewer animals re-
maining to be attacked.

8429. But we have had it in this room that
animals are not safe from second attacks, and
that there are even second and third attacks?—
They are not safe; but I do not think that re-
stitutions are found in the majority of cases.

8430. But you would rather think that for a
year or two we have the disease very violently
and

and then there is a period of time during which they are not likely to have the disease again?—I believe it has been explained previously.

8431. We have had it in evidence from the Veterinary Report, that the disease, ever since its first introduction, has been virulent to a degree at times, and then has almost died away, whether there have been restrictions, or whether there have not been restrictions. There seem to have been waves of disease, and apparently that is the case now; would you imagine that to arise from the first of all the animals having had the disease?—I think that has something to do with it, but I would rather have the restrictions and keep the waves down.

8432. Do you think that the farmers are quite prepared to submit to these restrictions, Nos. 4 and 6?—They are, provided the first two were carried out.

8433. You think that the agricultural mind is still so firmly impressed with the fact that this disease is continually freshly imported from abroad, even in spite of the present regulations?—Yes.

8434. Are you aware that when the Privy Council put in force the pleuro-pneumonia rules, with regard to foot and mouth disease, in 1869, there were strong remonstrances from many counties against the stringency of those rules?—Yes, I am aware that there were.

8435. Was there not a very general feeling among the farmers when they bought their store stock, that they were anxious as soon as possible to get over the disease; that they did not think very much about foot and mouth disease. I am speaking of men who bought a great many lambs; was not it their object to get through the disease while the animals were lean, and when the loss was very trifling, in order that the animals might not be attacked when they were fat?—Certainly; but the farmers would rather be without the disease.

8436. But the farmers do not take any very strong precautions to avoid it when they first get their animals?—They regard the precautions as useless.

8437. The farmers think that any precautions are useless?—Hopeless, under the present management.

8438. Do you think that any farmers when they buy a lot of cattle in a fair, after they bring them to their farms, isolate them?—I always do, and I believe that others do the same; it is a general practice, I believe.

8439. You say that pleuro-pneumonia has not done one-fourth of the mischief that foot and mouth disease has done; you mean that pleuro-pneumonia has not been so prevalent, but you do not mean the Committee to understand that you regard pleuro-pneumonia as a more trifling complaint than foot and mouth disease?—That depends upon what you mean; pleuro-pneumonia kills more animals; but it does not sacrifice more money, because it is not so prevalent.

8440. Which do you think a man would rather have, pleuro-pneumonia or foot and mouth disease?—I lost 35 Irish cattle last year by pleuro-pneumonia, and I had foot and mouth disease among 70 cattle and 500 sheep and lambs. I can hardly draw a comparison between the two; but I should prefer foot and mouth disease, certainly, in that case.

8441. I am afraid that you did not resort to 035.

any isolation with your animals with pleuro-pneumonia if you lost 35?—I think they were all affected when they came.

8442. Were they Irish beasts?—They were.

8443. Did they come direct from Ireland to you?—I do not know how long, but I think that they had been in the country a few weeks.

8444. Did you buy them at an English fair?—I bought them at Lyan.

8445. When did you first find that there was any attack of pleuro-pneumonia among them?—About a week after I got them home they began to cough very much.

8446. How many of the animals were there affected with the disease?—Only two or three at first.

8447. What did you do with them?—I shut them up by themselves so that nothing could get at them, with one person to attend to them.

8448. Did you slaughter them?—No; I gave notice to the police inspector, and he slaughtered them, and the magistrates afterwards refused to pay the compensation for them, so we took our chance with the rest, and the rest we killed and made the best meat of them we could.

8449. Did the whole lot perish from pleuro-pneumonia?—Two were slaughtered, 11 died, and the rest began to cough, and therefore we slaughtered them, and sent them to market immediately.

8450. How long was that attack of pleuro-pneumonia from its first appearance to its last appearance with you?—It was all done in two months; I do not know the exact number of weeks.

8451. We have not heard from you how you would deal with pleuro-pneumonia; we have only heard with regard to foot and mouth disease; how would you deal with pleuro-pneumonia in England?—I should slaughter all the animals that were affected with it, paying a full compensation for them, and the others I should isolate, but I should be in favour of trying inoculation upon them, and all animals adjacent.

8452. Have you read or heard the evidence here that infection from pleuro-pneumonia is only communicated by the breath of the animal?—I have not had any opportunity of seeing the evidence.

8453. Have you had much experience of pleuro-pneumonia except this last outbreak?—No.

8454. You would give full compensation in the case of the slaughter of an animal affected with disease?—I would give full compensation for the sake of getting the information.

8455. And you think that by that means we might probably be able to extinguish pleuro-pneumonia?—I think so.

8456. Do you think there would be any difficulty in getting information unless you gave full compensation?—Certainly, the farmers would endeavour to make the best they could of the stock.

8457. How would you deal with the animals supposing you slaughtered them and gave full compensation to the farmers. Take a fat animal, just commencing with an attack of pleuro-pneumonia, would you allow the hide and carcass to be utilised, or would you bury and disinfect it?—I am not a sufficient authority upon the subject, I do not know whether it would be dangerous or not.

8458. I want to ask you a few questions with regard

Mr.
J. A. Clarke,
9 June 1873.

Mr.
J. A. Clarke.
June 1873.

regard to carrying out your views with respect to foot and mouth disease. Would you trust to the police to report all cases of foot and mouth disease and to carry out the stringent regulations which you suggest?—I must have a number of inspectors and assistants.

8459. That is what I want to come at. Take your own county, Lincolnshire, what number of inspectors and assistants do you suppose would be necessary to carry out your views?—I suppose each local authority would require an inspector.

8460. Do you mean by each local authority a court of quarter sessions, or each petty sessional division?—Each petty sessional division of magistrates and a committee.

8461. Would you keep the inspectors constantly employed?—I should keep them constantly in office.

8462. Would you have them paid by salary or paid by fees?—I have not considered that matter.

8463. Have you considered at all the question of the expense of the inspectors?—No.

8464. Have you not had any experience of the bills of your inspectors at the time of the cattle plagues?—I know that they were very serious.

8465. How are the inspectors to be paid?—I think the Privy Council should appoint the inspectors and pay them.

8466. Do you think they should be entirely independent of local authorities?—With regard to the inspection, which I alluded to in a previous answer, viz., inspectors appointed by the Privy Council, I am inclined to think that one inspector for each county would be sufficient, and I think that these inspectors should be appointed and paid by the Privy Council, and should be totally independent of the local authorities.

8467. You would have one inspector for each county, appointed and paid by the Privy Council, and he should have control over the local authority?—Yes.

8468. And in addition to him, you would have inspectors under the petty sessions?—I do not think that you could have any better force than the police in that case.

8469. You would only have one veterinary inspector and he should be appointed by the Privy Council for the divisions of a county?—I do not mean to say exactly a county, but a large area.

8470. In Lincolnshire you have three courts of quarter sessions, have you not?—Yes, three divisions.

8471. You probably would appoint one inspector, in that case, for each division?—Yes, I should.

8472. Take the West Riding of Yorkshire, in which there is only one court of quarter sessions: in the West Riding if there was any disease it would be impossible for the inspector to do his duty, he would be always travelling about?—My idea is that if a system of that kind were established, in the case of a serious number of outbreaks of disease, that inspector would have assistants, but that when the disease had been got under, and we were only liable to a few outbreaks here and there, assistants would be no longer required, but simply to keep the machinery in existence.

8473. You think that this prohibition of movement in the months of June and July would be important because there is not much sale of

store animals at that time?—There is not much in June and July.

8474. Would you carry that out in Ireland and Scotland; would you stop the movement of animals in those countries at the same periods?—I might make the months more convenient, if I knew it, for Scotland and Ireland; but I imagine that they would be the most convenient months.

8475. We have had it in evidence that there are a great number of fairs in June and July in which the store cattle are gathered together by dealers for sale to the graziers to buy in the autumn?—There are not so many stores come over in July, I think.

8476. But the store animals are collected in these months, we are told?—Ireland might be treated by itself in that respect.

8477. You were under the impression that sheep which had been on board ship with animals affected with foot and mouth disease might be moved, although all the cattle were slaughtered?—They were for some time, I believe, before the passing of the General Order.

8478. There is an Order put into my hands, dated the 14th of August 1869, which closes in these words: "If the inspector certifies that any one or more of the animals are affected with the foot and mouth disease, or any other contagious or infectious disorder, the whole of the animals imported in the vessel are to be slaughtered; that appears to be an Order made almost immediately upon the passing of the Act?—Yes, that appears to be so.

8479. Mr. Barclay.] Where were those cattle of years which died of pleuro-pneumonia between the time when you bought them at Lynn and the time when they came from Ireland?—I do not know where they had been, but I believe that they had been at some large fair in the Midland districts; I believe that they had not come direct from the port of landing.

8480. I ask the question for the purpose of getting some idea whether the animals had had pleuro pneumonia before leaving Ireland, or whether the animals had contracted the disease from being driven about here from fair to fair?—When they were opened they showed signs of having had the disease for a considerable time.

8481. Did you buy those cattle of an English dealer?—I bought them of an English dealer; but who he bought them of, I do not know.

8482. You did not ask afterwards?—I asked the dealer how long the cattle had been from Ireland, and he said only a few weeks.

8483. Are the farmers in Lincolnshire and in the Central Chamber of Agriculture anxious for the importation of foreign store cattle?—They would rather be without them.

8484. The conclusion they have arrived at is, that they would rather want the store animals than have them?—I believe they would rather be without any foreign store animals.

8485. You seem disposed to recommend inoculation in cases of pleuro-pneumonia; have you had any experience of it?—I have not had any experience of it whatever.

8486. What induces you to recommend inoculation?—Because I am acquainted with authorities who have had experience, and who have pronounced that it would be a very effectual remedy.

8487. Are those authorities in England or in Ireland?—There is one in England that I could name.

8488. Is he a farmer or a veterinary surgeon?
—A veterinary surgeon.

8489. Has he had experience of the result of inoculation?—He has had very great experience, I believe. I allude to Mr. Priestman.

8490. You are speaking upon his authority?—Yes, and upon that of others.

8491. You recommend having an inspector for a large district, paid by the Privy Council, and responsible only to the Privy Council?—Yes, I do.

8492. Do you propose to have, also, a local authority in the district?—Certainly.

8493. And what is the inspector of the Privy Council going to do?—I expect the Privy Council inspectors would watch the early outbreaks of disease, and see that the local authorities acted promptly upon it, or had early information.

8494. Would the inspector of the Privy Council simply be there to look after the local authority?—I think that would be the proper means of ensuring the uniform action which is pointed to in paragraph No. 1.

8495. But do you think that the local authorities in counties would submit to have an inspector from the Privy Council settled there to look after them specially?—They are going to have a medical officer, and I do not know why they should not.

8496. You recommend uniformity of action in counties and boroughs; do you mean by that, that different counties might have different regulations, provided all the regulations in one county were the same?—This points to the whole of Great Britain; the words are, "throughout Great Britain."

8497. It says, "Uniform action in counties and boroughs should, as far as possible, be enforced throughout Great Britain." I suppose that means that there should be uniform action throughout Great Britain?—I would not limit uniform action to the boundaries of a county, because disease does not confine itself to those boundaries; it means throughout Great Britain.

8498. I understand it means not only that all the arrangements should be uniform within a county, but that it would be desirable to have uniformity of action in dealing with cattle disease throughout Great Britain?—That is the intention, that the borough authorities and the county authorities should be subject to and have the same obligations laid upon them by the central authority.

8499. Have you considered how that uniformity of action might be accomplished within one county, that is to say, by the various local authorities which at present exist within a county?—I should no longer leave it to their discretion whether they should put orders in force or not.

8500. Do you think it absolutely necessary to have separate local authorities for the boroughs and counties; do you think it might be possible to have one local authority constituted which might be satisfactory to various persons interested in the county, including the boroughs?—It is quite possible; but I think the boroughs might be jealous of the county authorities interfering with them, and the county authorities the same.

8501. That would depend upon the scope and power given to the local authority?—Certainly.

8502. Have you considered what power you would be prepared to give to the local authorities?
0.58.

—I cannot say that I have given much attention to the question of administration.

8503. Upon what points does a conflict generally arise between the county and the borough authorities?—The principal objection is to their not taking the same action at the same time.

8504. In what respect; they slaughter out cattle plague, for instance; neither party slaughter pleuro-pneumonia, in most cases; wherein is it that the county local authority takes action, and the borough local authority does not?—I have no complaint to make against the boroughs, but it is simply a simultaneous action between the two that I wish for.

8505. Would you prefer having, so far as you are speaking for the counties, to have one local authority for each county, and to admit the boroughs to a share in the representation for such local authority?—No; I should say that the present local authority is sufficient.

8506. You would not prefer the various local authorities within a county to be united?—I do not think it is necessary at all, if they have similar orders to carry out.

8507. I suppose you would hope to secure the various local authorities carrying out their duties by this Privy Council Inspector?—Instead of making the orders permissive, I should make them all compulsory, so that the local authorities should have no option but to carry out what the Privy Council issued.

8508. But supposing the local authorities elect not to have it, how would you manage it?—Simply by Act of Parliament.

8509. Acts of Parliament contain penalties as against individuals, but against these local authorities of counties there are no penalties, and many of these local authorities do not carry these orders out?—In that case, I suppose, the local authority would be liable to be superseded by the central authority, if it failed to do its duty.

8510. You would contemplate, if the local authority failed to do its duty, that it should be superseded by the Central Department?—I do not see any other way out of it.

8511. Have you considered with reference to the details of quarantine?—Yes; I have answered a few questions about that.

8512. With regard to the practicability of carrying out quarantine for a week?—I believe it is quite practicable; it only wants a sufficient space, removed from herds and flocks.

8513. Supposing you are importing at one of these selected ports 500 animals per week, and you keep them six or seven days, and assuming that foot and mouth disease breaks out amongst one of the lots of 500 animals, what would you do then?—Then I should slaughter the whole immediately.

8514. You propose, in a quarantine establishment, in the event of disease making its appearance, to slaughter all animals there confined?—Yes, all in the same lot.

8515. Supposing you were importing dairy cows, that would inflict a serious loss upon the importers, would it not?—Yes, but it would be much more serious to let them go amongst our cows in the country.

8516. In the concluding paragraph it is stated "The Council regret that, notwithstanding recent enactments for the purpose of securing the comfort of animals in transit, great privations are still experienced by them for want of more stringent regulations and proper supervision;" what

X X 4

Mr.
J. A. Clarke.
9 June 1873.

Mr.
J. A. Clarke.
9 June 1875.

what particular district do those remarks apply to?—They apply generally; in long journeys, animals have not an opportunity of rest and water.

8517. What is about the longest journey which is undertaken by cattle in this country?—I suppose from the north of Scotland to London.

8518. Have you had any complaints from the north of Scotland respecting the treatment that animals get in transit?—I have heard no complaints personally.

8519. Upon what authority was this statement made here?—I have heard many complaints from certain quarters. Irish cattle, for instance, come across the country, and I am continually hearing such complaints.

8520. You are not aware that there were complaints from Scotland with reference to the transit of animals?—I am not cognisant of any; none have come to me.

8521. Mr. Vigning.] Just to follow up that last question, the Council states so positively that great privations are still experienced, that they ought to have some authority for that statement; the evidence we have had before this Committee has been that those reports have been grossly exaggerated; does this apply especially to railways or steamers, or what does the Central Chamber mean by that statement?—This paragraph, I believe, refers principally to transit by rail.

8522. In England?—In the United Kingdom.

8523. Do you know what form those privations take?—Deprivation of water for too long a time would be one of the principal things.

8524. Is it your opinion that cattle will always drink upon a journey at any time when water is offered to them?—Not at any time; but they will if they have been for a long time without water, and this without removal from the trucks.

8525. Are you aware that cattle generally refuse water offered under those circumstances on railways?—I am aware that cattle generally refuse both hay and water when they are in railway trucks, unless they have been deprived for a very considerable time.

8526. What do you consider the maximum of time that an animal would refuse hay and water?—It is impossible to say what time would drive one animal, and what time would drive another to partake of food and water, but I should say that 12 hours is the maximum period; they ought not to be left without opportunity of food and drink after twelve hours.

8527. Do you think that cattle are often twelve hours in England and Scotland without water being offered?—Last week a number of valuable show cattle went down to the Plymouth show of the Bath and West of England Society, and they were more than twelve hours, and I think more than 20 hours, without food and water of any kind.

8528. Are you in a position to state that no food was offered to them?—I know that perfectly well; they were Mr. Walter Gilbey's animals.

8529. I think you stated those were valuable show cattle?—They were.

8530. Of course cattle of that value are always accompanied by some one who is in charge of them; they are not cattle sold to some jobber, and going to some place without any particular care; it is choice and pot stock, therefore has choice and pot care, or something like it, in consequence; was there nobody to see that the animals had food and water?—The owner's man was with the cattle; the cattle were in horse

boxes, but the man, although he tried to get water at every station at which he stopped, had not time to water the animals without losing the train, and let them go by another, and so losing his chance of admission to the showyard.

8531. Do you know exactly how these animals went down?—I could not say exactly, but it could be stated by the owner of the cattle.

8532. If you are coming again, we should be glad to have that statement, as it is important. I suppose I may understand that in the opening paragraph the slaughter is applicable to fat cattle, and the quarantine to store cattle; that is the general idea. As regards foreign importation you would slaughter the cattle coming for meat, and you would quarantine the cattle coming for store purposes?—The idea is that the importer shall select which he will have slaughtered and which he will have quarantined.

8533. Because the general idea of those recommendations of the Chamber is that it is a scheme for stamping out?—It is.

8534. Has the Central Chamber of Agriculture at all considered the effect upon the price of meat, from a consumer's point of view, of those recommendations?—The views generally held by my society are that those measures would wonderfully increase the quantity of meat, and so tend to reduce the price.

8535. Am I to suppose that all foreign meat is to be slaughtered for all time, that is to say, that on and after the time for the application of these recommendations, all foreign meat would be either slaughtered or quarantined; it is not merely for the purpose of eradicating disease, and then starting upon a more liberal principle afterwards, but it is to be a permanent arrangement?—It is for permanently keeping out disease.

8536. Then, as regards the principle of paragraph No. 5, has it occurred to you that you would have enormously to increase the various steamboats and trucks, and the various means of conveyance, to carry out this principle, because it is based, so far as I understand, upon double disinfection; that whenever anything can be traced in the way of contagious or infectious disease, there is to be a double disinfection, which necessarily implies great delay, and a great increase of the means of conveyance to meet such delay; and it also implies great increase of expense in consequence?—It was contemplated that there would be both some delay and some expense also.

8537. From your own knowledge, do you find that farmers and those engaged in the trade, generally, are prepared to pay higher rates for the conveyance of cattle under all these disabilities?—They are prepared to pay lower rates on dead meat, and higher rates on live meat, if they could ensure anything like the repression of contagious disease.

8538. Are you aware that butchers throughout the whole country are entirely opposed to anything like the dead meat trade; that is to say, to receiving meat in the form of carcasses in towns?—I do not think that the butchers are wholly so, because I know butchers and dealers who would go warmly for these measures; but I believe that the great majority are opposed to our view.

8539. Mr. Ridley.] With regard to this disinfection of railway trucks, I suppose that in the discussions which you have had in the Central Chamber of Agriculture there have been frequent complaints

complaints of the dirtiness of railway trucks?—Certainly.

8540. And since the time of the transit Order of the Privy Council, ordering the disinfection of railway trucks, there have been also complaints of the manner in which that Order has been neglected?—It has not been carried out.

8541. Generally, it is a very frequent source of spreading disease, is it not?—Yes, certainly.

8542. I take it that it is so in consequence of those recommendations which you make here in No. 5?—Yes.

8543. Would not it be generally thought that, supposing trucks, after having been used, were always properly disinfected, that would be a sufficient precaution, without declaring them infected places and twice disinfecting them, what special reason have you for recommending that?—Twice was put in to insure effectual disinfecting, because we believe that the so-called process of disinfecting is carried out in a very loose and ineffectual manner.

8544. Are you aware that there are many local authorities in England who have appointed an inspector to see that these provisions were carried out in their district?—No.

8545. Are you not aware that that has been the case in Northumberland for some time?—No.

8546. Are you not aware that proceedings have been instituted in Northumberland against railway companies for neglecting to carry out that transit Order?—I am not aware of that.

8547. Would it not generally meet with the approval of the Central Chamber of Agriculture if the local authorities were uniformly to adopt some such course as that?—Certainly that would be very satisfactory.

8548. And you would propose to enforce the carrying out of such provisions upon local authorities who did not do so in the same way as you would enforce the other provisions which you would desire to carry out?—I propose that the whole of the enforcement should come from the central authority.

8549. Would you propose that the central authority should appoint travelling inspectors to see that the railway companies have carried out the transit orders; perhaps you have not considered that point?—I have stated that I should approve of the appointment of a properly qualified veterinary inspector to a large district or a whole county.

8550. Do you think it would be necessary to appoint a properly qualified inspector to see that the trucks were properly cleansed?—It would be part of his duties.

8551. Do you think that the mere fact of his travelling about to see that the railway companies carried out the regulations would be his duty?—I do not suppose that it would be his duty altogether; but it would be part of the duty that was under his direction.

8552. But do you consider that great importance would attach to the satisfactory carrying out of the transit order of the Privy Council by the local authority?—Certainly.

8553. Mr. O'Connor.] All these suggestions depend, as I understand, upon the slaughter or quarantine, in the first instance, of foreign stock?—Certainly.

8554. If that is not adopted there would not be much use in carrying out these suggestions?—Yes.

—We think it would be useless and also tyrannical.

8555. Mr. Dent.] Supposing the preamble of these recommendations were not carried out, that foreign cattle were not slaughtered or quarantined at the port of debarkation, would you leave the English, Scotch, and Irish animals entirely free, without any restrictions whatever?—No, I should require the watering and cleansing of trucks, and so on.

8556. But would you strike out from the Act any of the penal clauses relating to the movement of animals affected with foot and mouth disease?—Certainly.

8557. Mr. Clay.] You were speaking just now of the bad management at the port of Hull with respect to the importation of foreign cattle; were you specially alluding to the case of the importation by the "Joseph Soumes," to which an outbreak of cattle disease was attributed?—Yes, that called attention to the position of affairs at Hull.

8558. Are you aware of the circumstances of that case?—I have not inspected them upon the spot; I know them by the authentic publication of reports.

8559. It is a very short story; will you be kind enough to narrate it to the Committee as you have heard it?—I do not remember the details of it. I believe the "Joseph Soumes" arrived at the port of Hull, and was in dock for some days. I believe two days (but I am not sure) with cattle plague on board, and there was probably free communication between the shore and the vessel for persons to pass to and fro, and that was the position of the ship, while the English cattle market was only a few hundred yards off.

8560. Are you aware that the cattle were slaughtered on board?—Yes, I believe they were.

8561. That they never landed?—That is so.

8562. You are aware that there was some mismanagement in sinking them as it was intended to do, and that a good many of the carcasses were washed ashore at one place?—Yes.

8563. Are you also aware that it is the opinion of gentlemen best competent to judge upon this subject, the agents of the Privy Council, that it was impossible that any infection could have been communicated by those carcasses?—I believe that was the conclusion they came to.

8564. Have you concluded that the disease was carried in that way?—I believe that it was probably conveyed by persons passing from the ship to the market; possibly the contagion might have been transmitted in some very obscure and indirect way, but I have no doubt it passed from the ship to the market.

8565. This is one of the cases in which, I presume, you suspect that there was insufficient disinfection of the persons who went on board the ship?—My suspicion rather would be that that was the case, but I do not think that there is any evidence to show how the contagion was conveyed from the ship to the market.

8566. Are you aware that sums of money were paid by the Corporation for disinfecting persons who came on shore and passed to and fro from that ship?—I am not aware that there is any evidence that disinfection was practised before the time came for slaughtering those animals.

8567. You are not aware that, at any rate, the process was paid for?—No, I never heard that.

8568. Mr. Kewens.] This Central Chamber

Y r

Mr.
J. A. Clarke,
9 June 1873.

Mr.
J. A. Clarke.
9 June 1873.

of Agriculture which you represent here, represents, I suppose, the opinions of all the farmers in England over the whole country?—Indirectly, it does.

8569. Those recommendations of course would apply to all the ports in England?—Yes, I suppose they would.

8570. Therefore the real effect of that recommendation No. 1 is to put a stop to the importation of all meat into Great Britain except in the shape of dead meat, speaking with regard to fat cattle?—Those regulations were intended to apply to the United Kingdom, not to Great Britain only.

8571. To stop fat cattle from being brought in from all foreign countries except as dead meat?—Fat cattle, not store cattle.

8572. You talked of store cattle afterwards with regard to quarantine, but with regard to fat cattle at all events you spoke of them only as dead meat?—That is so.

8573. You stated that you thought that that would not increase the price of meat?—I do not think it would; I think it would tend in the opposite direction coupled with the other recommendations.

8574. Have you ever gone into the question of the meat supply of this country?—Very elaborately.

8575. And from the inquiries which you have made you are of opinion that limiting the import of meat into this country to the dead meat trade would not increase the price of meat?—My calculation of the proportion of the meat supply of the United Kingdom is, that five per cent. only is contributed by foreign live animals. I believe that it would be very easy to supply more than that by the repression of contagious diseases amongst our own stock.

8576. Then the information which has been given to the Committee by the English Veterinary Department is not correct, that England depends so largely upon the foreign import?—I do not agree with that.

8577. Still, you are of opinion that all that England gets from foreign countries is five per cent., and that the stamping out of disease would give us more than that?—I think that the veterinary report upon the subject refers to Great Britain, and includes the supplies from Ireland to Great Britain. My answer refers to the United Kingdom, including Ireland.

8578. Still that is your opinion, that all that is acquired from foreign parts, that is to say, Holland, Spain, France, the Netherlands, and Russia, wherever it comes from except Ireland, is five per cent. of the whole supply of live animals?—That is my impression. There is more dead meat imported than double the weight of the live foreign animals imported.

8579. But the amount of salt meat imported is considerable, is it not?—It is very large.

8580. But I am referring entirely to the fresh meat supply; does your answer apply to that?—When I say that more than double comes in in the shape of dead meat, I include salt meat; the fresh would be very much less. I do not know the percentage.

8581. Does England require more than five per cent. of the supply from foreign countries to keep her in fresh meat?—She requires 10 times the amount, if she could get it, to cheapen the supply; but at the present prices, five per cent. is, I believe, all that comes in.

8582. With regard to store stock and quarantine, of course those recommendations apply to all the ports of debarkation in the United Kingdom, as you have already stated?—That is so.

8583. Now, taking a large port where the cargoes are perhaps four or five a week, would you keep those lots separate?—My proposal is to limit the number of quarantine ports, so that store animals from foreign countries could land at only a certain number of ports, much smaller than the present number, and there I would have separate landing-places and separate establishments altogether for different cargoes.

8584. Decreasing the number of ports would necessarily increase the number of importations into those ports which were retained?—Yes, certainly.

8585. Would you keep the cargoes separate, or would you limit the separation to, say, a cargo which had gone through half its quarantine?—It might be limited to animals arriving upon the same day.

8586. Supposing you had cargoes arriving every day in the week, do you think you could find room to store all the animals so arriving in different places?—The animals arriving each day would of course be few.

8587. There would be no difficulty in that?—I do not see any.

8588. Your opinion is that, if the disease broke out, the whole lot of animals herded with the animals in quarantine should be slaughtered?—Yes; and of course it might be an indefinite time before the place would be fit for another cargo.

8589. That would be another question also; how long do you consider the place would be infected where foot and mouth disease broke out?—If it were foot and mouth disease, I imagine that with thorough disinfection an interval of a few days would be sufficient.

8590. How would you disinfect a field, because if they were store stock they must be turned into fields?—I should not disinfect a field; but I had reference to sheds and buildings.

8591. Would you keep store stock for a week in sheds?—Yes, I think so.

8592. Would there be no objection to that?—I do not know of any.

8593. Are you a very large farmer yourself?—Not large; I farm 500 acres.

8594. Do a large number of cattle pass through your hands in a year?—No; my stock is about 70 cattle and 500 sheep.

8595. Have you had much experience of foot and mouth disease?—During the last two years very much, as all the sheep have had it, sometimes twice over, and nearly all the cattle.

8596. You have examined the cases, and watched the course of the disease?—Certainly.

8597. You, I presume, attend the different fairs yourself?—Some of them, but not many.

8598. Do you always buy your own stock?—Not always; sometimes I employ a dealer.

8599. Have you any practical experience, and can you give the Committee any idea what the period of incubation of foot and mouth disease is?—I am not sure that it is not in some cases a few hours; but I should limit it to four or five days; it might be longer than that; I think that it has been known to be longer than that, but that is about it.

8600. What is the longest time you have known yourself

yourself, or have you watched it?—I have never watched it so closely as to say to half-a-day.

8601. So that when you speak of four or five days, your opinion is founded more on theory than on any practical experience?—I cannot say that I have proved it by experiments, but my experience would agree with that theory.

8602. Could you give the Committee the instances upon which that experience is founded?—I have had cattle come from market which have fallen down from foot and mouth disease the day after, and the animals adjacent to them have fallen within two or three days.

8603. Could those animals adjacent to them have got the disease in any other way than by contact with those which were brought from the market?—It is within the bounds of possibility, but there was no other disease near them at the time.

8604. But still it was within the bounds of possibility?—Yes, certainly.

8605. Probably you think it was within the limits of probability that they caught it from the cattle that you bought in the market?—I think there is no doubt of it.

8606. And what is the longest time which, to your knowledge, elapsed between those animals being in contact with the new ones, and the disease breaking out?—I could not speak to that point.

8607. Where do you generally get your cattle from, or, speaking generally, the farmers in Lincolnshire?—They come from very long distances; they come from Scotland and Ireland, and from Yorkshire.

8608. You stated that in 1869 you traced the outbreak of the foot and mouth disease in Lincolnshire mainly to the imports of diseased foreign cattle into Stockton and West Hartlepool?—I do not say that I traced the disease; it was an outbreak of the disease in the kingdom generally. I attribute it to those importations.

8609. You stated afterwards that between the years 1839 and 1869 the foot and mouth disease was extinct?—No, there was a good deal of it at various periods, but there was very little of it, or very few cases known of it, directly after the Cattle Plague Regulations had expired just previously to 1869.

8610. But in 1839 it first appeared?—Yes.

8611. Between 1839 and 1845, which was the year of the cattle plague, was foot and mouth disease very prevalent?—It was at some times, but not at others.

8612. Were there any restrictions enforced during those periods?—There were no restrictions similar to those during the time of the cattle plague.

8613. There were no restrictions at all upon disease between 1839 and 1855, were there?—I think not.

8614. Still the disease used to appear and disappear?—It used to attack nearly all the animals in the kingdom sometimes; but when I first remember the disease it was in a much milder form; people looked upon it as an inevitable necessity; they did not think much of it.

8615. You stated that you had an immense quantity of foot and mouth disease coming from Ireland now?—Yes, I believe there is.

8616. Can you give the Committee any instances of that?—I have no experience of cattle directly imported from Ireland within my own knowledge, only those that I have heard of.

8617. It is only a sort of general rumour?—No, it is the testimony of farmers who have suffered in that way.

8618. Could you give the Committee any instance of that?—I have no doubt I could procure witnesses who could give instances of that. I understand you to refer to the Irish cattle coming over within the last few months.

8619. I wrote it down that you stated that there is an immense deal of foot and mouth disease coming over in the Irish cattle now?—Within the last few months, I meant.

8620. But you are not prepared to give any instances of it?—I am not prepared to give anything more than a general testimony of its existing at the Bristol market, and other places, where it has been traced to the Irish cattle.

8621. You have positively heard, that within the last three months there has been an immense amount of foot and mouth disease brought from Ireland into Bristol?—I believe that is the fact.

8622. It would not be the fact, if evidence had been brought before us to say that foot and mouth disease had very much decreased within the last three months?—It might decrease in the spring quarter.

8623. That is the last three months?—Then I would rather extend the period, and say there has been a great deal come in within the last three months, but whether it is less or more than the previous three months, I could not say.

8624. You stated that you believe that foot and mouth disease kills more stores than importation brings into the country?—The percentage of animals killed by foot and mouth disease, though more than it used to be, I believe is rather low, but the actual number I have never compared with the stores imported.

8625. Do I express your meaning rightly, that you meant that foot and mouth disease destroyed more stores than importation brings into the country?—I meant that it prevents the production of more stores.

8626. How does it prevent the production of more stores?—By killing as many calves and by deterring people from breeding; it makes such a hazardous business of it.

8627. Do you think that the foot and mouth disease deters farmers from breeding?—I am quite certain of it.

8628. You said that you lost 35 Irish beasts, bought at Lynn, from pleuro-pneumonia?—Yes, I did.

8629. Did you buy those cattle at the fair at Lynn yourself?—A dealer bought them for me.

8630. Who did he buy them from?—I do not know; a man who had taken them there from a fair somewhere in the middle of the country. I do not know where he got them from, but my neighbour, the dealer who bought the cattle, told me that they had been two or three weeks in Great Britain.

8631. [Clearance.] Had they been travelling about from fair to fair, or had they been upon a farm?—I think they had been in fields outside Lynn for a day or two.

8632. Mr. Keesenagh. You really do not know much about them?—I know that when they were opened they gave evidence of having had pleuro-pneumonia a considerable time before; they must have had it before they left Ireland.

8633. Who examined them; did you?—A veterinary surgeon who had been resident in our neighbourhood.

8634. What

Mr.
J. A. Clarke.
9 June 1873.

Mr.
J. A. Clarke.
9 June 1873.

8634. What did he say?—He said that the lungs had been diseased a long time; he showed that they had already been treated for the disease, and that the incision which had been made to put in a "plug," as they call it, or seton, had healed over, and that they must have had the disease months before.

8635. Do you treat for pleuro-pneumonia by inserting a seton?—We plugged them, which is a very common thing in our neighbourhood, and I think also in Ireland; I think it is a plug of hellebore root, put in the brisket.

8636. Was this veterinary surgeon who examined the lungs a gentleman whom you mentioned before, Mr. Priestman?—No; he was the local veterinary surgeon at Long Sutton.

8637. Does this local veterinary surgeon agree with Mr. Priestman in thinking that inoculation is a good thing?—I do not know; I did not ask him the question.

8638. You have never seen inoculation performed yourself?—I have not seen inoculation performed for pleuro-pneumonia, but for cattle plague I have.

8639. Was it any use?—Not in the case of cattle plague.

8640. How was it done?—There was an incision made in the tail, and then some virus taken from an affected animal was inserted.

8641. Was the affected animal dead when the virus was taken from it?—No, it was alive. I do not know exactly how it was taken; I believe from some of the excrement of the animal, but I am not sure about that.

8642. Mr. *Clare Read*] When you complained that the Orders in Council could be varied at any moment, I suppose you meant that if there was an Act of Parliament that could not be altered in a moment it would be more lasting and permanent?—It could be depended on.

8643. Do you think that the trade in dead meat is increasing throughout the kingdom?—I believe it is very much so.

8644. You are aware that a very considerable quantity of it comes from Scotland, I suppose?—Yes, I am.

8645. And therefore that some butchers do prefer the dead meat trade to the live meat trade?—Certainly.

8646. There are no store stock which come into England from Scotland by water that you are aware of?—I never heard of any.

8647. If there were you would have the same regulations apply to them as are recommended to apply to Irish stock?—Certainly; the recommendation being simply for the advantage of the animal, and therefore of the proprietor.

8648. Have you made any calculation at all with reference to the loss the country has sustained by any recent outbreak of foot and mouth disease?—I have in the case of the Herefordshire losses; if the rate of loss which has existed in Herefordshire in 1872 applies to the whole of Great Britain, the loss would be 13,000,000 £ or 14,000,000 £ in one year.

8649. By the returns of the Privy Council, I think the outbreak was not exceptionally severe in 1872?—There were no Police Returns in 1872, but the Police Inspectors' Returns in 1871 show that the average per cent. of attacks of cattle in Great Britain was 9½; in Herefordshire it was not quite 9, so that Herefordshire would be a moderate sample, and not one too large, but only

a moderate sample of the number of attacks in proportion to the number of animals.

8650. Reference has been made in your evidence as to the quantity of the meat supply to this kingdom; have you seen the calculation inserted in the Veterinary Report of last year?—Yes, I have.

8651. Are you aware that that is different from your calculation?—I think that refers to the meat supply of Great Britain only; mine refers to the United Kingdom.

8652. And therefore the difference between the two might probably result from Ireland not being embraced in the published returns, while it is embraced in your returns?—That would make a very great difference.

8653. Have you in any way since then revised your figures, and made calculations upon a different basis?—Some time ago I published an estimate of the meat supply, which I have modified very much, by more elaborate inquiry, and the results are in these tables which I wish to put in as evidence (*producing the same*).

8654. With regard to these Tables, what is the result of the modification?—The result is, which was not done before, to explain the figures which appear in the agricultural returns.

8655. What is the result; do they invalidate that calculation?—The result is that the percentage comes out just about the same as it did before, of the foreign live animals in proportion to the home animals.

8656. Am I right in stating that you make the percentage to be: home supply of meat, 83·16 per cent.; foreign live animals 5·07, and foreign dead meat, bacon, pork, hams, and other meat, 11·77 per cent.?—Yes, that is the result of the inquiry.

8657. What is your calculation with reference to the amount of animal food consumed by the population of this kingdom per year?—It is about six imperial scores per head.

8658. That is very much in excess of the calculation which is made by the Privy Council?—I believe it is.

8659. You wish to put in these Tables?—I do. (*The same were handed in, vide Appendix.*)

8660. Mr. *Dent*] With respect to the calculation of the losses last year from foot and mouth disease, I understand you to say they were between 13,000,000 £ and 14,000,000 £?—I think it is somewhere over 13,000,000 £, taking the Herefordshire losses as a sample; but I believe them to be considerably more than that.

8661. And taking the estimate of cattle attacked, given in the returns as 10 per cent. of the whole number of cattle in England, does that estimate refer to cattle only, or to cattle and sheep?—Cattle only. The returns upon the number of attacks in sheep, I look upon as very imperfect; the police inspectors know very little about the number of sheep affected.

8662. But is your estimate of 13,000,000 £ or 14,000,000 £ of loss upon cattle, sheep, and pigs taken together, or cattle only?—Cattle, sheep, and pigs.

8663. How much would you put down for cattle?—The Herefordshire figures will show that, upon which another witness will give evidence.

8664. But you tell me that you estimate the loss last year, from foot and mouth disease upon the stock of Great Britain, at between 13,000,000 £ and 14,000,000 £?—I do it in this way; in Herefordshire the number of cattle is 70,000, and

the loss was 93,000 £, and the number of cattle in Great Britain is 5,800,000, and the same rate of loss upon them would be 7,440,000 £, and the sheep I take in the same way, taking the number of sheep in Herefordshire as compared with the number of sheep in Great Britain.

8685. Then how do you estimate the number of sheep in Herefordshire?—Mr. Duckham will give the figures.

8686. You put your loss, as I understand, upon cattle at 7,000,000 £.—£. 7,500,000.

8687. Then how do you get at the amount of the loss upon sheep?—I work a rule of three from the loss in Herefordshire, which has been ascertained from very minute inquiry.

8688. There were a certain number of sheep attacked in Herefordshire, and therefore you assume that there may have been the same number of sheep comparatively in other counties?—Yes.

8689. And swine the same?—And swine the same.

8690. I want to ascertain how you calculate your loss; there are a certain number of animals affected?—There is a loss in condition, and a loss of time, and so on, in making meat when the animal is not killed.

8691. Could you give the Committee a little more detail upon that point. The loss in condition upon fat animals would be how much?—£. 2 a head I have put it at.

8692. Upon an animal of what value?—Taking a large average of a large number of cattle of different breeds.

8693. What do you take as the average value of fat beasts upon which you would put the loss at 2 £ per head?—From about 25 £. to 30 £.

8694. But that is rather a high average, is it not?—No, it is not; when beef is at 10 s. per imperial stone.

8695. And upon those animals you would average the loss at 2 £ per head?—I think that the losses upon fat cattle might be put down at 2 £ per head; it would not be enough upon dairy stock, or anything like enough.

8696. What would you put down as the loss upon store cattle?—The loss upon store cattle I should not put down at quite so much.

8697. What would you put the loss at?—I suppose that would depend upon whether they were young things, or what they were.

8698. But you must have estimated it at something to give as the estimate of 13,000,000 £ or 14,000,000 £, because if there is that loss, it becomes a very important matter to deal with foot and mouth disease by stringent measures. We ought to have the basis of your calculations before us?—The statement I made about 13,000,000 £. was simply an application of the Herefordshire case to the whole of the country; the Herefordshire case gives its own calculations.

8699. Therefore you do not base it upon any independent inquiry of your own?—Not that particular inquiry; but my own independent calculation which I made, came out at about 16,000,000 £ to 17,000,000 £.

8700. Could you give the Committee the basis of your own independent calculation?—I have not brought it with me, because I did not expect to be asked questions upon that point.

8701. Mr. Clive Read.] If the Herefordshire case, as presented to the Committee by another witness is correct, if that were applied to the

whole kingdom, that would be the result?—That is so.

8682. That is, all you pretend to do in this case is to work out the calculation?—That is so.

8683. Mr. Kenworthy.] These tables are only what we may call hypothetical tables?—They would be except for the fact that Herefordshire is, according to the Veterinary Report of 1871, quite a fair and moderate sample for the rest of the kingdom; if it had not that to show for it, it would be a rather wild estimate.

8684. It is your opinion that the Veterinary Department's Return of Herefordshire might be taken a fair sample of the rest of the kingdom?—That is so.

8685. Mr. Barclay.] That is with regard to foot and mouth disease?—That is with regard to foot and mouth disease only; it does not refer to other diseases.

8686. But it has been stated that the reports with regard to foot and mouth disease have been very irregular; in some cases they have been given and some not?—The Veterinary Report itself states that the cases reported are probably less than half the real number of cases.

8687. Have you inquired into the experience of butchers killing cattle which have suffered from foot and mouth disease?—I have not particularly inquired, but I know something about it.

8688. You are not able to say whether a butcher in buying an animal will take into account in the price he gives for it the fact, that four or five months previously the animal had suffered from foot and mouth disease?—I think he would give for it what it is worth at the time.

8689. But in judging by what he would give for the animal at the time, would he be influenced by the fact, that the animal had had foot and mouth disease four or five months previously?—I do not think so.

8690. Have you spoken to butchers upon that point?—I do not think so, especially.

8691. Have you put that point to the hushers (you do not think so of your own knowledge), whether an animal would be worse, or have any change in it, after four months?—I could not speak to that.

8692. Have you asked butchers upon that point?—I could not name any one particularly.

8693. Mr. Jacob Bright.] I think you represent the Central Chamber of Agriculture?—Yes, I do.

8694. You are in favour of the absolute prohibition of cattle coming into this country, that is to say, you would have compulsory slaughter?—I would have compulsory slaughter or quarantine.

8695. Would that be an injury to the importer, or the person sending the cattle to this country?—It would add to the price of the quarantined animals, because they would be safe, and they would therefore be worth more money; there would be no risk in buying them.

8696. Do you think that if all animals were either slaughtered or put in quarantine, those who now send animals to this country would be encouraged to send just as much as they are at present?—I think more so, because the trade would be regular, and no change would take place, and they would make arrangements accordingly.

8697. Do they take the same view on the subject as you do?—I think the majority of the

Mr.
J. A. Clarke,
9 June 1873.

Mr.
J. A. Clarke.
9 June 1872.

importers would rather have things as they are, just as the farmers would rather be left alone.

8698. You say that the majority of the importers would rather have things left as they are, that is to say, that they consider the trade would be more profitable to them open than obstructed, as you propose to obstruct it?—Men in a large business like that do not like changing. It might involve changing the persons employed in that trade.

8699. But there is a belief entertained widely in this country, that to compel the slaughter of animals at ports would be to diminish the importation of animals?—I think that is so.

8700. You think that is a delusion?—I think it is a great mistake.

8701. You think it would not diminish the importation of cattle?—I think it would diminish the importation of store cattle to some extent, but not of the other cattle.

8702. But upon the whole, you think it would diminish the importation of cattle?—I do not think that it would diminish, I rather think that it would improve, the trade in the cattle which were for slaughter; it perhaps might diminish the number of store cattle imported.

8703. You think it is likely that it would diminish the importation of store cattle?—That I am not certain about.

8704. You speak of dead meat coming from the North of Scotland; is there no difference; do you mean to say that it is quite as easy for dead meat to come from the Continent of Europe as it is to come from the North of Scotland?—I should think so, quite.

8705. Do you think that there is nothing in the circumstances and in the climate which makes it more easy to send dead meat from Aberdeen than from some parts of the Continent?—I should not expect much dead meat from Spain, especially in the summer time.

8706. Take Germany, for example?—I should not see any difficulty in that; there is some dead meat now coming from Germany.

8707. In the summer time?—That I do not know.

8708. You think there is some dead meat coming from Germany?—I believe there is.

8709. Have you any evidence upon that point?—I think the Board of Trade Returns state the ports from which the dead meat comes; I do not know exactly.

8710. Do you think it is likely that any of the dead meat comes from the Continent in summer time?—The amount of fresh meat which comes from the Continent is very small at the present time.

8711. But do you think it is likely that they send any dead meat from the Continent in the hot weather?—No; I think they would prefer cooler weather.

8712. Then you think it unlikely that from the Continent they would send us dead meat in the summer time?—I do not think that the dead meat trade with the Continent is likely to increase at all unless there is some other mode of conveyance, many schemes for effecting which are now before the public.

8713. Does dead meat come from Scotland now in the summer time?—Not in very hot weather I think, but I am not aware about that.

8714. You do not know whether dead meat comes from Scotland in the summer time? It does by rail, but I thought you referred to sea.

8715. I understand that you do draw a dis-

tinction between the North of Scotland and the Continent; you say that dead meat comes from Scotland in the summer time, but you would not at all expect to see it come from Germany or from any of those continental countries?—I should not expect that much dead meat would come from the Continent under any circumstances unless a new mode of transit were discovered.

8716. Then you admit that there is a broad line of distinction between Scotland and the Continent?—Not in the same season; in the summer time there is a difficulty in shipping from either.

8717. But you can get it by rail from Scotland?—Yes, certainly.

8718. Then there is a fallacy, is there not, in arguing because you can get dead meat from the North of Scotland therefore you can get it from the Continent?—I never expect to have much dead meat from the Continent.

8719. You talk with apparently great confidence about the slaughter of animals at the ports and about depriving this country entirely, as I understand, of live animals brought from abroad, and in supporting that view will not you admit that there are countries upon the Continent which take just as great care to have their cattle healthy as we do in any part of this country, and that in fact there are countries where the animals are attended to even better than they are here, and where great precautions are taken for their health?—Yes, I believe so.

8720. Would not it be very odd, if that be so, that we should advocate the slaughtering of animals coming from every country in Europe, coming from Spain, coming from Schleswig-Holstein and Denmark; does not it seem an exceedingly harsh measure to take?—I do not know any country upon the Continent which is not liable to send us foot and mouth disease, and other diseases probably.

8721. But still you admit that there are countries upon the Continent which take precautions as great as any that we take, and where they are as much interested in the health of their cattle as we are?—Certainly, they may be so; I believe they are.

8722. And they have an additional interest, have they not, in the health of their cattle, because for their cattle to become diseased interferes with their trade to this country, so that they have an additional interest to that which we have?—But when I have cattle disease upon my farm it is my interest to get rid of the diseased animals as quietly and as quickly as I can if I choose to evade the law to the injury of my neighbours.

8723. What has that to do with this question of foreign import?—That the same motives would operate with the foreign producer of cattle, that he would be tempted to get rid of his diseased cattle to the injury of his neighbours.

8724. That he might be tempted to send his diseased cattle here?—No doubt.

8725. Have you looked upon the effect produced upon the imports of different countries by the restrictions established in some of our ports; have you observed whether the importation of cattle has been diminished by those restrictions?—I have observed that the importation has been influenced very much more by the question of price than by the operation of any restriction.

8726. But have you observed that with the restrictions the importation of cattle has diminished?—

nished?—The importation of cattle very much diminished last year, but I have never been able to trace it to any additional restrictions.

8727. Mr. Kewenau. Has not the price of meat increased?—It has not increased much within the last two years, I think.

8728. Therefore the evidence that we have had given to this Committee that the price of meat has increased very considerably throughout the country is not true?—The price of meat has increased very seriously within the last few years.

8729. And still the importations have decreased?—The importations decreased in 1872.

8730. Although the price of meat has increased?—Yes.

8731. Do not you think it likely that the increased price would increase importation if left alone?—I think so; but then there is another explanation of the present case that the foreigner has been suffering from foot and mouth disease, and other diseases, as we have, and he has not the meat to send.

8732. But still it is probable that the importation would increase with the increased price?—Certainly.

8733. Mr. Clare Read. Are you aware that upon the Continent the prices are almost as high as they are here?—I believe they are nearly the same.

8734. Mr. Barclay. Are you aware whether the quantity of meat of all kinds imported into this country has increased during the last few years?—It has increased very much during the past year as compared with the year before.

8735. It is of very little consequence to the consumer, whether the meat comes here dead or alive; the import of dead meat will affect the price as much as the import of live animals?—I believe the increase is due to the import of salt meat.

8736. What sort of salt meat?—Bacon, pork, and hams.

8737. Have you any figures of the import of Australian preserved meat?—I think the imports of Australian meat have very much diminished during last year; I think the trade has been very much knocked to pieces.

8738. Within what time?—Within half a year.

8739. The import of preserved meats, otherwise than by salting, during 1872, was no less 352,028 cwts.?—Yes.

8740. And the total amount of beef of all kinds, salted or fresh, was only 228,000 cwts., so that the import from Australia, from which place the preserved meat usually comes, is greater than the beef from all other quarters together, while in 1870 the import of preserved meat was only 84,000 cwts., so that we have an increase in the course of these two years, no less than 278,000 cwts.?—I am quite aware that there has been a very great increase in the preserved meat trade, but that within the last few months the prospects of the trade have been diminished very much; in fact, the last report that I read from Melbourne was that they could not get animals at a sufficiently low price to be remunerative, and that the trade would be very much diminished.

8741. A large import of dead meat affects the price here quite as much as the import of live animals, does it not?—Such a large proportion of it being salt, I do not know that it would.

8742. Australian meat is not salt?—But that is a very small proportion.

8743. The figures I have just read to you show that the import of preserved meat is greater than the import of other beef, salt or fresh?—I did not understand that that was so.

Mr.
J. A. Clarke.
9 June 1873.

Thursday, 12th June 1873.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mr. James Barclay.
Mr. Jacob Bright.
Mr. Clay.
Mr. Dent.
Mr. D-don.
Mr. William Johnston.

Mr. Kavanagh.
Mr. Monzell.
Mr. Clare Read.
Mr. Ridley.
Sir Henry Selwin Ibbetson.
Mr. Tipping.

CLARE SEWELL READ, Esq., in the Chair.

Mr. THOMAS RIGBY, called in; and Examined.

Mr. Rigby.
12 June
1873

8744. Chairman.] I BELIEVE you are a farmer living in Cheshire?—Yes.

8745. How much land do you occupy?—About 350 acres.

8746. Are you secretary to the Cheshire Chamber of Agriculture?—I am.

8747. And secretary to the Manchester and Liverpool Agriculture Society?—Yes.

8748. Were you inspector of farms for that society, previously to being the secretary?—Yes; I was for three years.

8749. The last three years you have awarded prizes for the best cultivated farms in Denbighshire and Flintshire, have you not?—Yes.

8750. In this capacity you have travelled largely over those counties as well as your own, I presume?—Yes, I have.

8751. And you are supposed to know how the cattle are kept?—Yes, I am.

8752. And how the land is farmed?—Yes.

8753. You know the feeling of the farmers in the district pretty well, do you not?—Very well, I think, generally.

8754. Have you seen or read any portions of Mr. Verdon's evidence?—Yes; I have seen it.

8755. And what is your opinion of his statements with reference to the farmers and farming in Cheshire?—I think they are very erroneous as describing the farming generally. I can only conceive of his evidence being true as descriptive of about the worst instances of farming in Cheshire.

8756. You think that cattle are not so neglected as Mr. Verdon states they are?—No; nothing like it, generally; there are cases as there are in all counties, I dare say, of some exposure in the winter season longer than there ought to be; but there is nothing beyond that that I am aware of.

8757. There are exceptional cases of negligence, and there are slovenly farmers there as there are elsewhere?—Quite so.

8758. You have had cattle plague very badly in Cheshire, have you not?—Yes; very badly indeed.

8759. It has been worse there than in any county in England, has it not?—Yes; I believe so, in proportion.

8760. What did you calculate the loss at from

cattle plague?—I calculated it at from about 700,000 L. to 800,000 L.

8761. That is the actual loss?—Yes.

8762. Without taking into account the trouble and the subsequent loss?—Yes; that was before the Act for compensation passed.

8763. Will you inform the Committee how the cattle plague came into your county?—It came from some Dutch cattle that were sold by a dealer at Market Drayton.

8764. Were they Dutch store cattle?—They were store cattle; the dealer sold them to a farmer residing near to Market Drayton, and the disease developed itself there, and from that part it spread into the county.

8765. You say those animals were Dutch stock; had they been in England any time, or did they come straight from the Metropolitan Market?—I think they came pretty direct from London.

8766. Have you had any experience with regard to pleuro-pneumonia?—I have.

8767. In your own stock?—In my own stock.

8768. Do you believe pleuro-pneumonia to be an infectious and contagious disease?—Decidedly.

8769. I suppose you cannot always trace its spread, although you can generally, to contagious infected cattle?—Yes, generally, but perhaps not always.

8770. What experience have you had with regard to inoculation as a prevention to pleuro-pneumonia?—At the instance of the Cheshire Chamber of Agriculture I superintended the inoculation of some cattle, the property of one of the members, and in that case it seemed to be a partial preventative of further spreading; one or two of the cattle that were inoculated died, but in the others it seemed to check the disease. Then in another case I superintended the placing of two calves which had been inoculated in a shippin were cows were standing, which had pleuro-pneumonia; those calves escaped pleuro-pneumonia, and have remained free ever since. Another member also inoculated some of his cattle when the disease came amongst his herd, and he had no other cases after that time.

8771. Were the cows which were the subject of disease kept with the disease upon them, or were they killed, in the last case you mentioned?

—It was the practice in all the three cases to isolate those which were diseased as much as possible, but it was not complete isolation.

8772. Although those are experiments which point in a measure towards the benefit of inoculation, you do not rely upon them as any positive proof of the good of inoculation?—No, I do not.

8773. What alteration in the law would you propose in regard to pleuro-pneumonia; you are aware that it is only permissive upon the part of the local authorities to kill the cattle; what would you do?—I should recommend that every cow or animal, as soon as it was attacked with pleuro-pneumonia, should be slaughtered.

8774. And compensation paid in full?—And compensation paid, but not in full, as that might induce some imposition; but I would be in favour of giving something like two-thirds or three-fourths of the value, so as to induce people to make it known and to get rid of it as soon as possible.

8775. What would you do with the other cattle which were herded with the diseased animals?—I would inoculate them.

8776. You would inoculate them, and isolate them?—I would isolate in all cases.

8777. For how long a time would you have the cattle isolated; do you think 28 days is long enough?—No, I have known the disease to break out in stock after having apparently ceased for three months, and the disease has begun in the same stock in some cases.

8778. You mean to say after the diseased cattle have been killed or died, then at the expiration of three months you have known the disease break out again in the same herd?—Yes.

8779. Do you think the disease had been incubating all that time?—I could not quite say that; I only know the fact; it might have arisen from some other cause.

8780. But you are sure that 28 days is not long enough to isolate the cattle?—It is not long enough; I should certainly double the time, and say two months at the least.

8781. Do you suppose that when a diseased animal has died the danger of contagion is in a great measure removed from the carcass?—I should think that it was removed, but I should get the carcass out of the way as soon as possible.

8782. You would not think it necessary to have an animal that was killed in the first stages of pleuro-pneumonia, buried, and have the flesh destroyed?—No, not if the animal was killed as soon as it could be clearly proved that it was suffering from pleuro-pneumonia.

8783. Do you fancy that if your system of endeavouring to stamp out pleuro-pneumonia by slaughtering diseased animals, and isolating and inoculating those which had been herded with them, were carried out, that would be a very serious expense?—I do not think it would be more expensive than the present mode, not so much, I should say, because it would tend to rid us of the disease more completely, and we should certainly be much better off than we are now.

8784. That is your own opinion with reference to stamping out pleuro-pneumonia; do you gather that to be the opinion of the farmers in Cheshire generally?—Yes, decidedly so.

8785. And in those counties which you have mentioned would you think that that opinion prevailed there as well?—I would not like to speak quite with the same certainty upon that point, as I have not made the matter so much a

matter of inquiry, but I never heard an opposite opinion.

8786. When you have spoken to other farmers upon the subject you have never heard a contrary opinion to your own?—No; I have never heard any farmers say that they would try to cure or that they could cure the disease; there is no certainty about it.

8787. As it is do the farmers generally slaughter them?—I think as it is they isolate the cattle in the first instance, but they do not slaughter, for they are afraid of the loss, they hope that the animal may recover, and the animals are kept, perhaps, longer than they ought to be.

8788. And your cattle being chiefly dairy cows and young animals, of course the loss would be much more upon those animals than upon fat stock?—Yes; in slaughtering it would, because the meat would not be so fit for market as that of fat cattle.

8789. Now with regard to foot and mouth disease, have you had much experience of that?—Yes; I have.

8790. In your own stock?—Yes.

8791. How often have you had it?—Several times. I have not had it above twice, I think, myself. I have escaped rather more than my neighbours, I think, personally.

8792. Why is that?—I can hardly tell. I do not keep cattle for dairying myself, but purchase barren cattle to feed. I buy them chiefly from the mountainous parts of Wales, from the high land. I think I have noticed that such cattle are not so liable to disease when they come down to us. My plan is to feed at grass during the summer months. I do not keep them during the winter.

8793. Then do you buy in the spring?—Yes; I do.

8794. Those cattle having been in themselves healthy, not having undergone the privations of a sea-voyage, you think they are more healthy when you buy them?—Yes; that is my experience. Last year, foot-and-mouth disease was all round my farm, but I escaped it. I did not have that disease at all.

8795. Do you think that the Welsh cattle are more exempt from foot-and-mouth disease than Irish cattle?—Decidedly so.

8796. Do you imagine that the Irish cattle are diseased when they leave home, or that they contract the disease in transit?—I think the Irish cattle contract the disease in transit; that is the general idea which is prevalent in the country. We are told that inspection is not very complete in Dublin. When the animals are shipped, they are closely confined in the holds of vessels, and they get very much heated, and when they land at Holyhead they are exposed in a cold open shed, put on the railway immediately and sent into the country, and we have an idea that that treatment certainly predisposes them to the development of some disease; that is the general idea.

8797. Do you think that this treatment induces pleuro-pneumonia as well as foot-and-mouth disease?—Yes; I think that treatment is rather more likely to develop pleuro-pneumonia than foot-and-mouth disease, but I believe that both of them may be traced to that source.

8798. You do not believe in the spontaneous origin, either of pleuro-pneumonia or foot-and-mouth disease, do you?—No; I do not believe in spontaneous origin, either of pleuro-pneumonia

Z z

or

Mr. Blyth.

12 June
1873.

Mr. Rigby.
11 June
1873.

or foot-and-mouth disease; there are cases which it is difficult to explain, but it is so very contagious that I cannot but think there are some causes of contagion which we do not detect.

8199. What is the opinion, generally speaking, with respect to the Irish cattle which you have in Cheshire. I understand you to say that they come mostly from Holyhead, and that they are not landed in Liverpool?—Just so; most or all of the store cattle which come into Cheshire come by way of Holyhead and Chester; and another point, which rather increases the danger, is that the animals are exposed first in the Chester market, which is at the entrance to the county from Holyhead; Chester is under another local authority from what the county is; and they are not so strict there in inspection of these animals when they come to a fair, and they get diffused through the country from the Chester market.

8200. As a rule, are these Irish cattle brought by dealers, or do the farmers import them direct from Ireland?—As a rule, they are brought by dealers; there are a few instances of farmers going over themselves and buying them, and bringing them over.

8201. Is there any difference between the health of those stock and the stock which are jobbed about from fair to fair in England?—Yes. I have a letter from a farmer who has fetched several lots over, and says that by the care he has taken of them, and his superintendence upon the voyage, these cattle have generally escaped the disease.

8202. Does that farmer go with them himself?—Yes.

8203. That is the substance of his letter?—Yes. He says "I have been a buyer of Irish cattle for 20 years, and I have twice brought pleuro-pneumonia. I have fetched over myself 1,700 sheep and 100 head of cattle in ten weeks, and as I attended to them myself during the voyage and to my home, the impression made upon my mind is that there is not much danger of disease except when cattle come in contact with infected cattle."

8204. You have no practical experience yourself of the transit of Irish stock by sea?—No, I have not.

8205. And no knowledge of the state of the cattle in Ireland?—Not personally.

8206. But I think you have seen some Spanish cattle landed, have you not?—I have seen some Spanish cattle landed in Liverpool; they were fat cattle.

8207. In what state were they?—They were in a very good state when they were landed.

8208. Did there seem to be every precaution and care taken to make them comfortable?—Yes, every care.

8209. You are aware that there is not the same care taken with the Irish store cattle?—From what I have read, I think there cannot be anything like the same care taken with the Irish store cattle that there was in that case.

8210. What further measures would you take to stop the spread of foot-and-mouth disease?—I do not know that I could suggest anything more than the strict carrying out of the orders in Council in a uniform manner.

8211. You were saying just now that you had several different local authorities in your country?—Yes.

8212. Would they be boroughs?—Chester is a county of itself; but then there are the

boroughs of Stockport and Macclesfield, which are under their own regulations with respect to fairs and markets.

8213. These boroughs are under the regulation of their own town councils?—Yes, they are.

8214. Do you believe that the restrictions imposed upon these markets are altogether as satisfactory and as strict as you could desire?—No, they are not.

8215. How would you propose to remedy the defect of having so many different local authorities; would you have a county board, in which the borough members should have seats with the county justices?—Yes; I think that a board of that kind formed from the boroughs as well as the county, in some way, if they could agree upon a plan, would be certainly better; it would tend to more uniformity in the orders which they receive, and to a more complete carrying out of suitable restrictions. I would put them under one management, and unite them altogether.

8216. So as to have only one local authority for the whole county?—Yes.

8217. Do you think if the boroughs had a fair representation at the board, say according to their rateable value, or something of that sort, they would object?—I think not.

8218. You think such a thing would work?—Yes.

8219. With regard to Irish cattle, what further provisions would you make to insure their coming over here in a more healthy state?—I should like to know that the animals were not quite so crowded on board ship, and that when they were landed at Holyhead they were put into a tolerably warm and protected shed to be cooled down, and fed and watered before they were transhipped to the railway; and I think also that it would conduce greatly to their comfort, and perhaps to their health, if the railway trucks had spring buffers attached to them. The animals are sometimes a long time upon the road, and they are shunted about from station to station. I have seen cattle coming from Holyhead to Chester. I have brought Welsh cattle in that way, and I have noticed the treatment of the Irish cattle, and I have seen some very cruel things done to them.

8220. In what way. Do you mean by being shunted about, or bruised, or kept a long time at the station?—They are kept a long time at stations, and the train is joggled and knocked very much, which is very injurious to cattle in calf, as is mostly the case with stores coming to Chester.

8221. How long a detention would be necessary at Chester, and the ports of debarkation?—I think a detention of six hours would be sufficient.

8222. Would you wish that all cattle sent from Ireland to England should be inspected at the port of debarkation as well as embarkation?—Yes; I think that ought to be done.

8223. You wish to put no further restriction upon the movement of Irish cattle than we have in England?—My experience is that the farmers in Cheshire would very willingly submit to the restrictions already imposed, if they were conscious that similar care was taken in coming over to England, or if all possible care was taken, such as I speak of.

8224. You would have an inspection at the Irish ports, and also at the English ports?—Yes, I would.

8225. And

Mr. Rigby.
19 June
1873.

8825. And if any disease developed itself among the cattle during the voyage, what would you do?—I could scarcely say, but I think they should be detained at Holyhead; I think that they should be isolated at once from the others, and the whole herd should be treated with proper care and surveillance by the authority, so as to prevent the importation of disease by those measures, which must occur to those who are interested in the matter. I do not like to suggest what definite measures should be taken.

8826. You think that some measure of that sort is imperative, to guard us from diseased cattle?—Decidedly, in Cheshire, I think it is.

8827. Have you seen anything in reference to the cleansing of railway trucks?—Yes, I have.

8828. Do you think that that cleansing is sufficiently carried out?—I hardly think it is.

8829. Is there any difficulty in inspecting railway trucks; that is to say, are they not continually moving about, so that it is difficult for one local inspector to get at the trucks?—I think there ought to be an inspector going about from fair to fair, or from market to market. It is the practice of railway authorities to have a number of trucks ready to load at the stations of towns at which fairs are being held, and it would not be difficult for an inspector to see that they were properly cleaned and disinfected.

8830. You think that there should be a Government inspector roving all over the country to see that these orders are properly carried out with regard to disinfecting railway trucks?—I think that that would be very likely to be useful.

8831. As a sort of check upon the local authorities?—Upon the railway companies rather, I think.

8832. Have you made any calculation at all in reference to the loss your county has sustained from foot-and-mouth disease and pleuro-pneumonia during the last year, 1872?—I have taken the returns which have been published by the chief constable for the three years and five months ending the 4th of January last, and I have put my own estimate upon the cattle, and the losses from pleuro-pneumonia and from foot-and-mouth disease, and I make it to come to something like 86,712*l.* per year during those three years and five months, according to the numbers returned by the chief inspector; that is the average for three years and six months, as I may call it, but really it is only for three years and five months, so that if I am right in the estimate of the individual value, the estimate of 86,000*l.* is rather under than over the value.

8833. So that in ten years you would have lost, if those diseases continue, more than you would have lost from the cattle plague?—Yes.

8834. Would you give the Committee the benefit of your calculations in detail?—Yes, I will. With regard to the losses from pleuro-pneumonia in Cheshire, according to the chief inspector's return, 311 were killed for market; I put down a loss of 5*l.* each upon them; 184 were killed for burial, and 184 died; I have put them at 15*l.* each; 251 recovered; but I debit them with a loss of 10*l.* each, because a cow or an animal recovering from pleuro-pneumonia is always greatly reduced in condition. I make that to be a total of 8,836*l.*, and it gives the annual loss at 2,524*l.* The losses from foot-and-mouth disease were 53 killed for market, which I put down at 5*l.* each; 86 were killed for burial; 965 died, which I put down at 15*l.* each; and

111,427 cattle recovered; the loss upon them I estimate at 50*z.* each, which brings the total per year to 84,188*l.*, making a total upon both diseases of 86,712*l.*

8835. As the average annual loss during the last three and a half years in your county alone?—Yes, in my county alone, according to the chief inspector's reports.

8836. Do you suppose those reports embrace every case of disease?—No; the chief inspector told me that he believed a good many cases were concealed, and that every case was not given notice of as it ought to be; but I certainly think it would be more under the correct statement of the thing than over.

8837. Do you consider that your estimate of 50*z.* a head lost from foot-and-mouth disease upon those animals which recovered is an excessive or a very moderate one?—It is a very moderate one. Many farmers have the opinion that at least 3*l.*, or even more is lost, and perhaps it may be so, for there are remote contingencies arising always, as we have proved this last spring in Cheshire. A great deal of abortion has prevailed this spring, which we think may be traced to so many cattle having had foot-and-mouth disease last year seriously.

8838. And so many of those cattle being cows the loss would be greater upon them than if they had been store stock, or even fat cattle?—Yes; decidedly.

8839. Mr. Knowlough.] I think you said with regard to Mr. Verdon's evidence, which you have read over, that you did not think it was really correct with regard to Cheshire?—With regard to the farming of Cheshire, I think it is decidedly incorrect as descriptive of the farming of the county generally.

8840. I forget exactly what the nature of his evidence is, but would you state the particulars in which you disagree with him?—I think he says very broadly that the farming of Cheshire is very bad, and I contend that it is nothing like that, as very great improvements have been made in the farming of Cheshire. And, I will go so far as to say, that I think as much value of produce per acre is raised in Cheshire as in many other counties in England.

8841. Then you are more inclined to agree with Mr. Jenkins's Report to the Royal Agricultural Society that Cheshire is a model county?—I will not say that it is a model county, but certainly Mr. Jenkins is much more correct than Mr. Verdon is.

8842. You would think that Cheshire is nearer to a model county than it is to what Mr. Verdon stigmatised it, as being very carelessly managed?—Yes.

8843. As regards carrying out the Act, do you think Cheshire may be regarded as a model county?—I am quite sure that the Act is very well carried out under the local authorities of the county of Chester. I think the Act is carried out as well as it possibly could be in that respect.

8844. Did not Cheshire suffer very severely at the period of the cattle plague?—Very severely.

8845. And do you think that the Act was carried out then in an exemplary manner?—Yes it was, but you are aware that there were frequent alterations in the Orders of the Privy Council at the commencement of the cattle plague; after the passing of the Act every possible precaution was taken, and everything done that could be

Mr. Rigby.

done to carry out the spirit of the Act of Parliament.

8846. I find a report here, in the Appendix to the Veterinary Report upon the Cattle Plague in Great Britain, saying that, "Cheshire has been often cited as having suffered more than any other county, but those who are familiar with the numerous causes which exist there to favour the continuance of the plague are not surprised at the extent of their losses; rather, in fact, at the smallness of them. The dairy farmers displayed more than usual obstinacy in resisting the means by which alone the plague could be exterminated"; you do not agree with that Report, I believe?—The farmers did not certainly display more than usual obstinacy; there was opposition to it; the farmers could not believe that the animals could not be cured, and there was opposition manifested to the Act; but the authorities were very strict in carrying it out, and I think that the officers acted in an exemplary and proper manner.

8847. Did not the farmers of Cheshire generally, as a rule, resist that part of the Act which compelled the slaughter of affected animals?—They resisted it at first, as I have said, but it was no use, they had to submit.

8848. Is it the fact that the Marquis of Westminster agreed to pay half the loss that his tenants suffered from cattle plague, upon condition that they would not allow any animal to be slaughtered?—I never heard of that before.

8849. If it was the fact would you have heard of it?—Yes, I think so.

8850. You do not think that that is a correct statement?—I think not; the late Marquis would be living then; if it had been so, I must have heard it, but I never have heard it. The late Marquis was very liberal to his tenants in making up for their losses, but I do not think he made it a condition of their not slaughtering; I certainly never heard of it.

8851. So far as your knowledge goes did he at all encourage his tenants to resist the effect of that order?—No.

8852. Then upon that point I have been wrongly informed?—I think so. I never heard that the Marquis did so; there was another gentleman in the county who did so to some extent.

8853. It was done, was it?—There was one gentleman, a member of the local authority, who did oppose it in his own view; but it was carried out by the authority in the spirit of the Act as a whole.

8854. Were not there some townships in Cheshire which suffered from cattle plague a great deal more extensively than others?—Yes.

8855. Should I be wrong in naming these townships, Puddington, Rahy, Woodchurch, and Neston; do you know those townships?—Yes; Neston suffered very much indeed. I have here an account which I wrote of the cattle plague in Cheshire (producing the same), and I refer in it to the different townships in the hundreds, and I find I have these names in the pamphlet.

8856. You think that these townships suffered more than the generality of the county?—No; not more than the average. I think less upon the whole in those townships; they are in the Wirral Hundred; the Hundred of Wirral lies between the Mersey and the Dee as a promontory, and I do not think they were so exposed to the con-

tagious influence as the other part of the county which was more centralized.

8857. Then my information is quite wrong, that very nearly all the cattle in those townships died from cattle plague?—I will not speak of those specific townships; but I speak of the whole hundred compared with other hundreds.

8858. Were there any of the proprietors in those townships who resisted the order for slaughter?—Not that I am aware of.

8859. I understood you to say that you did not recommend any further restrictions being put upon the import of Irish cattle into Cheshire, than that they should be well cared for on the voyage?—Just so; and if they were properly and carefully inspected upon their embarkation, and kept carefully during the voyage, and not overcrowded, and then if they were cooled down and were properly watered and fed at Holyhead before being sent by railway, I think, that we should not have the same amount of complaint as we certainly have now. I think that that treatment might prevent the spread of the disease in the county considerably.

8860. Do you agree with Mr. Clarke's evidence that there is an immense amount of foot-and-mouth disease imported into Cheshire from Ireland?—I can safely say that a good deal of disease follows the spread of Irish cattle in the county, whether it is always that they bring the disease with them, or that it is developed after they are settled upon the farms, is another question; but it is the general opinion of farmers in the county that whenever Irish cattle have been purchased, if it is a time when foot-and-mouth disease is about, it certainly spreads more after the introduction of such cattle into any district.

8861. Where do those Irish cattle come from after they have left Ireland; how do they come into Cheshire?—They generally come into Holyhead by boat, and then by rail down to Chester. It is attempted to bring them direct to a fair or market in Chester, and they are shown in that market, and if not sold they are driven to other fairs and markets in the county.

8862. Do not a great number of Irish cattle come into Cheshire from Wrexham, and from the Denbigh and Flint fairs?—No; not Irish cattle.

8863. But still you are of opinion, I think I gather from your answers, that the Irish cattle are more infected upon their journey than that they actually leave Ireland in a diseased state?—That is my opinion. I should think it was so; but I say I am not able to speak personally from my own knowledge of cattle on transit. I do not think I have heard much complaint that the animals have been shipped in a diseased state.

8864. What time would elapse between cattle being shipped in Ireland and arriving in Cheshire by the route you have described?—Perhaps a day and a half, or thereabouts.

8865. Not longer than that?—Not from the time of their being shipped at Dublin.

8866. Have you ever brought any of those Irish cattle yourself?—Never.

8867. Therefore you cannot speak from your own personal knowledge?—I cannot speak from my own personal knowledge; but I have always held the opinion which I am now expressing, and I have always determined never to buy Irish cattle, and I know many graders who follow the same kind of practice that I do who have the same

same view, and who say that they would not purchase Irish cattle upon any account.

8868. Are you sure that those cattle that you buy from Wales are really Welsh cattle?—Yes, I am.

8869. Is there a plain distinction between an Irish and a Welsh heaver?—Yes, there is.

8870. Mr. Dent.] Are they the black Welsh cattle that you buy?—Yes; they are a different class of cattle altogether.

8871. Mr. Kawasagh.] Can you give the Committee any idea from your experience what length of time foot-and-mouth disease would be incubating in an animal after the time he got the infection till it broke out?—I do not think I could speak with anything like confidence or specifically upon that point.

8872. You do not think the foot-and-mouth disease is so long in incubation as pleuro-pneumonia?—I should think not; I should think, as a rule, foot-and-mouth disease might break out about a week after the animal had been purchased, and sometimes about a fortnight; I think that would be about the time in which foot-and-mouth disease would develop itself.

8873. With regard to inoculation, I think you stated that you looked upon inoculation as efficacious in preventing pleuro-pneumonia?—I have a very high opinion of inoculation as being a preventative; I do not regard it as an absolute preventative, but I think the evidence which I have gathered goes to prove that it is a very proper and a very good thing to do upon the disease manifesting itself in any herd.

8874. With regard to inoculation, how do you take the virus; is it the virus from a live animal or a dead animal that you inoculate with?—From the lung of a dead animal, and that is an important point. I have been told by the veterinary surgeon, who was employed by the Cheshire Chamber of Agriculture, that he would like to have the virus when an animal had had the disease about three days, and if it was intended to inoculate, he would recommend the slaughter of animals in an early stage of the disease to get the virus; his opinion was to this effect, that virus taken in more advanced stages was more likely to produce greater inflammation, and the loss of the cows' tails in a very many instances; and other consequences.

8875. Did any of those cattle which were inoculated die?—Yes; in one case.

8876. From pleuro-pneumonia?—Yes, from pleuro-pneumonia; but it is possible that that might have arisen from their not being inoculated early enough after getting the disease; the disease might have been too far advanced in the system; that is a possible suggestion or idea of it.

8877. In many cases did the cows lose their tails?—Not very many; the per-centage is not very high.

8878. When they did lose their tails it was from mortification setting in?—Yes; there is less danger from it if done in cold weather than in very hot months in summer. I would not recommend inoculation to be performed in July or August; I think it might then possibly be as injurious as the disease itself.

8879. Then you do not agree with the veterinary professors, who look upon inoculation as worse than useless?—I do not.

8880. Did you ever try inoculation for foot-and-mouth disease?—No.

8881. With regard to the loss upon foot-and-

mouth disease, you say that you estimated the loss upon those stores which recovered, at 50 s. each; what sort of cattle were they?—The majority of them were good, fine milking cows; of course, in those numbers, there are some heifers taken into account, which are not so valuable; but they are all cattle taken at an average of 15 l. or 16 l. each.

8882. Now, on young store cattle, do you think that 50 s. would be a fair amount to estimate the loss at?—I do not think it would be quite so much upon young store cattle as upon the average of large cattle, but my estimate is upon an average of all, embracing heifers and young stock.

8883. Mr. Dent.] And fat stock?—Yes.

8884. Mr. Kawasagh.] You estimate the loss at 50 s., regarding all classes of stock, fat stock, dairy stock, and stores?—Yes, I do.

8885. And spreading the loss over all, you estimate the average loss at 50 s.?—Yes; I should say, that in Cheshire, we have not so many feeding cattle; the proportion of fat cattle would not be so very great; we are mostly a dairy county, and the cattle are mostly in a low state of condition. I dare say the loss in a feeding county would be more than this.

8886. Cheshire is mainly a dairy county, you say?—Yes.

8887. Therefore, there are an immense number of calves born there?—Yes, there are.

8888. What becomes of these calves?—A large proportion of them are fed for veal, and are sent to Manchester and Liverpool; a good number are reared by the farmers themselves; nearly all the heifer calves, for instance, and some few, I believe, this last spring and the last spring or two, have been sent away to other counties to be reared. I know of this going into Yorkshire, and into Scotland, and into Ireland.

8889. You know of some of them going into Ireland?—Yes, I do; but there have not been many of those last spring, I believe.

8890. Has that ever been a large trade?—Never, that I am aware of. Of course, I cannot say what might have been done with those calves in Manchester. I am speaking of cattle bought by Irish dealers, or taken to Ireland; the farmers have purchased them in Chester market, but I think it is hardly likely, because the calves that go there are real calves, worth more money than they would be likely to pay for them for stores.

8891. They are sent there fit for the butchers?—Yes; that is the chief trade.

8892. Mr. J. Bright.] I think you say you have written a pamphlet upon the subject of the cattle plague in Cheshire?—I have.

8893. In that pamphlet, did you discuss at all the causes and the reasons why Cheshire should have been exceptionally injured by the cattle plague?—My conclusions are, that it was because we are very largely stocked with cattle; cattle are very numerous all over the county, and the contagion would be more readily spread. I mean in this way, that the farms are small, and the buildings are contiguous; they are near together, and disease spreads more rapidly from farm to farm.

8894. But is there no other part of England where there are so many cattle per acre as in Cheshire?—I believe in Norfolk there are, but the homesteads are larger there, and consequently, further sunder; I have not been in Norfolk myself, but I think that would be the state of things.

x z 3

8895. You

Mr. Rigby.

13 June
1873.

Mr. Rigny.
—
12 June
1873.

8895. You think that Cheshire stands alone in that respect?—I know that it prevails in Cheshire, and I think that is a very probable explanation of it.

8896. Do you know anything about the extent to which the cattle plague prevailed in Lancashire?—I am not very conversant with any facts or figures about it, but I do not think it prevailed so largely as in Cheshire.

8897. I suppose that cattle plague did not prevail more largely in Lancashire than in other counties?—I think not.

8898. But it appears that Lancashire has just as large a number of cattle per acre as Cheshire?—Yes; but they are located in districts more closely. In the Fylde district, for instance, the cattle are more numerous, but in some parts of Lancashire very few cattle are kept.

8899. When human beings are attacked by epidemics we usually find that the places where the least sanitary precautions have been taken suffer the most, do we not?—Yes, we do, I believe.

8900. Then it would not be remarkable if that should be the cause why Cheshire suffered so much more than the rest of the country with cattle plague, would it?—It would not be remarkable; but the fact is, that in many places where there was the greatest negligence, they escaped the disease more than where there was the most care taken. I could give instances upon instances where there was the greatest neglect of sanitary arrangements, and yet the cattle escaped the plague.

8901. That would be so in particular instances, but upon the average you would scarcely suppose that would be so?—No, I would not suppose it; but I know upon the other hand, where every possible care was taken, and the use of preventives supplied in the shippers, but it did not seem to avail at all.

8902. Then if the reason which you give for the excessive amount of cattle plague be true, you would suppose that at any future time Cheshire would be much more liable to cattle plague than other counties?—If cattle plague got in, I think that similar results would follow again.

8903. And you think that Cheshire would suffer very much from being so very largely stocked with cattle?—Yes, I do.

8904. The only way to make Cheshire as secure as other counties would be to arrange that she should only have about half the number of cattle?—I think the only way would be to stamp it out as soon as it appeared. My view would be that if it appeared upon one farm the cattle upon that farm should all be killed.

8905. Have there not been many other explanations suggested for the intensity of the cattle plague there besides the one which you have given?—I do not think there have; not any which seem to be feasible; indeed, it did not seem to be amenable to any rule. The utmost difference of circumstances prevailed with similar results; there was as much fatality in one place where the utmost care was taken, as in others where the very reverse was the case.

8906. Have the authorities of Cheshire adopted no plan in regard to stamping out disease among cattle, and have the local authorities done nothing in altering their mode of conducting their business?—I do not think they have, except than from other circumstances, and perhaps from that

also, the cattle are being better fed in the winter time than they were formerly, and every possible care is taken of them, but it would be a mistake to suppose that the cattle were ever neglected to such an extent as to induce disease, because the interests of the farmer are bound up in keeping them in the best order possible. That is the rule, but there are exceptional cases, as I have said, and in those exceptional cases singularly enough the least loss occurred.

8907. Has Cheshire suffered more than other counties in respect to other diseases?—I should think it has suffered quite as much from foot-and-mouth disease as any other counties.

8908. And with regard to any other disease?—Pleurisy-pneumonia has been very prevalent in Cheshire; I cannot speak decidedly in reference to cornuaries.

8909. Do you think that with regard to every other kind of disease Cheshire has had its full share of them all?—I think it has.

8910. Mr. Topping.] You were speaking as regards the conveyance from Ireland, and you were referring to trucks generally, and especially to the route by Holyhead to Chester; to your own knowledge, are those cattle trucks negligent as regards the cleansing; are you aware from your own knowledge that the railway authorities do not cleanse those trucks as, according to the regulations, they ought to do?—I have seen the trucks coming from Welsh fairs on the Holyhead and Chester line, and I think they are not always cleansed as they ought to be.

8911. I want to arrive at the action of the railway companies in carrying out those regulations; to your knowledge you have seen cases of neglect?—Yes, I have. I trucked some cattle myself this spring from Corwen, and one of the trucks was in a very dirty state when the animals were put in.

8912. And you were attaching some importance to this; that in the loading of cattle on board ships they should not be over-crowded; are you not aware that it is frequently maintained that if cattle are too loosely packed, in rough weather they suffer extremely from the rolling; that a certain amount of compactness is required to meet the rolling about of the vessel?—Yes; I conceive it would be better to have the animals packed so as to prevent that, but I speak of excessive crowding, when they would be more thronged than to be comfortable.

8913. Have you at all considered this question of sea transit?—Not much personally, for I have never seen the animals come into Holyhead.

8914. Do you advocate deck transit as preferable to stowing the animals in the holds?—I think not, so far as my judgment would go; I think it would be better to put the cattle in the holds, if they were well ventilated and not so crowded.

8915. Speaking about your own county, as regards the county and the boroughs, you seemed to draw a distinction between the management of the county authorities and the borough authorities; do you think that the borough authorities in large towns have shown a want of strictness?—The borough authorities are more lax in carrying out the regulations.

8916. You are aware that they have to bear their share of the heavy losses caused by the slaughter and what not, and then the high price of meat as well, so that they have almost more reason to restrict the disease than the county authorities

Mr. Blyde.
17 June
1873.

authorities can have?—I think not; because the notable value is so much higher, and they only compensate for cattle which die within their boundary. For instance, in the case of the county of Chester I do not remember the figures; but the loss in the county of Chester is distinguished from the county of Cheshire was very much less.

8917. But doubtless it had to bear a very decided share of the total cost of the cattle plague originally. Now, as regards the peculiar loss in Cheshire, do you consider that dairy stock is more liable to disease and more tender than store and fattening stock?—Yes.

8918. Would that at all account for the excessive amount of disease in the county of Cheshire?—It might to some extent.

8919. Then you are of opinion decidedly that that would be the tendency?—I think that feeding cattle would perhaps be in a more robust state of health.

8920. Am I to understand from your observations in reply to the honourable Member for Carlisle County that you denied that there was anything like singular obstinacy in the earlier days of the disease, upon the part of the Cheshire farmers, which obstinacy was rather strengthened and supported by the leading people in the county? It was certainly the case, was it not, that in the earlier days of the disease there was a singular obstinacy upon the part of many people in Cheshire to carry out the provisions of the Act?—You may call it obstinacy, but I do not think it was singular obstinacy; that is too hard a term.

8921. You do not mean that it was very surprising, but that it was stronger there than anywhere else?—I will not say that it was stronger there than anywhere else, but it was very strong.

8922. Mr. Boreley.] There was a strong feeling generally throughout England at the first against slaughtering out cattle plague, was there not?—Yes, there was, except in the county of Aberdeen.

8923. I am speaking of England?—In England there was.

8924. The farms are small in Cheshire, are they not, comparatively speaking?—They are.

8925. And it is principally a stock county as contradistinguished from a grain county?—It is.

8926. The proportion of cattle per acre is larger in Cheshire than in most of the other counties in England, is it not?—Yes.

8927. How are the cattle fed and housed in Cheshire, as compared with other counties?—I think the animals are not fed quite so liberally in the winter season. That arises from the fact that they are cattle in cold, and are being kept for store purposes for the next season; they do not require so much rich food as is required for feeding cattle. The general practice is to feed them for the first months of winter upon cut-straw and hay, and as they get nearer calving a liberal allowance of corn is given, with hay and roots.

8928. It is not desirable to feed dairy cows so liberally during the time they are off milk, as cattle which are being fattened?—No, it is not.

8929. Can you give the Committee any idea of the total value of the cattle in Cheshire?—I do not think I can with any certainty.

8930. Had the cattle plague a great hold upon Cheshire by the time the Act was passed?—It had.

0.58.

8931. And the slaughtering out provisions at that time looked very likely as if they might exterminate the cattle in Cheshire altogether?—They did.

8932. Are the farmers now educated up to the point of a slaughtering out for cattle plague, if it should unfortunately break out again in the country?—I think they are.

8933. They would enter into it cordially now?—Yes, I think they would.

8934. Are you satisfied with the constitution of the present county board, or do you think that the farmers should have a voice in the election of the county local authorities?—I think we have no occasion as farmers to complain, but I have thought that if practical farmers, interested in the matter, were combined with the local authorities, their practical experience would, perhaps, be of use sometimes.

8935. The local authority is constituted exclusively of the justices of the peace, is it not?—It is.

8936. Would you approve of making the local authorities consist partially of justices of the peace, and partially of tenant farmers, elected by these bodies respectively?—I think I should for conducting the Act; there could be no objection to it.

8937. Would the tenant farmers and the owners of cattle be likely to have more confidence in such a board than in the boards as presently constituted?—I have not heard any expressions of want of confidence in the present board; but I think there are some who would say they would have more confidence in the board if there were a few members upon the board who were farmers themselves.

8938. You think that farmers would approve of a certain portion of the local authority being elected from farmers in the county?—Yes; there could be no objection to that.

8939. Do you think there is necessarily any conflict between the interests of the counties and boroughs, or cities, in reference to carrying out the Cattle Diseases Act?—There is a little conflict of interest.

8940. Upon what point?—It is the interest of the boroughs of the county of Cheshire to have their fairs well attended; they get better tolls, and they do not put the same impediment upon cattle coming into the markets. The cattle come in to pass through merely; but if the disease breaks out in any part of the county, the whole county is rated to the compensation.

8941. Is there any other point upon which you think there is a conflict of interest between the boroughs and counties?—No; I do not know of any.

8942. Now, supposing we make provisions for dealing with pleuro-pneumonia by slaughtering diseased animals and isolating the stock for two or three months, as may be resolved upon; and supposing it is made illegal to move animals labouring under foot-and-mouth disease upon a public highway, or to exhibit them in fairs or markets, do you think there is any necessity for stopping fairs or markets?—No; I do not think there is. If that were done, I think that would be sufficient.

8943. Then if the local authorities have not power to stop fairs and markets within their jurisdiction, there is no other point upon which you think there could be a conflict of interest between the counties and the boroughs?—No, I think

Mr. Rigby.
15 June
1878.

think not; but I would have the other points very strictly enforced.

8944. The stoppage of fairs and markets is a very extreme measure, is it not?—Yes; it produces a great deal of inconvenience and loss.

8945. It would be necessary to accompany such a measure by a measure providing for a total stoppage of movement within the county, would it not?—Yes; I think it would, except under very careful revision.

8946. Have you had any experience of how the movement of cattle by certificate was carried out in your county?—Yes; during the cattle plague the cattle were moved by certificate. There were abuses; certificates were issued somewhat thoughtlessly and recklessly in many cases; but upon the whole, the provision was very fairly carried out.

8947. Would you have much confidence in the safety of moving cattle by certificate, particularly if there was any very great danger in the face of the farmer?—Not if there was no great danger; but in the case of cattle plague, I should have confidence in them. I think that persons would feel the responsibility in giving these certificates if they saw a danger in doing so.

8948. Would they be likely to feel such a responsibility in the case of foot-and-mouth disease?—I think not so great a responsibility; but I think that if it was the law, there would be men who would be conscientious in administering the law, to administer it fairly and justly.

8949. Who granted the certificates in Cheshire?—The members of the local committee. There were committees of the local authority in the different petty sessional divisions; about half of them were farmers, and about half of them were justices of the peace.

8950. There were a very great number of people altogether in Cheshire who were authorised to grant certificates, were there not?—Yes.

8951. You think that many of these people would be very conscientious, and would feel the responsibility of granting certificates; but a great many people would not be so particular?—I believe these people were chosen because it was thought they would be particular, and as a rule they were, I think.

8952. Looking to the future, would you place any great confidence in the safety of the system of removing any cattle under certificate?—I would if it was proved that they were to be removed to a butcher for slaughter, but I do not think that I should have very much confidence in the licensing system if it was simply for store animals, and in reference to foot-and-mouth disease.

8953. You think the certificate might be depended upon in the case of moving fat animals from an infected place to a slaughter-house, but not in the general moving of the animals about the country?—Yes, that is so. I would like to see that done, because when foot-and-mouth disease breaks out upon a farm, a man has a number of fat, or three-parts fat cattle, which he would like to sell rather than expose them to the loss of going through foot-and-mouth disease, and if there was some provision which would allow of their being sent direct to slaughter, that would be a desirable relaxation.

8954. You would be in favour of allowing a fat animal, in a case of foot-and-mouth disease, to be removed to the nearest slaughter-house,

under the certificate of the nearest local authority?—I would.

8955. Would you put any limit upon the distance that an animal should travel?—I do not think I would, because you might send animals by rail 30 or 40 miles in a little time as to the nearest slaughter-house.

8956. You would not allow fat animals affected with foot-and-mouth disease to be sent to the nearest slaughter-house?—No; I mean animals in the same herd not affected with the foot-and-mouth disease.

8957. You would trust to the discretion of the local authority with reference to the place where the animals should be slaughtered?—Yes, I would.

8958. Would you give the same discretion also as regards fat animals in the same herd with, but not affected with pleuro-pneumonia?—I think I should.

8959. Would you allow fat animals affected with pleuro-pneumonia to be moved to the nearest slaughter-house?—Not if they were affected. I would insist upon those being slaughtered upon the place, if they were affected.

8960. The animal would be slaughtered upon the premises, and if the flesh was fit for food it should be made the most of?—Yes, it should.

8961. In a good many cases the salvage, or the proceeds of the animal slaughtered upon the place, would amount to at least half of the sound value of the animal?—In the case of feeding animals it would.

8962. Possibly more?—Yes; possibly more.

8963. In such a case you would propose that the owner should be compensated to the extent of about three-fourths of the value of the animals?—Yes; and including the salvage, of course.

8964. Would you approve rather of a system, whereby the owner was paid a certain proportion of his loss; that is to say, assuming the value of the animal which is slaughtered realises a certain value; that the loss, amounting in this case to one-half, should be divided in certain proportions between the local authority and the owner of the animal?—Yes; I think that would be a good plan.

8965. You would give the owner of the animal an interest in making the most of the carcass?—Yes, I would.

8966. And also in reporting the disease as early as possible?—Yes.

8967. In the case of fat stock, or stock in a fair condition, the farmer's loss would not be large?—His loss would not be so large, and it would very likely prevent more effectually the spread of the disease.

8968. With such provision the loss which the farmer would have to encounter under any circumstances would not be so formidable as to deter him from reporting the disease, and trying to make the most of his cattle by selling them off?—No.

8969. Have you had any great experience of inoculation?—Yes, I have.

8970. How many different cases have you seen it tried in?—I quoted three instances which I have specially superintended, and I have heard of many other instances in which it has been done; the farmers have told me that they have very great confidence in it, and those who have tried it have told me that if the disease revisited their farms they would try inoculation.

8971. You told the Committee of an animal that

that died of inoculation?—Not of inoculation, but from the effects of the disease after the inoculation; the animals were inoculated after they got the disease, and they died of pleuro-pneumonia after being inoculated.

8972. In those cases you know of might the same results have happened if the diseased animals had been strictly isolated and kept away from the healthy animals in the herd?—It might, of course, but I think it is fair to assume that when there are many instances of inoculation seeming to prevent it and so many cases where the disease spreads where it is not practised, that is very good evidence in favour of inoculation.

8973. In the cases you refer to isolation was practised as well as inoculation, was it not?—Yes, it was.

8974. If isolation was attended with the same results, as isolation *plus* inoculation, that shows that those cases which you have adduced are no great arguments in favour of inoculation?—I do not say that they are perfect proof of the value of inoculation, but I think they tend in that direction.

8975. One case that you spoke of was where two calves which had been inoculated had been put beside some diseased cows and did not take the disease?—That is so.

8976. How long were those calves with the diseased cows?—Six weeks; they were the property of Mr. Tollemache, who was then Member for Cheshire; he was very much interested in the subject, and he sent me the two yearling calves, and I sent them to a herd where the disease existed, and they were placed in a house where the disease existed, amongst the cows there.

8977. How many were affected?—Three were sick at the time, and the farmer could not isolate them, as his buildings were open.

8978. How many more cattle had the farmer besides the three affected with the disease?—There were nine in the same shipment.

8979. Did the others escape the disease or not?—I think the farmer had only one more of his own herd, which had the disease after the calves were placed with them.

8980. Then it seems there were four animals altogether attacked?—Yes.

8981. And five escaped?—Yes.

8982. And the two calves escaped?—Yes, they did.

8983. Were the five cows inoculated?—They were not at the time; that is three years ago.

8984. There was very little difference between the case of the five cows, which were not inoculated, and the two calves, which were inoculated?—There was not much.

8985. That does not seem to be much evidence in favour of inoculation?—Mr. Tollemache places very great reliance upon it.

8986. Do you place any great reliance upon it?—Not so much as he does, but I place some reliance upon it, as there is so little risk in inoculation if properly done; I think it is worthy of trial.

8987. Supposing you had the evidence of veterinary practitioners that they had tried to communicate pleuro-pneumonia by various processes, and that they had in every case failed, would you not suppose that that is very much stronger evidence against the possibility of inoculation as a safeguard than the mere statement which you have given?—Yes, it would seem so.

048.

8988. What evidence is there that inoculation gives pleuro-pneumonia disease at all?—I do not think it does give pleuro-pneumonia at all; inoculation does not produce the disease, as I understand it; it seems to produce inflammation, which results in the formation of some virus or matter in the tail, and it leaves behind it a kind of pockmark, something like the small-pox disease.

8989. But I dare say matter of any kind inoculated upon a living subject would be attended with unpleasant local results, and possibly to a far greater extent?—Very likely it might be.

8990. *M. Abet.*] In carrying out the present Act have you any sub-committees appointed by the local authority?—Not now; there is a committee of the magistrates, who consult the local authority of the county; they issue their instructions to the chief inspector, and he works out these instructions by the police.

8991. Then is the chief inspector a veterinary surgeon?—No; he is the chief constable.

8992. Then in your petty sessional division you do not have sub-committees at present?—No, not at present.

8993. But are you aware that under the Act the local authority has power to appoint sub-committees, and to delegate to these sub-committees all the powers except that of making a rate?—Yes, I believe they have.

8994. So that by the Act there is nothing to prevent practical farmers from being associated with the magistrates in carrying out the law?—I understand there is not.

8995. What regulations are you carrying out at present in Cheshire with respect to the foot-and-mouth disease; if foot-and-mouth disease breaks out upon a farm, is that farm declared an infected district?—It is.

8996. And no cattle can be removed from it?—They cannot be removed from it at all.

8997. How long have you carried out those stringent regulations with regard to foot-and-mouth disease in Cheshire?—For two or three years.

8998. I believe you have had the foot-and-mouth disease more virulently in Cheshire than in any other county?—Yes, we had last year.

8999. That does not seem as if those regulations had done much good in checking the disease?—It does not.

9000. What is your idea of dealing with foot-and-mouth disease; if you were going to devise an Act of Parliament, how would you deal with foot-and-mouth disease; would you have stringent regulations, or would you leave the farmers to deal with the disease themselves?—I should say that the regulations must be of use, though I cannot speak very decidedly to any very good effects arising from them in preventing the disease. It is possible, however, that we might have had the disease very much worse if we had not had the restrictions.

9001. But it goes to prove that in Cheshire where the Act has been carried out very stringently, they have not escaped the foot-and-mouth disease, but have had it more violently than any county in England?—It may have been that the cattle which are brought into the county were diffusing the disease; that is the only explanation that I could give of the matter.

9002. Cheshire is not a very large importing county is it?—Many calving cows come from Ireland.

3 A

Mr. Rigby.

15 June
1873.

Mr. Rigby.
12 June
1873.

Ireland in the spring, and numbers of store cattle.

9003. Do you import many calving cows into Cheshire?—Yes.

9004. I thought that the farmers generally kept their own heifer calves, to replenish their dairies?—Yes, that is so, but still a large quantity of calving cows come from Ireland; the stock from Ireland has improved in dairy qualities lately. I do not say that the best farmers purchase them, but they are largely purchased by the smaller farmers; they come at less cost, and the farmer can buy them as cheaply as he can rear them.

9005. It has been a matter of reproach, has it not, to Cheshire farmers that their buildings are bad, and that they keep their dairy cattle very poorly during the winter?—Yes, that has been said, and there are many cases in which it may apply, but they are a very small percentage of the whole.

9006. With the present prices of stock and of cheese, there is very great inducement to keep the cattle better than there used to be?—There is.

9007. But the figures which I noticed in the return from Cheshire seem to show that Cheshire is a county which to a large extent keeps up its own stock?—During the last year or two many farmers have turned their attention to rearing, and they have reared more calves. I should think upon every farm there has been about double the quantity kept for rearing than used to be kept.

9008. Are those calves kept until they are yearlings, and then sold away to other grazing counties?—The heifer calves are generally kept for the dairy when they become cows.

9009. Do they keep the steer calves at all?—No, the bull calves are fed, and sent to Manchester, and Liverpool, as veal.

9010. But upon the whole you are hardly prepared to say that you would enforce anything more stringent, or as stringent as you are doing now in Cheshire with regard to foot-and-mouth disease?—I would not mind allowing the present stringency to exist. I would rather like it if we were protected by some other means against the importation of disease, chiefly from Ireland.

9011. You would like the same rules to be carried out in every county as are carried out in the county of Cheshire, would you not?—Yes.

9012. You would like to have uniformity in England and Ireland?—I would.

9013. And greater care exercised in the mode of transit of cattle?—Yes; and with that I am quite willing, and I am sure that the farmers of Cheshire would be, to submit to any means that would tend to repress disease.

9014. But supposing those restrictions not to be uniform in other counties, you do not see much good in retaining them in Cheshire?—No; and it is a hardship to be compelled to, obey those

restrictions, and I should like to be under the relief of being able to send away animals for slaughter.

9015. Chairman.] You had considerable losses from the cattle plague in Cheshire before the passing of the Act, had you not?—Yes, we had.

9016. Were there many cattle slaughtered by order of the inspectors for which no compensation was given at all?—Yes; there were a good number.

9017. Were they Government inspectors or local inspectors?—They were local inspectors appointed by the Privy Council at the time.

9018. And it was very natural that farmers should resent that?—I should think so.

9019. But after compensation was given there was not the same amount of opposition to the slaughter, was there?—No, not by any means.

9020. Do you remember after the cattle plague ceased with you, whether you had any cases of foot-and-mouth disease or plouro-pneumonia in your county?—We had not much plouro-pneumonia or foot-and-mouth disease for some time afterwards.

9021. For how long?—I should say for 12 months or more; but there is this to be said, that there were a very small number of cattle in the county then. So many had died of the plague, and for some time farmers were very cautious and chary about purchasing. I should think it was 12 months or two years before we had any very serious losses from foot-and-mouth disease.

9022. The farmers increased their stock of sheep, did they not?—Yes.

9023. Do you apprehend that the disappearance of these diseases had anything to do with the strictness with which the cattle plague regulations were carried out?—Yes; it was thought so, and I think it is fair to infer that it was so, although it would seem that the restrictions have not very materially suppressed foot-and-mouth disease in the last year or so.

9024. Of course the restrictions were very much stricter during the cattle plague than they have been since?—They were in many respects; but the restrictions were very close and severe last year.

9025. Was not it the case that all movement of cattle was for the time entirely prohibited?—Yes; with regard to declaring places to be infected places where disease prevailed, we had the same regulations as during cattle plague.

9026. But there was not the same chance of importing disease?—No, there was not.

9027. Supposing Irish cattle came into your county as healthy as the Welsh cattle, would they be increased in value?—Yes, decidedly; if farmers had the same confidence in the purchase of Irish cattle as they have in the purchase of Welsh cattle, they would give at least a pound a-head more for an animal, or it might be even more, say 1*l.* or 2*l.* a-head more.

Professor JOHN ANAN MCBRIDE, called in; and Examined.

Professor
AFBride.
—

9028. Chairman.] You are a member of the Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons, I believe?—Yes, I am.

9029. And Professor of Veterinary Medicine at the Royal Agricultural College, at Cirencester?—Yes.

9030. Have you ever been an inspector *ad hoc* post?—I have.

9031. Where was that?—At Glasgow.

9032. Had you means there of inspecting foreign cattle as well as Irish stock?—Yes; both.

9033. What is your opinion as to the efficacy

of inspection?—I think that it is of no use in preventing the introduction of contagious and infectious diseases.

9034. Does that observation apply to the whole of these diseases, including foot-and-mouth disease, as well as others?—It applies to cattle plague, foot-and-mouth disease, pleuro-pneumonia, and sheep-pox.

9035. You think that inspection at the ports could not guard us against the introduction of those diseases?—It could not be carried out so effectually as to prevent the introduction of those diseases into the country.

9036. How long does cattle plague take to develop itself?—The period of incubation varies very much; it is generally from seven to nine days, and in shorter periods we have had it.

9037. What would you say would be the shortest period?—From six to seven days.

9038. And from eight to nine days the maximum?—Yes, I think so.

9039. And sheep-pox; how long does that take to develop?—Sheep-pox takes about nine days.

9040. And pleuro-pneumonia?—Forty days, and even more.

9041. And foot-and-mouth disease?—From three to seven days.

9042. So that, although the animals might be perfectly healthy at the time they were examined, they might have the disease incubating in them, and so professor on earth could find it out?—No; during the incubative stage we cannot find it out by any inspection which we can give to public steamboats or railways.

9043. What is your opinion with reference to the present regulations under the Act with regard to cattle plague; do you think they are sufficiently stringent in the case of an outbreak?—I do not know very much about the present Act with regard to the cattle plague; if you will tell me what they are, I will give my opinion.

9044. It is this, that all cattle affected with cattle plague are to be slaughtered, and all those that are herded with them may be slaughtered; and I believe it is possible to slaughter with consent of the owner those that may be in adjacent places; would you have it imperative that all cattle, which are herded with diseased cattle, should be at once killed?—Decidedly.

9045. And power, we will say, given to some inspectors of the Privy Council to slaughter all those that are adjacent?—If there is any danger of the disease spreading in that direction, decidedly.

9046. Would you give that power to the local inspector, or to the Privy Council?—It would be better if it were placed in the hands of the Privy Council.

9047. So that in case a spark of disease appeared, it could be stamped out without the chance of its re-appearing?—Yes.

9048. With regard to sheep-pox, what would you do?—I would kill all those that were affected, and all those that were in contact with them.

9049. You are quite positive upon that point?—I am quite positive upon that point.

9050. What would you do with regard to pleuro-pneumonia?—There is a difficulty with regard to pleuro-pneumonia. In country districts where disease had broken out, I should slaughter all the diseased animals, and those in contact with them, but in regard to town dairies it is a very difficult matter to deal with. I think

058.

that before adopting any course with regard to that, some experiments should be performed by the Privy Council or other parties, to see whether inoculation is a preventive for this disorder, or not.

9051. But in the generality of cases in the country districts, you would go so far as not only to slaughter those animals which were diseased, but those which were in contact with them in the case of pleuro-pneumonia?—I should slaughter all those that had been in contact with them, more especially if they had been confined in shippers, as the disease is more certain to spread in those cases.

9052. I believe that when an animal which has been the subject of pleuro-pneumonia is killed, almost all fear of contagion is gone?—For almost all practical purposes, I should suppose, that was a correct idea.

9053. If that were the case would you not think that it might be sufficient to stay the disorder, by killing all the cattle that were actually diseased, and isolating all the others, and killing them as they fell down with the disease?—There would be a chance of spreading the disease in that way, simply because, sooner or later the rest of the animals would be affected with the disorder, especially if they were kept in shippers.

9054. But if the animals were isolated for a period of three months, would there be any danger then?—There would be no danger then.

9055. Do you think that we might try this plan: kill all the cattle which are the subjects of the disease, and inoculate the rest of them, with strict isolation for three months?—It would be a very good plan; but with regard to dairies I could not recommend that.

9056. What would you recommend with regard to them?—For a city such as London I should recommend that some experiment should be performed to try the effect of inoculation, because although some foreign authorities believe in it, yet we in England do not believe so much in it. I think the Privy Council officers should have performed some experiments, and that they should be carried out most thoroughly, and on a very extensive scale. We have English authorities who believe in it, but where I am I have no opportunity of performing such experiments.

9057. Have you any belief in inoculation yourself?—I cannot disbelieve it, we have such good reports from elsewhere about it.

9058. Where have we good reports from?—In Belgium, Holland, Austria, Prussia, and in France, from Professor Bouley, who is a very good authority; and in the colonies, in Australia, for example, from Mr. Bruce's report; and in this country, Professor Gamgee.

9059. You are of opinion that inoculation ought to be tried?—I should decidedly be of that opinion. I should not like to recommend that all our stock suffering from pleuro-pneumonia, and all other animals in contact with them should be destroyed, without some experiment to prove whether inoculation be effective or not. I think it would be a great waste of money.

9060. When cattle are first attacked by pleuro-pneumonia, is the flesh marketable?—Decidedly.

9061. You would not have those animals killed and buried?—Decidedly not.

9062. Foot-and-mouth disease has been very prevalent, and, according to some witnesses here,

3 A 2

Professor
McClelland.
—
12 June
1873.

it

Professor
At-Bride.
12 June
1873.

it is not very important; what is your opinion with regard to that?—The spread of foot-and-mouth disease over the whole length and breadth of the country is, I think, a very important matter.

9063. What is your opinion with reference to the average damage which cattle sustain from foot-and-mouth disease?—There are a very great many things to be taken into consideration. In store stock the loss is not very great; perhaps 30 s., or perhaps less, would be the amount of loss we should suffer from it, and in fat stock the loss would be much greater; it would be even 4 l. or 5 l. on good fat stock, and upon dairy stock it may ruin them, as they will frequently be unable to give any further milk. I have heard an estimate given this morning of 2 l. 10 s. per head. I think that is a low estimate, because you must take into account the loss of milk, and the number of abortions, and, in the course of two or three years, you may have the same animals aborting again, and I have found this year upon our farm that our sheep had to be taken to be served with the ram more than once, and some of them did not breed, and in others we found they had only one lamb instead of twins; we have had very few twins this year, in consequence of the foot-and-mouth disease.

9064. Have you seen much of the disease amongst sheep?—Not a very great deal.

9065. Is there not much more disease than formerly amongst them?—I could not say as to that, because formerly I had not much to do with sheep; but recently the disease has spread extensively through Gloucestershire.

9066. And with disastrous results to the sheep?—Yes, that is so.

9067. What do you estimate the damage done to sheep by the disease?—I could hardly estimate that, but I know we had some of our own sheep which were ill, and it took three months before we could get them up to the same condition.

9068. With regard to ewes, you say the effect was more permanent?—Yes, there were a great many abortions.

9069. Does not foot-and-mouth disease develop itself two or three times in the same animal?—I have seen it twice in the same stock, I have not seen it three times.

9070. Is that disease more general than it used to be?—I never saw it to the same extent before as I do now, and I believe that is the general opinion.

9071. Do you know anything about the general opinion of the farmers with regard to foot-and-mouth disease?—There can be only one opinion about it when men are losing money, that it is a very serious matter.

9072. We have had evidence from the veterinary authorities that the farmers do not care about foot-and-mouth disease, and that the sooner they get it over the better?—That is, that they look upon it as a necessity, but where a man here 2 l. 10 s. a-head upon each animal it is a matter which he will think about, and he will not venture to bring in fresh stock while he has foot-and-mouth disease, which shows plainly that he must think a great deal about the disorder.

9073. Do you think that foot-and-mouth disease has been more prevalent last year than we have had it before?—I have seen more of it, and I should think that it was more prevalent last year than previously.

9074. Is it dying out now, apparently?—In our district it is.

9075. If foot-and-mouth disease were to die out and we were to get rid of it should we have any danger of its spontaneous origin again in this country?—Certainly not.

9076. Do not you think that foot-and-mouth disease, pleuro-pneumonia, sheep-pox, and cattle plague are all foreign diseases?—There is no doubt about that in the slightest degree.

9077. In case we get rid of pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease, do you think there will be a danger of re-importing those diseases from abroad?—There is no doubt about it, that we shall never get rid of those diseases as long as we import cattle from abroad.

9078. What would you do with the fat stock that come here?—I would kill them.

9079. Where?—At the ports; and prevent people from walking to and fro from the live stock to the store stock in other markets, as they may carry the virus in that way.

9080. Do you think that would create any difficulty or deprivation?—I do not think we should find any difficulty arising from that. In Glasgow we had to kill a large number to supply the surrounding country, and we did not find any difficulty in doing so.

9081. You do not think that if the foreign stock which were imported into Hull were killed at a water-side market, there would be any difficulty in supplying a great city like Manchester with meat?—I should think there would be no difficulty whatever in doing that.

9082. You were in Scotland for some time; did you see much of the transit of dead meat?—No, not much of it.

9083. Does some of the meat that is killed in the north of Scotland come to Glasgow?—Not a great quantity of it.

9084. The meat that is killed in the north of Scotland chiefly comes south, does it not?—It does.

9085. You really do not think that there is any reason to believe that the inland towns would suffer if the foreign stock should be killed at the ports at which they were landed?—I do not; in fact, I think they would be benefited.

9086. How?—Simply because so many animals would not be moving in the lines of cattle traffic; that would lessen the number of animals that would be diseased.

9087. Do you think that there is a possibility of diminishing the number which are imported if you were to kill the animals at the port of landing?—I do not think so.

9088. You think that if all cattle, sheep, and pigs that were imported from abroad were killed at proper water-side markets that would be a means of keeping out foreign diseases, and would be no injury to the great consumers of meat?—There could be no doubt that if you do so that would prevent the introduction of infectious and contagious diseases. I do not think it would injure the consumers, I think that they would be benefited rather than injured by it.

9089. You mean to say that we should be directly benefited by a reduction in the price of meat by having no disease in our own stock?—Quite so.

9090. Have you made any sort of calculation with reference to the amount of loss that we suffer from those foreign diseases?—I have calculated

culated it. I have looked over a lot of statistics with regard to the matter, but there is always great difficulty in getting them; you will find the statistics in the Fifth Medical Report, which appears to be very accurate. Mr. Kilby, who is an eminent agriculturalist in the north, has devoted much time to the matter; his statistics appear to be very reliable upon the subject.

9091. Do you suppose that the present excessively high prices of meat has anything to do with the amount of disease that we have suffered from recently?—There can be no doubt about it.

9092. That it has materially increased the price of meat?—That it has materially increased the price of meat.

9093. What is your opinion with reference to quarantine?—That is a very difficult matter to deal with; my idea is this, that I do not think that quarantine is practicable at all, that is to say, that the quarantine premises would form distinct centres for the spread of the disorder.

9094. Then under your regulations, as I may call them, there would be no foreign stores imported?—Decidedly not.

9095. And no foreign cows?—No foreign cows.

9096. Do you believe that foreign cows are unsafe to import?—I believe so; they are not safe by any means.

9097. As you have said no amount of inspection can discover latent disease, you think the animals would develop it after they came into this country?—They would not in all cases, but a percentage of them would do so.

9098. Are you aware of the quantity of disease, we will say pleuro-pneumonia, which exists upon some parts of the continent?—No; I do not know very much about that at the present time.

9099. With regard to stores, you think that they should not be imported, because you cannot quarantine them?—I should be afraid to recommend it; I should be afraid that disease would spread from such centres.

9100. Supposing we had one or two ports that were set apart for the purpose of importing foreign store stock simply, do you think that there would be a possibility of quarantining cattle for a certain time?—The chief difficulty in this matter, in the event of your getting a lot of cows into your quarantine premises, and pleuro-pneumonia or foot-and-mouth disease breaks out, what are you to do with the rest of the stock? You must kill them out, so that that would really prevent the introduction of foreign stock under that system. If you can get stock into those premises and keep them there a certain time, and find they are free from disease, no doubt that would be a benefit to the country, but that is where the difficulty is.

9101. The proposal to quarantine cattle you would not entertain for a moment?—Decidedly not.

9102. Do you think we are working in the right direction with regard to the prevention of diseases among our stock. I gather from you that you fancy we begin at the wrong end, and that we do not keep the disease out?—I think there can be no doubt whatever about that.

9103. And unless we do that, it is no use making any strong regulations for our own cattle?—I am fully of opinion that it is no use adopting any regulations with regard to home stock until you put a stop to foreign importations.

0.03.

9104. Have you had any opportunity of seeing the way in which the Act has been carried out with regard to home stock?—No, very little.

9105. With regard to disinfecting markets, for example?—I have seen the Bristol and Gloucester markets; they are said to disinfect there, but I fail to see it; the market is in a filthy condition, and diseased animals stand in the markets.

9106. Have you seen anything in reference to disinfecting trucks upon railways?—I always look at railway trucks in every part of the country I am in to see the state of them; and at our own goods stations at Cirencester, I went down one day a big market, and I found eight or nine trucks in a filthy condition, which had not been disinfected. They were being loaded with sheep; cattle were in them formerly, and the droppings were plainly visible on the side of the truck. I mentioned it at a meeting of our chamber of agriculture, and it was mentioned to the Great Western Company; but no action was taken upon it.

9107. Do not the railway companies charge for disinfection?—Yes; they charge a shilling for each truck.

9108. But the railway companies do not disinfect the trucks?—They do not do it.

9109. How would you remedy that; would you have a Government inspector going about travelling from place to place?—Decidedly, I would.

9110. What further improvement in carrying out the Act would you suggest with regard to home stock?—I should not care about suggesting anything further in regard to our home stock, for the simple reason that we have not the facts before us.

9111. You would decidedly kill all cases of pleuro-pneumonia, of which we have a great many now?—Not in all cases.

9112. I understand you to say that you would kill in all cases of developed disease?—Yes; when the disease was upon the animal; all animals suffering actually from pleuro-pneumonia.

9113. And in other cases in the country, you would kill, in some instances, those herded with them?—Yes; where the disease was introduced to a stock. I should prevent the disease spreading by killing the whole of the stock.

9114. And you would give compensation?—I would give compensation.

9115. Would you give full compensation?—I would give full compensation for the healthy animals, and half for the diseased animals.

9116. You think that the town dairies are great sources of disease?—They are centres.

9117. Do you see much of them in Glasgow?—A great deal. I inspected the dairies there under the town council. We were instructed to visit them all, and to report upon them, and in consequence of that, we saw a great deal of the town dairies, and the pleuro-pneumonia in them.

9118. Are they generally the homes of pleuro-pneumonia?—They are the homes of it. It arises in this way: they frequently change their stock, and they go to the public market and purchase fresh cattle.

9119. Do you think that it has nothing to do with the artificial way in which the cattle are kept?—It predisposes them, but it is not an exciting cause; it may lead them to take the disorder, but that is all.

3 A 3

9120. Do

Professor
M. B. D.

12 June
1873.

Professor
M. B. B. B.
12 June
1875

9120. Do you think that the stock suffer much from transit by land or sea?—In many cases they do.

9121. In coming from Ireland?—In coming from the north of Ireland; from Belfast. I have gone down into the hold to inspect the cattle, and I could not stay more than one or two minutes in the place; the ventilation was so bad; the odour was dreadful.

9122. Would that be worse when they were unloading than when they were at sea?—I refer to going on board before the animals were unloaded.

9123. When the ship was stationary?—When the ship was stationary.

9124. The ventilation would not be so bad when at sea, when the wind sails were at work, would it?—I do not think the wind sails do much good; I have gone down the hold, and near the mouth of the hold there was some difference; but in the further parts, where the animals were stowed away, the air was very foul.

9125. How long is it since you were inspector at Glasgow?—It must be nearly seven years.

9126. And you have not had much experience of the Irish trade since?—Except at Bristol, where I have been sometimes.

9127. Do you think the Irish vessels are improved?—I could not say that, because the Clyde vessels are very well adapted for the trade, and I could not say that they have improved since that time.

9128. When these vessels were badly ventilated, one diseased animal would, I suppose, be the means of infecting a great number of others?—There is no doubt about that.

9129. Are you of opinion that pleuro-pneumonia can only be conveyed by the breath of an animal?—Only by the breath of an animal.

9130. Then when the breath is out of his body, we hope there would be little danger of the infection spreading?—There is one very strange thing, which will go to prove that it is produced by the exhalation from the lungs. In those town dairies, if there was an animal standing near the door, perhaps next the door, that animal was the first victim, and the next victim has been found to be an animal right in against the wall, furthest from that animal first attacked; we attribute that to a current of air striking the animal newly placed there which had the disease, and carrying it against the wall over the heads of the other cattle.

9131. What distance would that be?—Perhaps 50 or 60 feet.

9132. You do not believe in the spontaneous generation of these diseases?—I do not.

9133. Has there been any new light thrown upon the diseases of animals during the last ten years?—No, I do not think so. I think all we know now we knew in 1863, from Professor Gunning.

9134. I suppose we have not tried very much to ascertain new facts?—No; it is so difficult to carry out those experiments for private parties, as they are liable to endanger the district.

9135. Have the Veterinary College done anything with regard to that?—Not since the experiments which they made some time ago, as I understand.

9136. Are you of opinion that foot-and-mouth disease can be contracted by other animals besides

cattle, pigs, sheep, goats, and deer?—It is said so, I believe, but I do not know that.

9137. I suppose that although horses might not be subject to the disease, they could carry the contagion from one field to another?—Yes; if they get the contagion adhering to their coat, they might convey it just the same as hay or grass would.

9138. Do you think that cattle which have recovered, say from the foot-and-mouth disease, carry the contagion with them for any length of time?—It is in my opinion that they do.

9139. And sheep in the same way?—Sheep undoubtedly do so; they carry the contagion in their coats.

9140. What would you do with reference to inoculation; did I understand you to suggest anything in regard to that?—It is simply this, that from what I have heard of Professor Simonds' and Professor Brown's experiments, they have performed some few experiments, and they came to the conclusion that inoculation was of no use as a preventive of pleuro-pneumonia. Now, we found in this country and in other countries, that many people do believe it who have experimented largely, and they have found that it is a preventive. Now I should recommend that the authorities of the Privy Council, and perhaps two or three other authorities in this country, who know so much about cattle disease as anybody, should have a district given to them each; let each have a county, and let each of them make experiments, and let it be tried; I should say that we should gain a great deal from such experiments.

9141. Do you believe in the possibility of getting rid of pleuro-pneumonia?—Undoubtedly.

9142. And also foot-and-mouth disease?—Stop the foreign importations, and foot-and-mouth disease will die out; it is the nature of all contagious and infectious diseases, that they die out in parts remote from the seats where they arise. Take the human subject; small-pox and yellow fever, and all those sort of things die out after a while.

9143. They must be fed with fresh contagion to keep them up, must they not?—Yes; we find that when the virus passes through many animals it dies out, the poison is destroyed, and unless we import fresh virus from abroad, the disease will die out.

9144. Are you quite positive that these diseases are of foreign origin?—I have no doubt whatever about it.

9145. Mr. Dodds.] You have told the Committee that in your opinion inspection was as kind of use?—Not as a preventive of contagious diseases.

9146. You say that, having been an inspector yourself at the port of Glasgow?—I was inspector at the port of Glasgow.

9147. Were you inspector for local authority, or were you under the Privy Council?—I was inspector for the local authority.

9148. For how long were you an inspector there?—For some seven or eight months, I think.

9149. How long ago was that?—Seven years, I think.

9150. When you say that inspection is of no use, do you mean that the present regulations at the ports are of no use?—Inspection is of no use; that is what I meant to say.

9151. The basis of the present system as regards

regards foreign animals is inspection, is it not?—Just so.

9152. And you say that that is of no use?—It is of no use.

9153. You might just as well abolish the present regulations, might you not?—You might abolish the present regulations.

9154. And let the importations be perfectly free?—I do not know whether I should recommend such a course or not, but when I say that inspection is of no use, I mean that it is of no use in detecting disease during the incubative stage, but when the disease is in an animal, any person who knows anything about an animal would be able to detect the disorder.

9155. Then you qualify your statement, that inspection is of no use, by saying, that it is of no use as regards the admission of animals in which the disease is not developed?—It is no use as a preventive to the introduction of contagious and infectious diseases into this country.

9156. Then the present regulations are of no use and they might as well be abolished?—They might be so.

9157. Would you recommend the present regulations being abolished?—I should not.

9158. If the present regulations are of no use what is the use of keeping them up?—That is for the authorities to say. What I say in the matter is, that when I was an inspector I could not detect disease in the incubative stage, but in the acute stage I could; therefore, I take it that inspection is of no use to prevent the importation of contagious diseases.

9159. Therefore, it comes to this, that the present regulations are of no use, but still you would not take upon yourself to advise that they should be abolished?—Decidedly not.

9160. Therefore, there is a lurking idea in your mind that the present regulations are of some use?—I do not think they are of any use in preventing the spread of disease; they may lessen the number of cases appearing in this country, but they cannot prevent the disorder from entering the country; that is exactly what I mean.

9161. And unless the regulations prevent the importation of disease they are practically useless, that is the legitimate conclusion from your position?—Quite so.

9162. Still you do not recommend their abolition?—No, I do not.

9163. Now, with regard to sheep-pox, you told the Committee that you would kill the diseased animals and those that were herded with them, would it be worth while trying inoculation with respect to sheep-pox?—I should say not.

9164. Has it been tried?—I should say it has been tried frequently.

9165. Has it been sufficiently tried to show that it is inefficient?—I think inoculation merely forms distinct centres for the spread of the disorder, and it increases the number of animals affected, and I think that it is inefficient in that way.

9166. You told the Committee that the foot-and-mouth disease and all the contagious diseases of cattle were of foreign origin?—Yes.

9167. And that if we kept them from being imported, these diseases would die out at home?—That is my opinion.

9168. You have explained the theory upon which you ground that opinion, that the virus of the disease, unless renewed from its source, dies out in process of time; have you any other

ground than that of theory for what you say; can you point out any instances of disease being introduced from abroad since the present regulations have been in force?—I do not know when the present regulations were in force.

9169. The present Act and the Orders of the Council as regards foreign animals came into force in 1869; has any foreign disease been introduced into this country since then?—I do not know anything about that because I am altogether out of the district.

9170. You not having been engaged as an inspector have not had any opportunity of seeing it yourself?—Decidedly not.

9171. But you proceed upon the theory which you have explained to the Committee, that the virus would die out unless it was renewed from time to time from the countries in which it had its seat?—Yes, we have seen that occur in former outbreaks of foot-and-mouth disease; we have seen it die out.

9172. But do you know that the disease was really introduced from abroad?—The disease could not be produced spontaneously, therefore it must be introduced.

9173. You proceed upon a theory; you have no fact to point to?—We have seen the disease die out.

9174. But have you seen it re-introduced into this country?—We have seen it break out again, and it must be re-introduced, as an actual fact.

9175. We are assuming that the disease has died out, but have you got the fact that it has been re-imported?—If the disease died out the virus must have been re-imported from abroad, before it could produce the disorder.

9176. Of course, unless we had any proof that a cargo had introduced the disease into the country after the disease had died out, that rests upon theory?—If you look at the Privy Council Returns you see that cargo after cargo and animal after animal is condemned at the ports.

9177. But those animals are stopped at the port?—But there is nothing to prevent the same ships from spreading the disease when they come again next time; I am now out of the inspection, and I am in the country, but I am morally certain of the thing.

9178. You are likewise morally certain that the disease has died out of the country?—Yes, I am.

9179. Are you more than morally certain that the disease has died out; have you had proof of that?—Yes; I believe so, during the cattle plague.

9180. You mean that the cattle plague regulations had the effect of stamping out the foot-and-mouth disease?—Yes; by preventing the moving of animals, and so stamping it out.

9181. You feel morally certain that by the time the cattle plague had expired, and the cattle plague regulations went out of existence, foot-and-mouth disease had ceased to exist in the country?—Yes, as far as my experience goes, and as far as I have heard about it.

9182. You stated that you would prohibit altogether the importation of foreign animals into the country?—I would.

9183. When did foot-and-mouth disease first appear in this country?—I believe it first appeared in 1839.

9184. Were there any foreign animals imported at that time?—They were imported before that.

S A 4

9185 We

Professor
AP. Hyde.
13 June
1875.

*Professor
McBride.*
11 June
1873.

9185. We have been told that the importation of foreign animals was prohibited until 1841 or 1842?—It was 1842, I believe.

9186. How do you account for the appearance of foot-and-mouth disease in the country before the importation of foreign animals?—It is difficult to account for it, because it may come in, in so many different ways; but I think the hides coming from infected districts in 1839, goes a great way to prove that that was the origin of the disease.

9187. Then, if we altogether prohibit the introduction of foreign animals into England, we should still not have absolute security against the introduction of disease?—No; not if we allowed unexamined hides to be brought into our ports without prohibition.

9188. It would be necessary to allow them, then, to be imported only under strong restrictions?—Yes; under strong restrictions.

9189. You would have to make very strong restrictions with regard to persons in the port who are engaged in handling and slaughtering the foreign imported animals, would you not?—Yes.

9190. Of course you would have to provide water-side markets for slaughter at all the ports where the animals would have to be landed?—Yes, that would be so.

9191. At whose expense could that be done?—I have not considered that; my only object is to provide the country with cheap butchers' meat, and to keep the stock of the country healthy. I do not care who pays for the water-side market.

9192. You told the Committee that quarantine was impracticable?—Yes, I did say so.

9193. Were you an inspector in the year 1868?—It was before that, I think, that I was an inspector.

9194. For a certain period of the time, in the course of the year 1868, foreign sheep were subjected to quarantine; are you aware of that?—I do not know that; in Glasgow we had no quarantine premises.

9195. At all events you had no experience of that?—No, I had no experience of that.

9196. What suggestions have you to make as regards the importation of Irish stock?—Ireland is a breeding country; I do not think there can be much done with that. Ireland is a very healthy country in a natural way; that is my experience of it.

9197. You think that the disease would die out in Ireland?—There is no doubt about that.

9198. Ireland imports very little foreign stock now, does she not?—She imports foreigners from England in the shape of calves.

9199. Ireland imports its disease from England, you think?—There is no doubt about that.

9200. In order to stamp out disease from Ireland would you have to begin by prohibiting all importations from England into Ireland?—No, certainly not.

9201. How would you begin with Ireland?—The disease would die out; if you stop it in England it could not go to Ireland.

9202. You would stop the disease in England?—If you put a stop to foreign importations the disease will die out in England and Scotland.

9203. And in process of time the disease will die out in Ireland too?—I have no doubt about that.

9204. Returning to sheep-pox, does sheep-pox always spread through a flock?—No; not in all cases.

9205. But still you recommend slaughtering the whole flock?—Yes; to prevent its spreading to other flocks simply.

9206. Would it not be enough if the flock in which the disease appeared was kept apart from other flocks; would it then be necessary to slaughter the flock?—But the great difficulty is to isolate the flocks; in another week it would go on, and you would find another case, and you would isolate that, and then it would go on until you had isolated a large number of animals.

9207. Provided the flock in which the disease appeared could be isolated from other flocks, would you think it necessary to slaughter the whole of the flock?—No; if you have a guarantee that the flock shall be kept entirely separate from any other flock; but if you could not get such a guarantee, I would destroy the whole of the flock.

9208. How long would sheep-pox take in going through a large flock?—I should not like to say.

9209. *Chairman.* Do you think it would be two or three weeks?—I think it would not, decidedly.

9210. In a flock of 200 or 300 sheep would it be two or three weeks?—Decidedly not.

9211. *Mr. Bodnar.* There has been no cattle disease introduced into Ireland except from England; is that your opinion?—If they did not import foreign stock, I should think not.

9212. But as a matter of fact, do you know whether any disease has been introduced into Ireland except from England?—As a matter of fact, I do not know that.

9213. You do not know where they got the cattle plague from?—From England, I believe.

9214. You do not know any instance in which Ireland got the disease from any other country?—No.

9215. What would you do as regards foot-and-mouth disease at some under present circumstances?—What I should do is simply to stop the foreign supplies, and then the disease will die out.

9216. But until the disease had died out, would you retain the present regulations, or what regulations would you recommend?—The best plan would be to appoint district inspectors, under the control of the Privy Council or of the local authority, who would attend to the disease when it broke out upon a farm, and isolate the cases of disease upon the farm, and prevent the cattle going into the public markets.

9217. Would you recommend the slaughter of diseased animals in the case of foot-and-mouth disease?—No.

9218. You would simply have control inspectors, appointed by the Privy Council, all over the country, and wherever disease appeared upon a farm you would blockade that farm?—Quite so.

9219. Would you keep up the present regulations, making it penal to expose an animal having foot-and-mouth disease in a fair or market, or to send it along a road?—Decidedly.

9220. Under the present regulations, if a diseased animal having cattle plague, sheep-pox, or glanders, is exposed for sale in a public market,

the local authorities have power to seize and kill it, have they not, without compensation?—Yes.

9231. Would you maintain that rule?—Decidedly.

9232. If an animal affected with pleuro-pneumonia or foot-and-mouth disease is exposed for sale in a fair or market, the local authority has now power to seize it; would you give the local authority power to kill the animal too?—I would make short work of it; I do not know what else you can do with it.

9233. You are prepared to give the local authorities the same power with regard to an animal exposed for sale having foot-and-mouth disease, as they have now with regard to the more serious disorders, are you not?—That is a matter which requires a little more serious consideration.

9234. You have not considered that matter?—I have not considered that matter; I am entirely ignorant of the existing rules, because I have not had to do with this matter; the difficulty is that I do not know what to do with the animals unless you kill them.

9235. Take the case of an animal landing from Ireland, would you give the local authority power to kill it upon arriving in port?—That should have been done long ago.

9236. Is it too late to mend?—I think it is too late to mend now. I should not like to advise the killing of the whole of the animals coming to the Bristol market, for example.

9237. Would you give the local authorities power to seize and kill an animal which had the disease upon it when it was landed?—I think so. I think it would be the best for the agriculturists in the end.

9238. You stated that in the case of animals that were killed by order of the local authority, you would give half compensation for animals actually having the disease, and full compensation for animals which were killed, because they had been associated with the diseased animals?—Decidedly.

9239. How would you measure the compensation; when you say you would give compensation, do you mean the value of the animal as if it had no disease upon it?—Decidedly; it would be difficult to value an animal diseased.

9240. The value of the animal which has got the disease upon it, is that of a diseased animal?—Yes.

9241. Nevertheless, you would give half the full value?—Yes, I would.

9242. And in the case of animals which were associated with diseased animals, you would give the full value of these animals?—Yes; that is so.

9243. I presume a dealer would not give the full value for an animal which he knew had been associated with diseased ones?—Quite so.

9244. But you would put that fact quite out of sight, and give full value?—Yes.

9245. Upon what ground?—Because the farmers now try to get the animals off at the markets, and in that way spread the disease, whereas they would then be induced to declare the existence of the disease; it would be an inducement to farmers to report all cases.

9246. An objection has been made to that scheme when recommended by former witnesses, that it would make the farmers comparatively careless with reference to the disease, if they

Q.38.

knew that they were safe to get the full value of the animals?—I do not think so.

9237. Why not?—Because a farmer would not care about having the disease; he would be glad to get rid of it.

9238. Would it be a loss to the farmer?—If he only got half the value for the diseased animals it would be a direct loss to him.

9239. You said that no experiments had been tried with regard to inoculation; do you know of your own knowledge that no experiments have been tried by the Royal Veterinary College?—I know some experiments have been tried upon inoculation by Professor Simonds, and I know some experiments have been made with reference to foot-and-mouth disease, but I do not know that the experiments with regard to foot-and-mouth disease have done anything to demonstrate the curability of those disorders.

9240. You have seen no statements in these reports?—I have read most of the reports, and I have seen nothing in them. I have looked up the reports several times, so that I might be able to give my class of students an idea how to prevent this disease. I should have expected the Privy Council to have given us an idea upon the subject, but they have not done so.

9241. Have the Royal Agricultural Society, the Central Chamber of Agriculture, or any such body, made any experiments?—Not at all, that I am aware of.

9242. Mr. Kewenagh.] Do you know what the present law in Ireland is, in reference to contagious diseases?—I have no idea of that.

9243. The present rule in Ireland is, that there is an inspector at the port of shipment, and he has power to seize any infected animal which he finds upon the gateway; that is to say, in the net of being shipped; do you think that is a good rule?—A very good rule; if the animal is diseased a sharp veterinary surgeon would detect it at once.

9244. Do you think that would be of any use?—When an animal has been herded with other animals, that is the difficulty; the other animals have got the disease although they do not show it.

9245. It is not necessary that every animal which has been herded with an infected animal, must catch the disease?—No, only a percentage.

9246. Whereas, it is perfectly certain that if an animal is sent to a place with disease upon him, he may infect the place where he is sent to?—That is quite true.

9247. Therefore, inspection would be of some little use in that way?—It is of some little use.

9248. Have you gone into the meat question?—I have not considered it very deeply.

9249. Have you considered what would be the effect of stopping the importation of cattle, or in fact, confining the supply of meat to the dead meat trade?—My idea is that it would be beneficial to the public.

9250. Do you think that the owners of fat cattle abroad would be so ready to send the cattle here, if they were to be slaughtered at the ports of landing, and take their chance of how they could be sold?—I think so.

9251. You do not think it would depreciate their interests in any way?—I do not think so, because they know that this is a good market for their stock.

9252. Do you not think that compulsory slaughter

Professor
McBride.
12 June
1873.

Professor
McBride.
12 June
1878

slaughter at the port of landing is a restriction upon the owner finding the best market where he can?—It might be to a very slight degree but very little; but then that is compensated for by the danger being stopped in our own stock, and giving us a larger supply of meat for the people, than we have at the present time.

9253. That is an indirect deduction from it, but the direct inference would be that it would deter a foreign owner from sending his cattle here?—But only to a very slight extent.

9254. Do you know to what extent England is dependent upon foreign meat for the supply of its population?—As far as I can understand, about $\frac{1}{4}$ per cent. of live animals.

9255. I must be misinformed, but I thought it was a great deal more than that; I do not wish to include salt meat; I refer to dead fresh meat, not taking into account meat such as meat which comes from Australia, or salted hams, or salt beef; I am talking of the fresh meat supply at the present time?—I cannot say.

9256. Supposing it was found that this restriction upon the importation of fat cattle into England was a serious stoppage to the supply of meat, do you think that that would alter your opinion at all; do you consider that that is a serious consideration?—The supply of meat is decidedly a serious consideration.

9257. Therefore you consider that it is of importance to weigh well whether any restriction we recommend would have the effect of raising the price of meat in this country to the consumer?—Yes, decidedly; but my opinion is that it would not.

9258. But still, if it would, I am asking you if we should consider it?—There is no doubt about that.

9259. You stated something about inoculation? I believe you have faith in it yourself?—I am rather inclined to think about it; but it is simply from the authorities which I have read upon the subject.

9260. Have you had any personal experience with regard to inoculation?—Only in one case, but I can hardly tell you the result of it.

9261. Was that a case of pleuro-pneumonia?—It was a case of pleuro-pneumonia.

9262. How did you inoculate?—By matter from the lung; I inoculated the tail.

9263. Was the matter from the lung of a dead animal?—Yes, it was.

9264. Could you tell the Committee the effect that was produced?—The effect was that the animal had not the lung disease, but it was sold very shortly afterwards, so I could not follow it any further.

9265. It did not die from the effects?—No; but there was a great deal of inflammation in the tail.

9266. Is it a wrong idea of mine that it is generally accepted as a medical fact that in the case of any living animal inoculated with matter from a dead animal, the part inoculated would be likely to mortify?—No, I do not think so; it might have a severe inflammation of the part, but I am certain it would not be followed, in a large percentage of cases, by mortification.

9267. Then upon that point I am wrongly informed?—That is my opinion.

9268. You say you believe that infection can only be carried, in your opinion, by the breath?—By the breath.

9269. What sort of disease would you import

by inoculating with the virus of the lung of a diseased animal?—That I cannot answer. I think the effect is, that it is a preventive of pleuro-pneumonia, if it is successful; but why it should be, I do not attempt to account for.

9270. You merely think it is a preventive?—I think so.

9271. Mr. Clay.] I understand that you would stop the entering into the interior of this country, of all beasts coming from abroad?—Yes, I would stop the entering into this country of all cattle coming from abroad.

9272. Irrespective of their coming from countries where disease did not exist and had not existed at any rate for a considerable time?—Quite so; because we always find whenever animals are travelling through a country, that disease follows upon the lines of traffic. They have always got such disorders upon the Continent, and that is the reason why I would exclude all foreign stock.

9273. You believe that this exclusion would not affect the price of meat?—I do not. I believe it would be cheaper to the public in the end; and that there would be a reduction in the price of meat rather than a rise.

9274. Have you any recollection in the history of trade of the entrance of any article being prohibited into this country without raising the price of the article?—But the articles were not deteriorated by disease; they were stock in trade.

9275. The question was, whether any article was ever prohibited from being imported from abroad without its price being raised at home?—It is a vital point to take into consideration in answering such a question that our home stock would be free from disease, and in that way it would lessen the cost.

9276. That only applies to the measures which you recommend, but it does not affect the question which I asked, namely, whether it is possible to prohibit an article coming from abroad without raising the price of it at home?—It does really materially influence me in giving an answer, that if the diseased animals from abroad were prohibited from entering the country we should lessen the disease amongst home stock, and as a result lessen the price of butcher's meat, and instead of the price going up I am inclined to think that it would go down.

9277. Mr. J. Bright.] I think you are a veterinary surgeon?—I am.

9278. What is the kind of education which a veterinary surgeon would have to go through before he is entitled to practice, or is there any diploma?—There is a diploma; a veterinary surgeon's education depends very much upon the man himself; we find that the usual curriculum is two or three sessions at the college, and then they are examined by a board of examiners, who are members of the Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons, and the examiners find out whether they are qualified to practice in the profession, if so, they give a man a diploma, and if not, they reject him.

9279. May anybody practise, whether he has a diploma or not?—He may.

9280. Is it supposed that the instruction of veterinary surgeons has improved much?—I should think it had.

9281. And that they are more capable than they used to be?—I should think so.

9282. Does

9282. Does it appear to you that veterinary surgeons are of much use anywhere?—They are very useful indeed.

9283. In what respect?—In preventing loss to stockowners, and in that respect I should not like to look upon them as a very useless body.

9284. But when gentlemen come here and recommend that animals which are affected with various diseases should be slaughtered, and that animals in contact with those animals should be slaughtered, and that there should be an entire stoppage of the trade in cattle between foreign countries and this country, does not it look like a declaration of complete impotency upon the part of the veterinary profession?—Decidedly not; it looks as if they had some knowledge of the value of pounds shillings and pence; our practice is wholly a matter of pounds, shillings and pence.

9285. Your practice is a matter of science to cure animals, is it not?—We are called in to advise owners whether it is advisable to kill their animals or to sell them.

9286. But it seems to me that the chief part of your business is to destroy animals and prevent the trade in animals?—Decidedly not.

9287. You think that veterinary surgeons are of some use?—They are a great deal of use.

9288. I understand you to express the opinion that nature has worked a miracle with regard to the health of animals in Great Britain and Ireland?—I do not understand that I said so.

9289. I gather that you consider that if we could erect a permanent barrier between this and other countries, British animals would be free from contagious diseases?—I believe so.

9290. That is to say, the farmer and his wife and his children are to be subject to diseases of all kinds at various times, but that it is quite in our power to prevent the animals from being subject to such diseases?—Precisely.

9291. You think that nature has worked a miracle in favour of these islands?—We are very favourably situated, no doubt.

9292. That other countries are subject to cattle diseases, but that this country is, from some reason or other, entirely free?—No, I do not mean to say that, there are other countries which are free as well as this, and were always free until they imported cattle.

9293. You think there is some great difference between the inferior animals and man?—In what respect?

9294. With regard to inferior animals if we only separate one country from another you may banish all disease, according to your statement?—There is a great difference between animals and men.

9295. Would you say, with regard to men, that if you could isolate this country from all other countries no disease would exist?—It depends upon whether the disease is indigenous to the country or not.

9296. I will take small-pox for example, if you could separate this country from all other countries would you kill out small-pox?—No, I do not think so.

9297. Small-pox is therefore indigenous to this country?—Yes.

9298. Take cholera, for example?—There are many kinds of cholera; there is only one kind of contagious cholera; what they call British cholera is a very simple malady.

9299. But even with regard to cholera, nobody

ever dreamt that because this country might be subject to Asiatic cholera, of permanently isolating this country from all other countries?—No; but if cholera was only 20 hours' sail from Great Britain, the Government might take measures to keep out the cholera from the country; there is only one country which is the natural habitat of such a disorder, and we should merely need to be separated from that one country, not from all countries.

9300. At any rate you take it for granted that those diseases of which we have been speaking we should be free from, if we were separated from other countries?—That is my opinion.

9301. You must acknowledge that the conditions of this country, atmospheric or otherwise, are extremely favourable to disease?—I do not know what conditions you refer to.

9302. Take the case of Ireland, where there is very little importation; perhaps there is as little importation into Ireland as into any country in the world, yet you find disease spread broadcast all over Ireland?—You find, as far as Ireland is concerned, that it is only in the large centres where the animals are brought together that there is any disease; that breeding districts are fully exempt from it.

9303. Have we not had disease in the breeding districts?—But it is mediated off from such centres.

9304. You would limit the importation of foreign cattle, I believe?—Yes.

9305. You would shut the cattle out from Spain and Portugal?—No; we have no disease from there.

9306. You would not shut them out from places where there is no disease?—No; but from places where pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease were known to exist all the year round I would shut them out; and as far as Spain and Portugal go, I do not know that they have any such disease.

9307. You would admit Spain and Portugal?—Yes.

9308. Do you know about Sweden and Norway?—I do not know about those countries.

9309. Is it wise of you to give such a positive opinion about the prohibition of the trade in cattle when you are ignorant of the condition of countries from which our supplies are drawn?—I say it would be advisable to keep them out.

9310. You have given a positive opinion that we had better abolish the trade in live cattle?—Yes, I did.

9311. Now you would make an exception in regard to Spain and Portugal?—Yes.

9312. And when I ask you about Norway and Sweden, you say you know nothing of those countries?—I know this much; I have examined Spanish cattle, and I have no objection to them. I do not know the others, therefore, I do not speak of them.

9313. Therefore, I ask, is it not a little unwise to give that positive opinion which you have given, that it would be advantageous to abolish the trade in live animals, if you are so ignorant with regard to the condition of the animals in those countries? I am not entirely ignorant of their condition, but I hold that the exclusion of foreign animals would not be beneficial to the country.

9314. But you say that you would admit cattle from Spain and Portugal?—I say admit them if you like.

Professor
M^r. Bridg.
12 June
1873.

9315. But you say that you are ignorant of the condition of cattle in Sweden and Norway; perhaps if you were better informed, you would say we might admit them?—No; in Norway, foot-and-mouth disease existed, but it was stamped out by killing out, and if you admitted them, the disease would, perhaps, break out again.

9316. With regard to Schleswig-Holstein, if it was shown that the cattle there were perfectly healthy, would you admit those cattle?—We have no means of knowing that they are perfectly healthy.

9317. They know at the Privy Council. Mr. Forster has the means of knowing with regard to other countries whether they are perfectly healthy or not?—I think it would be wise to exclude all foreign stock from our markets, for although the cattle of any particular countries might be free from disease, as those of Spain and Portugal, yet cattle from diseased centres in other countries might, and would be passed through their ports into ours.

9318. Is it not the fact that since Germany was a scheduled country the importations from Germany have considerably diminished?—I do not know.

9319. But before you give a positive opinion that the abolition of the trade would not raise the price of meat, do not you think that we ought to know whether that has been the case or not?—No, I do not.

9320. I should have thought it would have been necessary to know that?—No; because the percentage is so small, that it would not affect the meat market.

9321. Do you not know that $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. of the foreign importations of any raw material has an enormous effect upon the price of the article in the country?—Yes; but in this case you would increase your home supply.

9322. I ask you whether in the case of Germany, you do not know whether the obstructions to the importation of cattle from Germany, have diminished the import of cattle from that country?—No, I do not know that as a matter of fact.

9323. Seeing that we had disease wide-spread before the free importation of cattle in 1842, it shows, does it not, how easily the disease is introduced from abroad?—Yes, it does.

9324. I am assuming that the disease was introduced from abroad; I do not know anything about it, and you have a strong opinion upon it; but we have the disease, and you say that it was introduced from abroad. Now, as the disease was introduced under the absolute prohibition of foreign cattle, it might be admitted into the country if the importation was prohibited, might it not?—The question is, were there no foreign animals imported in 1859.

9325. We had no trade then in foreign animals?—But private individuals were permitted to import one or two foreign animals to improve their stock; that is a material element in the question, and we have no means of knowing that that was not done.

9326. You would introduce thousands of animals, but only to the ports?—Yes, only to the ports; and the importation of them must be placed under able heads, and under the charge of intelligent men; and the place must be thoroughly disinfected.

9327. Mr. Dent.] Were you educated at the Royal Veterinary College in London?—No.

9328. Where did you receive your veterinary education?—In Edinburgh.

9329. Do you know nothing of the course of study of the Royal Veterinary College?—Only by the prospectus.

9330. With regard to the veterinary education at Edinburgh, were the diseases of cattle and sheep part of the teaching of the college, as well as those of horses?—Yes; and of dogs and cats.

9331. Had you anything corresponding to what medical students have; had you any hospital to walk, or any opportunity of examining cases, or was your instruction derived merely from studying books?—It was much the same as with medical students; we had a hospital with a good many patients in it, and we had all the outside practice to attend to, and we had dresses to attend to the details of the treatment and give the medicine.

9332. But I want to know what opportunities you, as a student, had of acquiring practical knowledge of the diseases of cattle, sheep, and pigs?—There were animals for treatment.

9333. Had you any quantity of animals sent to you for treatment, as I understand, a medical student attached to Guy's or St. Bartholomew's, or some other hospital, sees all kinds of cases brought before him; and what I want to know is whether a veterinary student in London or Edinburgh has any such opportunity of studying the diseases of cattle, sheep, and pigs?—Yes; he has many opportunities; he has cases in the hospital, and outside practice as well.

9334. Your professors in veterinary sciences attended sick animals, and took their students to examine those cases, was that so?—Yes; outside, in the surrounding country.

9335. Had you any great number of cases which, as a student, you had an opportunity of observing?—Yes, a great many.

9336. But in the veterinary colleges horses are the principal subjects of study, are they not?—There is a large fancy for them from the fact that there is more money to be made out of that practice.

9337. Is it not the fact that the treatment of cattle, sheep, and pigs, is so unromantic, that veterinary surgeons, as a rule, have neglected that branch of their study in order to follow the diseases of horses?—I should not like to say that they neglected it, but there is a little more attention given to the one than to the other.

9338. You are now professor of veterinary science to the Royal Agricultural College, are you not?—Yes, I am.

9339. Have you a hospital there?—Yes.

9340. Do you make the diseases of cattle, sheep, and pigs, a particular study?—We would if we could get the farmers to support us a little more than they do, but they do not send us so many patients as we should like.

9341. I want to know whether you are able to give practical information upon the diseases of cattle, sheep, and pigs, from cases submitted to you?—Yes; it is not a large practice that we have.

9342. Do you practice independently of your professorship?—Yes, I do.

9343. I understand you to say that since 1852 the veterinary professors have learnt nothing or scarcely anything with respect to the contagious diseases of animals?—Quite so.

9344. You think that the veterinary art is at a
stand

stand still?—As far as that department is concerned, it is at a stand still.

9345. You would not think that medical science, with respect to the contagious diseases of human beings, is at a stand still, do you?—No; it is advancing very rapidly from the numerous experiments which have been performed recently.

9346. You do not perform experiments, and do not see so much of these diseases, because a farmer does not think it worth while generally speaking to doctor a sick beast or sheep; he thinks it would cost more to call in a veterinary surgeon than to stick the animal and make the most of it he could!—That is so.

9347. And therefore veterinary science is at a low ebb?—I should not like to say so.

9348. But with respect to cattle, sheep, and pigs, is it not so?—No; we have a lot of good stock shorthorns in our country, and they are worth treading.

9349. But if you have learnt nothing of contagious diseases in the last 10 years, when contagious diseases have been, according to your account, decimating the stock of the country, that does not say much for veterinary science?—It does not say much for the experimentalizing of our veterinarians.

9350. Nor of the veterinary professors?—I could not say with reference to the veterinary professors, because if I made experiments at our college, for example, there would be a chance of the disease spreading, and the sooner I left after that the better.

9351. But medical science goes on without extraneous aid?—I beg your pardon; the Government support the medical profession, and they do not support the veterinary profession. Professor Sanderson is aided by the Privy Council.

9352. But the greater part of the advancement in medical science has not arisen from Government supervision, but from the medical bodies themselves?—Yes; because there are so many scholarships. Young men have an opportunity of studying, which they have not with us; the Government give us no help.

9353. You say that in your opinion the inspection of cattle is of no use?—We cannot rely upon it as a preventive measure against disease coming into our country.

9354. With regard to the last outbreak of cattle plague, do you not think that inspection prevented the spread of cattle plague into our country; take the case of last year when you had the cattle plague introduced into four or five different centres, would you not say that inspection at the ports had a great deal to do with preventing its spreading through the country?—You could hardly say; the farmers are so well educated now, that in the case of cattle plague they would take all the measures themselves if they were well assured that it was cattle plague.

9355. Do you think that in case of cattle plague the farmers might be left to defend themselves?—No; because they would be in this difficulty; that they would require to know that it was the disease; and they would require to have an inspector or somebody who could inform them that it was the disease.

9356. Then, we come to the advantage of inspection. You think that by inspection you may discover animals which are infected in a cargo, &c.

and prevent their being taken about, and so prevent the spread of disease?—That is what I said; that you simply limit the number of animals brought into the country if they are suffering in an acute stage, but if they are suffering in an insubertive stage it is no real use, and you cannot prevent it.

9357. But in the case of cattle plague you can at a very early period by the use of the thermometer discover the disease?—That would be a very difficult thing to apply to cargo after cargo.

9358. But that plan has answered with respect to cattle plague?—There is no doubt that so far as the northern outbreak of cattle plague is concerned it was promptly stopped.

9359. With respect to foot-and-mouth disease, are the farmers so afraid of it that they would submit to any similar restrictions to those which were in force during the time of the cattle plague?—I would not advocate that the animals should be killed.

9360. The last witness told the Committee that they had a strict system of blockade in Cheshire, and yet that Cheshire had suffered more violently from foot-and-mouth disease than any other county in the kingdom?—That is easily explained; it is a dairy county, and they have to buy in the public markets.

9361. But there are other counties. Take my own district, the West Riding of Yorkshire, which is a very large importing county. We buy an enormous number of stock; we have not had those restrictions, and at this present moment I believe that we have not more than one case reported; in the whole of the West Riding the disease was very severe, undoubtedly, but certainly it was not more severe, or so severe, as it was in Cheshire, where they had this system of blockade; the circumstances are very much the same in both counties, except that ours is not a dairy county?—That makes a very great difference, because the cows are being brought from dairies.

9362. But a Cheshire farmer does not go to Manchester or Liverpool to get cows for his dairy?—He must get the disease in that way.

9363. A farmer does not buy from a town dairy to stock his farm?—But he buys cows in the town, some of which may have come from a town dairy, and in this way spreads the disease amongst the stock.

9364. You think that the way in which the disease spread so much in Cheshire, was from buying cows which had been in town dairies?—No; it was by buying cows which had been in contact with cows which had been the subjects of disease.

9365. Then you do not think the disease has spread extensively in Cheshire from the Irish cattle?—The Irish cattle may have spread the disease. There is no doubt that the transit of Irish cattle gives them every chance of contracting the disease, and it is quite possible that the Irish cattle may have introduced it.

9366. The frequent change of hands which stock undergoes gives every chance to the increase of disease, does it not?—There is no doubt about that.

9367. But does not that show to you that the disease ebbs and flows in spite of all the regulations, and everything that is done?—I do not think so.

9368. Then

Professor
Mc Bride,
19 June
1873.

Professor
AP. B. B. B.
—
13 June
1873.

9368. Then how do you account for it, now that the disease dies out throughout the country?—It is easily explained; it is the nature of the disorder to die out throughout the country.

9369. That explains what I say, that the disease comes in waves, and ebbs and flows, that with ordinary restrictions you cannot prevent it; sometimes the disease increases, and then at other times there is a gradual decrease of the disease?—It is simply what I mentioned before; it is the law of all contagious and infectious diseases that they tend, after being in a strange country, to die out of themselves for want of more fuel; and that to keep up the disease in the country, you must have fresh importations of the poison. If we have no fresh importations of poison, necessarily the disease will die out; and it is my opinion that if we do nothing in reference to foot-and-mouth disease, but prevent the introduction of foreign animals into this country, the disease will die out of itself.

9370. Now, we are not only destroying the diseased animal itself, but every animal which has been in the cargo; the disease is now reaching its ebb, and if we continue to do that, is there not reason to believe that we shall stop the importation of any fresh virus?—But all animals are not stopped; the importation of sheep and pigs is not stopped.

9371. All animals which are on board in a cargo in which any one animal is affected have been for some time slaughtered at the port of debarkation?—Supposing an animal had contracted the disease in its passage by virus adhering to the hold, that animal is sent to the market, being passed as sound, and three or four days afterwards it is found suffering from the disease; that will not prevent the introduction of it; the animal had the disease in its system.

9372. But at present if an animal is found affected with the disease, the whole of that cargo in which the animal has been, is slaughtered at the port, but of course if there are no animals affected they may be passed?—Those animals may be suffering from disease in an incubative stage.

9373. There is no doubt they may; but do you think that the present system presents as fair a means of stopping the disease as can possibly be resorted to, short of the complete slaughter at the port?—Quite so.

9374. And even with slaughter at the port, you never could be certain with so subtle a disease as foot-and-mouth disease that you might not convey it inland?—If you had the proper man in the proper place to have everything thoroughly looked after, and if the markets were thoroughly cleaned, I think you could limit that very much, and I do not think there would be much chance of spreading the disease.

9375. Is the disease very prevalent in your district at this very moment?—No; it is dying out; it is very nearly out.

9376. Have any very restrictive measures been adopted in that district?—It has been simply confined to the farmers.

9377. The farms upon which the outbreak has occurred have been declared infected districts, and the animals not allowed to be removed for slaughter or any other purpose?—That has been done.

9378. Chairman.] I suppose we have some native diseases among our stock?—Yes; a great

many which depends upon peculiarities of soil and climate.

9379. Have we any diseases among our stock which are not general throughout other countries; have we any diseases peculiar to these islands?—I do not remember any that are peculiar.

9380. We have scab in sheep, which I suppose is not a foreign disorder?—Scab in sheep is common among foreign animals too.

9381. It is not a foreign disease?—No; it is indigenous.

9382. Glanders among horses is indigenous, is it not?—That is the case.

9383. With regard to splenic apoplexy, do you think that that is indigenous amongst cattle?—That is indigenous.

9384. And common lung disease?—In a sporadic form, yes.

9385. So that we have a good many native ailments?—Yes, a great many.

9386. But previously to the year 1839, with the exception of cattle plague in the last century, we had none of those foreign disorders, I believe?—Not so far, as I am aware.

9387. We have got rid of cattle plague and sheep-pox, and have been able to keep them out?—Yes.

9388. But pleuro-pneumonia and foot-and-mouth disease have found a home in this country for many years?—They have.

9389. And notwithstanding that long period those diseases have been here you think we may get rid of them, just as we have got rid of sheep-pox and cattle plague?—I have no doubt about that.

9390. The honourable Member for Hull asked you, if you were to prohibit the importation of some foreign commodity which was only 5 per cent. of the consumption in this country, whether that would enhance the price of the home produce; do you wish in any way to prohibit a pound of meat coming into the country?—No; I should be in favour of as much meat coming into the country as we could get, if we got no disease.

9391. And you do not wish I suppose to prohibit the importation of live animals, provided they are killed at a water-side market?—Decidedly so; have as many foreign cattle as you like. I should like to have plenty of them, but have no disease.

9392. You apprehend that slaughter at the port of landing would not diminish the importation?—I think not.

9393. Whereas if the animals were all killed at the same market, there would not be the difference which now exists where some animals have to go to a water side market, and others are allowed to go over the country?—There might be a little, but it would be very trifling.

9394. Mr. W. Johnston.] Have you had much experience of the introduction of disease from Ireland into England?—I have seen a good deal of it at Bristol.

9395. Chairman.] Had you any disease at Glasgow at that time?—At Glasgow the animals were very healthy at that time.

9396. Mr. W. Johnston.] What is your experience of the introduction of disease from Ireland into England and Scotland?—I believe that most of the Irish cattle get the disease at Dublin, if not there, then on board the steamers, if not there,

there, than at the markets upon this side. The Irish cattle are the healthiest we can have; but it is simply coming from those hot-beds of

disease and being packed closely in steamers which renders them very susceptible to contagion.

Professor
M'Donnell.
12 June
1873.

Mr. WILLIAM CLODE, called in; and Examined.

9397. *Chairman.* You are the Secretary of the Census Department of England and Wales, are you not?—I am.

9398. And Superintendent of the Registrar-General's Office in Somerset House?—I am one of the Superintendents.

9399. You were the Superintendent of the Statistical Office of the Cattle Plague Department of the Privy Council during the prevalence of the cattle plague, were you not?—Yes; for rather over 12 months, from the beginning of May 1868 to the middle of May 1869.

9400. What was the state of the office when you went there with regard to the statistics?—It was rather in a state of confusion, partly owing to the accumulation of work, and to the inexperience of the additional clerks who had been so rapidly required; they were mostly persons inexperienced in official work, and they had to be instructed in their duties, and of course a good deal of loss of time and confusion arose from that circumstance; and the staff had to be supplemented by clerks from different Government offices, who worked extra time.

9401. They were all raw hands, I suppose?—There were about 100 clerks at the time of my taking charge of the department, and many of them were raw hands.

9402. Did they work pretty hard?—I found that they required some reorganisation as regards their duties, and I undertook that, and by dint of so doing, and getting them to make a daily return of work they performed, I got the department into better working order.

9403. How many clerks did you leave in that department?—I left about 30 clerks in the Statistical Department, to the best of my recollection.

9404. Did you compile the Statistical Report of the cattle plague for that department?—I did, according to plans which I submitted to Colonel Harnes, R.N. (then Secretary of the department), and which were approved by his Grace the Lord President of the Council.

9405. At what time was that ready?—That Report was ready by the middle of 1869.

9406. I do not think that we had it in the House until the middle of 1868?—I am informed by Her Majesty's printers that copies were delivered to the House of Commons on 21st May 1870.

9407. Why was that?—Chiefly because Dr. Williams, the Secretary of that department, thought fit to have my Report set up in different and smaller type from that in which it had been printed; and that of course took some time to do, and entailed considerable, and, in my opinion, unnecessary expense, and he then presented it as an appendix to his own Report, together with the matter which the veterinary professors prepared, and amalgamated the whole in one volume.

9408. Had the cattle plague pretty well died out when you left the department?—It had.

9409. And the country did not have the Report till three years afterwards?—Not until three years after I left.

0.58.

9410. Then the chief interest of it was gone, I suppose?—Yes, it was.

9411. In your official capacity have you had considerable experience in dealing with clerical work and organisation?—I have.

9412. Do you think the present Veterinary Department might with advantage be transferred to the Local Government Board?—I think so.

9413. In what respect do you think this transference would be advantageous?—At the time of the outbreak of the cattle plague in 1868 the regulations necessary were of a character so novel and stringent that I think no other department could so well have enforced them as the Privy Council Department; the influence of so powerful a body as the Lords of the Council, and the great experience of the Clerk of the Council, were invaluable in that great emergency. But under the normal state of things as regards cattle diseases, I think it is no longer essential that that department should form a part of the Privy Council office, and I think that it might very well be transferred to the Local Government Board.

9414. In the same way as the Medical Department of the Privy Council?—In the same way as the Medical Department of the Privy Council. And I think that the urban and rural sanitary authorities created under the Public Health Act of 1872, would make good local authorities for cattle disease purposes, and possibly the sanitary inspectors might be utilised in an emergency.

9415. Now that it is more a question of law than of Privy Council orders, you think that it would be advisable?—I think the duties of carrying out the provisions of the Contagious Diseases (Animals) Bill could be very efficiently done under the Local Government Board.

9416. Rather than by the Privy Council?—Yes, rather than by the Privy Council; and I think that economy would result from that arrangement.

9417. What amount of economy do you think would result?—The Privy Council Department is an old and historical department, and one of great influence, being brought into personal contact with the Sovereign and with the highest personages in the kingdom, and it is therefore very properly a highly paid department. But to attach any newly formed office to it is not an economical arrangement, for although the new department would not participate in the same scale of salaries as the central office, yet it pitches the key, so to speak, of their salaries, and they gain no advantage in consequence.

9418. Who is the head of the Census Department?—The Registrar General.

9419. What office does Dr. Farr hold?—Dr. Farr is the Superintendent of Statistics in the office of the Registrar General and is assistant to him in taking the Census.

9420. Am I right in supposing that his salary is about 800 £ a year?—The maximum salary of his office is 700 £ per annum; but he has a special allowance in consequence of having formed the

3 z 4

Statistical

Mr. Clerk. Statistical Branch, and as a reward for his eminent and peculiar services during many years.
—
12 June 9421. How many years has he been in the
1873. Government employ?—About 35 years.

9422. Then they appear to be more liberal in the salaries at the Privy Council Office than they are in that department?—Yes.

9423. Do you think that, as a general rule throughout the whole of the Government offices, the officers of the Privy Council Department are paid more highly than those of other departments?—They are not paid more highly than the officers of a certain class of departments, such as the Home Office, the Foreign Office, the House of

Commons, and a few others, but in comparison with the majority of Government offices their pay is decidedly higher.

9424. You think that it would be advantageous and economical to transfer this office in the same way that the Medical Department was transferred to the Local Government Board?—Yes; I think that the Local Government Board would administer the department more economically. For instance, it is a small office, and I do not think they would require the services of a secretary as well as a chief clerk; I think they could carry on the duties with an officer of the rank of superintendent, thus saving one of the salaries.

Monday, 16th June 1873.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mr. James Barclay.
Mr. Jacob Bright.
Mr. Clay.
Mr. Dent.
Mr. Dodson.
Mr. William Edward Forster.
Mr. William Johnston.

Mr. Kavanagh.
Mr. Monseil.
Mr. O'Connor.
Mr. Pell.
Mr. Clare Read.
Mr. Tipping.

THE RIGHT HONOURABLE WILLIAM EDWARD FORSTER, IN THE CHAIR.

Professor JOHN GANGER, called in; and Examined.

9425. Mr. Clare Read.] I BELIEVE you have not very much interest in the veterinary profession just now?—I have retired from the profession, but I take a great interest in the prevention of cattle disease in the country, since I have adhered steadily to this subject throughout life up to the present moment. I am most anxious to do everything in my power for the extinction of foreign cattle diseases in Great Britain and Ireland.

9426. We will go to foot and mouth disease first; do you consider that there is any spontaneous origin of that disease in this country?—Certainly not. I may be permitted to say here that I may perhaps claim the honour of being the originator, not of the theory but of the demonstration, that the contagious diseases which have afflicted our cattle, since 1842 more especially, are exclusively of foreign origin. The great difficulty at first was the demonstration that pleuro-pneumonia was of foreign origin. Hübner, in the last century, and Gerlach in the present, as far back as 1858, independently of my own observations, proved that; and in 1862, I furnished a report to the Privy Council, in which Mr. Simon quite admitted that I had made out my case, that the diseases which interfered with a proper meat supply were exclusively of foreign origin.

9427. Do you think it is possible to rid this country of foot and mouth disease?—I think it is not only possible but easy, as our daily experience and very recent experience, for example, with regard to America, would demonstrate.

9428. Would you tell the Committee what diseases you consider of foreign origin?—I will just mention them in the order in which they were imported. The first malady, which was imported in 1839, was the foot and mouth disease. At that time probably an importation of pleuro-pneumonia occurred (I have no doubt of it in my own mind) in the county of Cork, from direct importation from Holland; and I may explain that for some years prior to that time, the wants of Western Europe had led to a strong current in the trade of cattle turning westward, and I supplied maps to the Privy Council in 1862 to demonstrate the way in which pleuro-pneumonia spread gradually into Holland, and afterwards to our own country. These maps were never published, but I believe they are in the hands of the medical department now. Then smallpox in sheep was introduced, *variola ovis*. Then we had the cattle plague of 1865.

0.58.

9429. Those four are the chief foreign diseases from which we have suffered, two of which we are suffering from at the present moment?—Two of which we are suffering from at the present moment.

9430. And the other two have been got rid of, have they not?—The other two have been got rid of.

9431. In your opinion would Professor Baldwin's plan of stopping all movement for six weeks or two months exterminate foot and mouth disease in this country?—I should say no. Of course it is almost impossible to deal with a question of this sort in a dogmatic way; but having been very anxious to ascertain the truth on this subject, I have investigated it in a comprehensive manner. Last century we were afflicted with these cattle plagues by importations from Holland and Denmark. I am not prepared to say, as Dr. Headlam Greenough does, that pleuro-pneumonia was here. Cattle plague was here. The last records that we have correctly are about 1769 and 1770. One of the greatest physicians we have ever had, Dr. Cullen, with Mr. Laidlaw and others, saw that these maladies came along the Eastern coast, and they stopped the importation. To that circumstance we owe the high position of British live stock during the first half of the present century.

9432. To the year 1859?—To the year 1839, and notice the effect of the restriction; that we had the price of meat high in 1800, and steadily down it went in spite of our population rising from over 16,000,000 to over 27,000,000 in the 38 years, from 1801 to 1839.

9433. You consider that the supply of meat was plentiful then, in consequence of the freedom from diseases?—What did our stock come to; what did our shorn-herd breeders do for us? The price of meat supplied by contract to Greenwich Hospital in 1800 or 1801 was 3 l. 4 s. 4 d. per cwt. In 1840 it was 2 l. 14 s.; the reduction had been gradual, and the increase in our stock was very great; and by the cattle plague year it had risen to 3 l. 12 s. 7 d. I need scarcely say anything with reference to the price of meat now, but I deliberately say that the high price of meat now is due to the persistent introduction of foreign animals and foreign diseases, and that we should be very much better fed at the present moment if we did not import a single foreign animal, and that the recuperative energies of the country are such that in two years we should have more meat if we stopped the foreign importations than we have now.

3 C

9434. Provided.

Professor
J. Ganger.
—
16 June
1873.

Professor
J. Gamgee.
—
16 June
1873.

9434. Provided that we got rid of the disease as well as of the importations?—Yes, but the one disease which affects us most we should get rid of by itself; foot and mouth disease would cure itself; we do not need to trouble ourselves with curing it.

9435. Are you of opinion with Dr. McBride that the virus would burn itself out, if there were no fresh importations?—It is illustrated as a fact, and there are thousands of instances of it. Every farmer knows it; and when very lately and very exceptionally foot and mouth disease was introduced into Canada and the United States it passed away spontaneously. In that case you had not as you have in the case of England and Ireland, the fact that you send diseased cattle to Ireland, and that you get the disease back with compound interest, and as keep on creating the disease, but even here it is wonderful how readily it dies out, as it did in the cattle plague time. During the year of the cattle plague, foot and mouth disease was extinguished in this country.

9436. Are you sure of that?—I am as sure of it as it is possible for a man to be sure of a fact of that kind.

9437. You did not bear of a case, and did not know of one?—I did not bear of a case, and I drew special and marked attention to it, because it bore out all that I had said before.

9438. Did you not either write a pamphlet or deliver a lecture about that time in which you said, "We have now got rid of foot and mouth disease, and we shall not have it again until it is re-imported," or words to that effect?—I could not put my finger upon the thing at this moment, but I have no doubt whatever that I did say such a thing. In fact, I knew it at that time, and as the cattle plague extinguished the foot and mouth disease, it was natural that I should draw special attention to the fact, because when Mr. Bruce actively supported me in 1863 and 1864, when Professor Simonds said, "This disease is not of foreign origin; it may arise spontaneously here." With his support, the farmers looking upon restrictions as being very detrimental to their interests, we were defeated. But when the cattle plague came in, without any effort foot and mouth disease was stamped out.

9439. And I suppose pleuro-pneumonia was very much curbed by those restrictions?—Yes, no doubt, because a great many of the sick cattle were killed, and the regulations to a great extent checked the disease. But the reason why pleuro-pneumonia constantly comes into this country is that it has established stations now in Central Europe; that is a very important point. It is very strange that these contagious plagues spread always from east to west. I have followed out their general history from Eastern Prussia mainly, but when they undoubtedly originate further East, and exactly where they have in times gone by originated in the East, we know not.

9440. You stated something about established stations in Europe, could you name any of them?—No. In this country the established stations of pleuro-pneumonia are the town dairies, concerning which we have nothing in the veterinary reports, because they know nothing whatever upon that subject, so far as we can read. Cattle dealers' farms, I proved many years before I reported to the Privy Council, were the established stations, owing to the weekly importations always kept up. Pleuro-pneumonia is an insidious

disease; it kills in such a way that the farmers are impoverished, but yet they can go on with their dairies. We do not see now the flourishing dairies, with 1,000 cows in them, which we used to do, but by the purchase of fat cattle, which can be sold to butchers if attacked with disease, dairymen have greater facilities for counteracting the ordinary consequences of pleuro-pneumonia, that is to say, pecuniarily. The reason why we stamped out cattle plague was because we were obliged to do so from the prompt mortality amongst the cattle, and we did not come to that until we had suffered a good many months, and pressed the point very firmly upon the Government of the country.

9441. What do you consider the loss per head from foot and mouth disease in cattle?—I should say from 1*l.* to 5*l.* or 6*l.* a head; it may be the total loss of the animal, but that, as you are aware, is rare. Foot and mouth disease affecting an animal a day before it is slaughtered, of course, leads to a certain waste. A fat animal kept over from one market to another, will go back 5*l.* at once, and in the dairy districts of this country, in Cheshire, and in some other parts; indeed, all over the country foot and mouth disease is the greatest scourge that we have, and one that interferes the most severely with the production of animal food. That is a point upon which I have been at variance with some of my professional brethren of the old school; foot and mouth disease is a malady which they are not aware we lose anything by; but we have lost millions upon millions every year for 30 years past, and the very fact that you have stopped cattle plague will open the eyes of the country to it. We shall have done our work when we get rid of that.

9442. Would you exclude foot and mouth disease from the Act of 1869?—Never. I should legislate for contagious diseases. I should first attempt to get rid of foot and mouth disease; it is the one which does most mischief, and it is the one which must be got rid of at all cost.

9443. It has been stated that your estimate of the loss from cattle diseases at 5 per cent. has been greatly overestimated, and that 1 per cent. would more nearly represent the losses between 1842 and 1867?—I am afraid I must trouble you with a little history upon that point. When I studied in London, more than twenty years ago, I went into one dairy and saw 21 cows in a week carted out of a place where there were 200 head of cattle. At that time we know absolutely nothing either of the origin of that disease or of its extent, except this, that when it first came in it was called the "new disease," and the Germans recognise it as their "lungenseuche," or lung plague, and therefore we called it "lung disease;" but I travelled about abroad, and made inquiries about the relative mortality in cases of this description, and at Edinburgh I began to investigate the insurance statistics, and was amazed to find out that, whereas, we did not need anything but very limited cow clubs before, the importation of foreign cattle, the agricultural insurance companies came into existence after the free importations of foreign stock, and within a few years they were all bankrupt; they were all ruined. I took my ground upon the evidence of the books in which the cattle losses were actually paid for, the books of people therefore having a deep interest in not paying for too many, and it was from the most accurately recorded facts and the most careful investigations that I was continually making, that I came to the

the conclusion that our losses were, as a rule, not less than 5 per cent. since the introduction of foreign animals, and very often unfortunately above 7 per cent. Now, at the time that the Government endeavoured to bring in Bills to put a stop to these cattle diseases in 1864, since my position in relation to the foreign origin of these diseases could not be very well impeached, with Mr. Simon at my back, they "abused the plaintiff," as the lawyers say, and tried to make out that I had published statistics which were not actually warranted by facts, a matter in which Mr. Bruce not only most cordially supported me, but he knew all the time that I had taken every possible precaution.

9444. Who are "they"?—Dr. Hall Maxwell and other witnesses who were brought here to give evidence to weaken the position which I had taken.

9445. Who had opposed your views?—Yes, and who were responsible for the introduction of cattle plague in 1865, according to my view of the matter.

9446. Do you think that inspection of fairs and markets is of any very great value?—Inspection at fairs and markets is of value in this sense, that we ought always to know where we are, and certainly we ought always to inspect. I do not wish the Committee to fancy that I pretend to any great prescience, but if we only read our history we shall find all the information we require. I have here a pamphlet which accidentally dropped into my hands from a waste paper stall. It is "An Essay upon the Contagious Disorders raging in this part of the Kingdom," dated in 1746, which ought to be written in letters of gold with reference to the method of killing out rinderpest. I tried to get the best information I could from all sources, and to have a large amount of science brought to bear upon the matter if I could possibly get it together, and it is upon that I speak. I do not pretend to any marvellous faculties or greater perception than other people.

9447. Would you advocate a system of license or warranty?—In suggesting a method for the prevention of disease I should prefer to say that my belief is that we must in this country return (in a country that has intelligence and soundness about it) to the condition prior to 1839, when the cattle of Great Britain and Ireland were perfectly free from disease; it is to that state of perfect freedom that I wish to return. Of course for a time you may stamp the disease out, and in another case you may have licenses, but we do not want the system of licensing, which is said in the reports of the Veterinary Department to prevail extensively in Switzerland, and which we had in the cattle plague time; we want no such licenses as a rule. My motto is minimum interference with the home trade, and rational dealing with the foreign trade, so as to enable that to grow in a proper way.

9448. Would you agree with Professor Simonds in sending Irish cattle suffering with imported disease back to the ports from whence they came?—You might do whatever you liked with animals from foreign ports, unless you killed the animals at the port. The harder you hit them the better you are off. I do not say that in any spirit against the foreign trade. I am working hard now to do everything whereby the foreign trade may attain its maximum point, but how can the foreign trade attain its maximum point when you have these periodical attacks, &c.

proving that the disease comes from abroad. In one of the Reports I noticed this on page xxv.: "There appears no reason to doubt that foot and mouth disease and pleuro-pneumonia are both introduced into this country by Irish cattle, and that a great number of outbreaks of these diseases are due to the introduction of stock imported in vessels from Ireland. The evidence of this is, in a great number of cases, incontestable." I should think it was. We send them as much disease, that they send it back with compound interest, as always happens between farmers. But you cannot have regulations for the county of Kerry which would apply to Cheshire; and Ireland is one of the healthiest and one of the finest countries in the world to supply us with store cattle. We do not want to go to Australia; the Irish farmers will give you all you want if you could protect them. You have not got to protect yourself from them; you must protect the Irish stock. When I went on behalf of the Privy Council in 1862 into Ireland, I found we were spreading disease over the country by the calves which were born in the large towns in Lancashire. There was the industrious and thrifty Irishwoman buying with her hard-earned savings a few calves, and rearing them upon hay-ten, and sundry other things, and having losses of between 50 and 60 per cent. by diarrhoea amongst those calves; those animals suffered from pleuro-pneumonia, from the fact that they were the offspring of cattle affected with pleuro-pneumonia, and had been born in infected dairies.

9449. How would you deal with foot and mouth diseased animals who were detected upon their way to a fair, or upon their way home?—I may say, in a general sense, that the traffic of diseased animals must be stopped; *ceasez vos coites* it must be stopped; there is no question whatever upon that. When I gave evidence upon this subject many years ago, they said, "You do not mean to say you would stop a whole cargo of animals landed from abroad," and I said that every animal must be stopped, and Professor Simonds objected to that very strongly; he objected to stopping the whole cargo; but what is the use in a contagious disease of stopping one animal.

9450. You have not told the Committee what you would do with cattle in a market which were found affected with foot and mouth disease?—By the time the animals have got into the market they have done the mischief; you are bound to disinfect, but you have done the mischief by that time. Of course you may disinfect them, and do the best you can, but I am looking at a larger question. If I knew there was any chance of foot and mouth disease spreading from one centre, say towards Scotland, by all means stop the cattle going there.

9451. What would you do with those animals if you saw one lot in a large market suffering from foot and mouth disease?—If it were a lot of store stock I do not think it would be an economical thing to slaughter them; they have done the mischief, and all you can do is to place them in such a position that they can contaminate nothing else, and then watch them very carefully as to where they go. There is no doubt you cannot prevent disease any more than you can cure isolated cases of disease by rote; while men as well as good measures are required.

9452. And you would isolate the cattle, and not allow them to go about the country?—Of course

Professor
J. Ganges.
—
16 June
1875.

Professor
J. Ganges.
—
15 June
1874.

course I should, if it were possible to do so, but sometimes it is impossible to do so. We are helpless when you have brought us the disease; what you must do is to stop it coming here, and this will have to be done in time.

9433. How do you consider pleuro-pneumonia is propagated?—By contagion, and contagion alone.

9434. Would you slaughter all cattle affected with pleuro-pneumonia?—Yes, I should slaughter all affected cattle, but I would not sell them as human food.

9435. What would you do with those animals which were in contact with diseased animals in the case of pleuro-pneumonia?—I am simply dealing with the matter as a national question; you are compelled to sacrifice to a certain extent, and you cannot always go the most economical way to work. I am quite aware of that; but as a general rule you must inoculate the animals which were not actually diseased, and in that way you would have a minimum of loss; but if you gave me a lot of cows all affected to such a stage that the cases were coming on very rapidly, if I had a stock of 30 cows, for example, and had them nearly all ill, you would be obliged to sacrifice them, but I will give you an illustration of that: I am no longer practising in the veterinary profession; I am most anxiously pursuing the question of turning the live cattle trade into a darning trade as much as possible; nevertheless people constantly come and ask me, "What shall I do in the case of pleuro-pneumonia?" The last case that I had any special connection with, I asked Professor Duguid, who is now at the Brown's Institute, to go and inoculate some animals at Mr. Amey's, at Petersfield. There were 300 cows there; cows very rarely to be bought now: cows worth about 30*l.* a piece. Suppose you stamped out that lot of animals. There was a case of pleuro-pneumonia, and we told him what to do; he is a very skilful man in various ways. Professor Duguid carried out a system of inoculation; and within three weeks they had no more disease, and they have never had it since. Mr. Amey buys very carefully, and if you killed down his 300 cattle, look at the loss, not to the nation, but to the man. How could he have got 300 cows together at once. It would have been ruin to him, even if you had paid him 30*l.* a head for the cattle; you would have destroyed his herd.

9436. How many cattle were affected with pleuro-pneumonia?—I forget at the moment; he was sending them up to London, to the butchers. Mr. Amey will be most happy to supply you with the facts, but I cannot tell you the number which had been carried away, but I think only one or two; the disease had not spread.

9437. You say that you would kill all the cattle which were affected with pleuro-pneumonia, and that you would isolate and inoculate the rest of the herd which were associated with them?—Yes, I would.

9438. Would you give compensation to the owner for all the cattle slaughtered?—Yes, and you must be liberal. I may mention here, that I perceive from some of the reports that the Prussians were against inoculation. The fact of the matter is this, unfortunately for me, I believe it is the only case in which I implicitly relied upon the experiments of other people. For some years Professor Simonds was experimenting in this country, and I followed his views, and

he induced me to believe that inoculation for pleuro-pneumonia was an absurdity. I had no practical means of ascertaining whether inoculation was good or not. Professor Simonds performed some experiments, and he said that it was not useful, and I very foolishly, for the only time almost in my life, followed his advice, and therefore remained in the dark for some years. I went abroad in 1863 and established the International Veterinary Congresses, and Professor Nicklas showed me that he had cleared Bavaria, and Professor Hering and many others spoke so clearly upon the point that I began to see that I was wrong. Then in my experiments I had rather unsatisfactory results, for this reason: People complained of the tails rotting off, and then I thought I would adopt the Australian idea of diluting the virus with glycerine; it was some time before I found that the glycerine destroyed the virus, and that I had not been inoculating the animals at all. Dr. Williams introduced inoculation into Hants; and as the best answer that I can give you, I will give you a translation of a letter from Professor Gerlach of Berlin; he is one of the ablest men in Europe, and he writes me on the 10th of April to this effect: "Berlin, April 10th, 1873.—The opinions of veterinary surgeons on the Continent, regarding the value of inoculation in cases of pleuro-pneumonia, differ materially, being even diametrically opposed to each other. It is characteristic, however, that all practical men, all who have inoculated much, and possess much experience, defend the great value of inoculation, whilst all its opponents are theorists. This will indicate to you my own stand point. I have repeatedly stated, both verbally and in writing, that according to my experience it is a sin of omission if peremptory inoculation be not immediately resorted to in the case of an outbreak of the epidemic. This opinion is based on both experiment and numerous clinical observations. 1st Experiment.—The comparative trials with serous exudation, the result of the traumatic inflammation, and from the inflammation of pleuro-pneumonia, have shown that whilst the first exudation had no effect whatever, the local reaction only corresponding with the irritation of the wound, the clear and fresh serous exudation from the diseased lung, though used in the same small quantity of two drops, in the same way and in the same spot of the subcutaneous tissue, caused an astonishing reaction, such as I could not produce through any poisonous substance. This proves the specific action of the product of the disease. 2nd Experiment.—In all cases where the inoculation took place early, i.e., immediately after the first or second case, the contagion was interrupted. If the plague has existed for some time then inoculation comes too late, because it only effaces the disposition, but does not stop the disease when already in course of development (certainly not when in a more advanced stage of development). Inoculation can only serve as a means of protection, not as a therapeutic remedy; cases of disease may still occur three or four weeks after inoculation, depending on how far the contagion was already developed at the time of inoculation. Besides imperative inoculation, I have also practised protective inoculation, inoculating sound cattle just bought, and isolating them until after the expiration of the inoculation, and then placing them in infected stables by the side of sick cattle, and I did

Professor
J. Gargan,
15 June
1873.

dise with the greatest success, only two or three fall ill, which proves the exceptional repetition of the disease of pleuro-pneumonia, the same as other contagious diseases. Remain, &c., your sincere friend, Gerlach." He is certainly one of the most distinguished men in Europe writing upon the subject of pleuro-pneumonia.

9459. Has he converted you back to your original belief in the efficacy of inoculation?—My belief in it is most strong.

9460. I understand you to say that Professor Snodgrass had showed you the contrary?—Until 1842. I have here the Report of 1872, and by that I see how little has been done for veterinary science. When I see 10,000*l.* a year spent on the Veterinary Department, and a very considerable amount of that which is not correct in theory, and not only in theory but in fact, in its reports, I am amazed. Of course if the person writing the reports says he knows nothing of veterinary science, I can understand it, but on no other ground.

9461. You think inoculation for pleuro-pneumonia ought to be tried after killing the cattle which are diseased?—Yes. I may mention that the reason why I turned to the Report of the Privy Council for 1873 is this: It says, on page 23, "The establishment of uniform international proceedings, with a view to prevent the spread of these diseases (more especially cattle plague) from one country to another, would greatly benefit Great Britain. If those transit countries, from which we receive a large proportion of our import of animals, would engage to take the same precautions against transmitting diseased or infected cattle as they take against retaining such cattle in their own dominions, the precautions necessary in this country might be very materially simplified and our risk very much reduced." Now I, in 1843, started the International Veterinary Congress expressly to establish international relations, and here we have, in 1873, the proposal brought up; and in my cattle plague book I have the reports of the first two International Veterinary Congresses, and in my circular, which I shall not trouble you by reading, addressed in March 1873, I there called all my colleagues from all parts of Europe together on purpose that we should work together for the extinction of these diseases.

9462. In large towns do you think that a system of public abattoirs the best, and that private slaughterhouses promote disease both in man and beast?—Certainly. As regards private slaughterhouses you cannot inspect them, apart from the fact that they contaminate the district round which they are.

9463. Do you suppose that a good deal of diseased cattle finds its way into the London slaughterhouses from town dairies?—Such is the information I have always had. I have constantly seen them there, and detected them there, not within the last year or two, but they always are there undoubtedly. The trade in diseased animals has been, for many years, a prolific cause of disease; if you had not had the diseased meat trade you must have stopped the disease.

9464. What disease has been imported here by means of hides and hoofs?—Foot and mouth disease, cattle plague, and small-pox in sheep, could come in the skins.

9465. I suppose there would be most danger of importing foot and mouth disease in that way?—Of course, the disease is constantly transmitted in
0.68.

that manner; it is not only the immediate but the mediate contact. There is a time, which I recollect, when a butter box took cattle disease up from Glasgow to the remote districts of Leamshire; it was a butter box which had been placed in a slaughterhouse, and upon which some blood had collected. It went up to Mr. Edmonstone Crawston's farm, and propagated the disease there. Such cases are very difficult to trace, but they do occur.

9466. If we slaughtered all cattle at the port of landing, we should still have the danger of importing foot and mouth disease, unless precautions were taken to disinfect the hides which were imported?—I think so, but then there must be proper precautions for disinfection. That is another point upon which I have worked for many years, and my work upon meat preservation led me to find out a disinfectant which would not be anxious to meat, and might be used in slaughterhouse, dead meat markets, and butchers' shops, where carbolic acid and chloride of zinc are inadmissible. When I walked into the meat market at Deptford the other day, and walked out of it, I found every facility for the propagation of disease; they were disinfecting hides with chloride of sodium (common salt), by sprinkling them over with it, and the man I spoke to said, "We want people to believe that we are disinfecting them, so we sprinkle them with a little salt." Now common salt is not carbolic acid or chloralum, so that the disinfecting amounts to nothing, and any cattle market conducted as that cattle market is, would be no guard against the introduction of foreign diseases.

9467. Does glanders arise from the bad treatment of horses?—No, glanders affords an instance of pure contagion, which we, so doubt, receive from abroad. Upon this point it is difficult to prove the extent of recent introductions of the disease since the Veterinary Department has ignored this, as other pressing subjects, but I have received general information from veterinary surgeons that glanders has been exceptionally prevalent. We have had for our couriers, and for the autumn manures, the introduction of a lot of foreign horses, and they have propagated a great deal more glanders, especially in London, than we ever had before.

9468. How would you deal with glanders?—I would shoot the horses. In the extinction of glanders in the Army you have an admirable illustration of the stamping out system. The veterinary surgeons of the Army are thoroughly up to their work, and for years we have not been distressed by the presence of glanders in the Army, as the French have. It is not true that foreigners have been really before us in many questions of this kind, because we certainly were the first to point out amongst the veterinary surgeons the advantages of ventilation, and the importance of killing animals affected with contagious disease.

9469. How would you deal with sheep pox, if it were introduced again?—I should any kill the animals as I did in Wiltshire, where they were inoculating them and spreading the disease. Some people think you must kill the whole flock, but sheep pox is not like pleuro-pneumonia, and if you had a clever shepherd (and shepherds are very clever in detecting sick sheep), if he finds that the eyes are not bright, or the wool is clumped, you can separate them, and you do not need to stamp out the whole flock; it is only a
waste
3 0 8

Professor
J. Gengee.

16 June
1873.

waste of money, and gives a large amount of trouble to the farmers.

9470. But you would decidedly kill all those cases in which the disease was developed?—Yes, and watch narrowly for other cases in their very earliest stages. That was what I did with regard to the cattle plague. I watched for it and succeeded, thermometer in hand, to detect the disease long before the manifestation of general symptoms; but that was not adopted by the Veterinary Department until the medical men enforced the teaching very strongly.

9471. Were you the first to call attention to the value of the thermometer to discover incipient cases of cattle plague?—I was the first to discover that it should be done. I had been asked by the French Government to make certain inquiries, and my brother, Dr. Arthur Gengee, and myself, were trying the thermometer with some calves that we had in Edinburgh. At that time I had an establishment in Edinburgh, as well as in London, and having examined the case very carefully, I made up my mind to follow it up closely when I came up; then, on going through a number of dairies, I found that I could tell the disease two or three days before anybody else could tell it by the use of the thermometer, certainly two days before, and I published this fact at once.

9472. What is the difference of the temperature?—It goes up two or three degrees; from 101 to 103, or 104, or 105. When a cow is bailing, you may have an exceptionally high temperature. There is a very interesting fact with regard to the recognition of disease in herds by the thermometer, which the Committee ought to know. The Congress of America appropriated 15,000 dollars, in order that I should give them a report on pleuro-pneumonia, and upon the Texas cattle disease. That not only enabled me to discover the existence of the disease in Texas, but it enabled me to ascertain the absolute method of propagation by the faeces in the case of the Texas cattle disease. Now, in that case, I had Blacks with the lasso in the plains, and they would catch the cattle with the lasso, and I never found that the disturbing or rousing down the cattle elevated the temperature. By that means I was enabled to discover that the theory which the Americans held, that these animals were all healthy that gave the disease to other animals, was false; the animals did not communicate the disease by their breath, but, like cholera, wherever they were followed by other cattle on their pasture, and ate the grass which had absorbed a certain amount of feculent matter, those animals died as rapidly as by cattle plague. In that case the thermometer came in at once, and you could tell whether the animals were sick or healthy.

9473. If small-pox in sheep became prevalent here, would you recommend inoculation?—Inoculation is the great cause of the annual recrudescence of disease in Europe. In certain parts of Eastern Europe, the unfortunate opinion prevails, that if the farmers inoculate their lambs these will be protected, and so they are to a certain extent, but the disease spreads as the animals move around the farms. Professor Gerlach, however, tells us that it is the yearly inoculation of lambs which keeps up sheep pox in Eastern Europe.

9474. You, on the contrary, would depend

upon early slaughter, and long isolation?—Upon careful isolation and long isolation.

9475. For how long?—You do not need to be very long; if a flock has sheep pox, it would not be prudent to let the animals go about under two months, or, perhaps, three, but in all these cases, to a great extent, it is a question of brains in framing regulations for special emergencies, and brains, as well as measures, are needed in the prevention of cattle diseases. We should always be prepared for the adoption of means dictated by the highest science based on the largest amount of experience.

9476. How long do you suppose it is necessary to isolate for pleuro-pneumonia without inoculating?—Twelve months may not accomplish your object. That is the great difficulty with regard to pleuro-pneumonia. I have known an animal bought at an auction taken upon a farm, and placed amongst some valuable Alderney cows. That animal improved every day, and thrived and went on magnificently, and six weeks afterwards another animal in the place coughed, and about two months after that another animal was seized, and that one died, and when I was called and came to examine all these cases, I found that the first animal which was brought in apparently healthy, was the cause of the whole mischief. That was a case in which three months afterwards the malady was recognized, and not before.

9477. You would think that an isolation for 28 days, as prescribed under the Act of 1869, was not sufficient?—So far as I am aware, I do not know of anything which has been done for stamping out pleuro-pneumonia which has been effectual to clear the country; it may be in some isolated cases sufficient. If you inoculate the animals, within three weeks, if you are at all intelligent in watching the disease, you know you are protected, but then if you bought any animals, for some months afterwards, I would inoculate every animal brought in, on account of the contagion about the place. It is very difficult to disinfect sheds, but fortunately for us the practical difficulties are not quite so serious as they at first appear. I am obliged to be very cautious in any answer which I give of that description, because if you killed out the disease to-day, six months afterwards, if you turned up a manure heap, you might propagate the disease.

9478. You refer to pleuro-pneumonia?—Yes.

9479. Mr. Peil.] Do you think the disease can be propagated from dead pleuro-pneumonia matter?—Yes, my experience in Scotland proved that. We had a butcher in the heart of a fine grazing district, and that butcher was killing diseased cattle and throwing out his lungs and offal, partly to the pigs and partly to the manure heap, and pleuro-pneumonia broke out frequently on farms where this offal was spread. It is true to a certain extent that that might be hot manure, but the carting of manure from the town dairies has been a source of that disease, and also of foot and mouth disease.

9480. Mr. (Mr. Read.) You do not agree with the great body of the Veterinary Department we have had before this Committee, that when the breath is out of the body of a pleuro-pneumonia beast, all danger is at an end?—Then I cannot tell how they account for cases of pleuro-pneumonia propagated by dead animal matter.

matter, such as the lungs. I have seen animals which I have known to have been perfectly sound placed in a stable for experimental purposes. The carrying in of the lungs of cattle that had died of lung disease was sufficient to propagate the malady. If you will give me healthy animals, I will produce pleuro-pneumonia in them.

9481. How would you do so?—By matter from the lungs.

9482. In what way?—I would have a fine spray, and let them breathe it.

9483. They will inhale the poison?—They will inhale it, and the mucous membrane in that case is the only point where you have the absorption. The natural method of communication for pleuro-pneumonia is by virus coming in contact with the mucous membrane of the lung, and then from the mucous membrane spreading into the tissue, between the lobes of the lung; and if you take the virus and put it under the tissue of the skin, you have the same effect as explained by Professor Gerlach in the letter I have read you, and as we all know who have studied this subject. I think it should be generally stated that the name pleuro-pneumonia is a wrong name; the malady is a fever; it is a lung plague; it is not inflammation of the lungs. There is a very interesting point which I may mention, that probably something was known of it in the days of Moses, when the Jews adopted the rules for examining the pleura of animals killed for food. According to the law of the Jews they are obliged to pass their hands round the lungs, to see that there are no adhesions; and a great point is made by Dr. Livingstone, who proves that pleuro-pneumonia beef in hot countries probably leads to carbuncles. Dr. Livingstone has proved this, and I think we are bound to look back at the precautions which are taken in these hot countries to prevent the contamination of the human subject by diseased animals.

9484. I understand you to agree with the whole bulk of the evidence which we have had before us with regard to pleuro-pneumonia, that we ought to kill every case in which the disease is developed?—Yes, I do; but I would not permit the sale of diseased animals, at any stage, as human food.

9485. And then I understand you to say in addition to that, that you would recommend strict and long and careful isolation, and also inoculation?—Yes.

9486. And supposing you were to inoculate, how long need the isolation be of these cattle which were banded with the diseased ones?—Practically if you adopt the plan of inoculating the animals which come upon a farm, I believe a couple of months would certainly accomplish your object.

9487. What is your opinion with regard to the efficacy of quarantine in the case of store stock from abroad?—If you want store stock from abroad (which I very much doubt, if you will only take care of Ireland), you must have some method of quarantine, but I am certainly not a strong advocate at all for any wholesale system of quarantine. I believe this, that by co-operation, for example, the dairymen of London might be provided with cows even from Holland, whence from the constant transit of cattle through the country we get pleuro-pneumonia and foot and mouth disease, provided a proper system were adopted for the inoculation and isolation of the animals, and a

proper system of quarantine, but taking it as a general system for the supply of store stock, you cannot carry out a system of quarantine; it is costly and impracticable. Why did they reduce the quarantine upon the Austrian frontier from 21 days to 10 days in the case of cattle plague?—Because the difficulties were insuperable, and people smuggled the cattle. It is true that this country is protected by the ocean barrier, and we must not forget that Nature has created this country in a manner to protect it permanently, and for ever, if we would only look fairly into the matter, and act up to what we ought to do. There is no question that the ocean itself protects us, and did protect us, as I have proved, for 50 years.

9488. In case there should be any store cattle imported from abroad and subjected to quarantine, I suppose you would suggest that there should be special ports and places for that stock?—Clearly, or else you could not carry out any system of quarantine; and it must be very well chosen.

9489. I gather from your evidence that you want to have the Irish trade as free as the English trade?—Certainly; if you go to Ireland the disease enters there from Scotland and from England, and if you go to Scotland the disease enters there from England and from Ireland; and if you come to England, the people are mainly blaming Irish cattle, because they get the store stock from there, and they believe the Irish cattle are contaminated.

9490. I suppose you would consider it necessary that whatever system we adopt, should be one uniform and efficient system throughout the whole of Great Britain and Ireland?—Yes, clearly.

9491. You do not think that inspection of Irish cattle would be of much use?—Unfortunately for us inspection has done such an amount of mischief in relation to foreign cattle, that I do not think it would. As I said before, you must keep a vigilant inspection of everything, and it is a proper thing to do; but as a means of stopping the importation of disease from Ireland or elsewhere it is not sound, according to my views; you cannot trust inspection.

9492. I suppose inspection would be very useful to show you where disease exists?—That is the point; inspection is useful in all fairs and markets, so as to be able to trace the disease to its centre, and so enable you to put a stop to it. That is why we require, especially if we are to spend 10,000*l.* a year in connection with the Veterinary Department, the very ablest men, men trained like Dr. Buchanan and Dr. Ballard; I am not saying a word against Professors Brown and Simonds, for whom I have the greatest respect as men, however much I may differ from them as veterinarians. I do protest most strongly against the Veterinary Department being placed under anybody but a veterinary surgeon; it would be wrong if I were to be appointed to succeed Mr. Simonds, as the head of the Medical Department, notwithstanding that I have made contagion my special study. I hold that the country should have the services of the person who knows the most upon these questions, and not the person who knows the least. I do not know Dr. Williams, so that I must not be understood as indulging in any personality when I protest most strongly on his holding his present appointment.

Professor
J. Galloway.
—
15 June
1879.

Professor
J. Gargen,
16 June
1873

9493. *Chairman.*] When did you first enter the veterinary profession?—In 1849 and 1850; I did not obtain my diploma then, I entered the college.

9494. When did you obtain your diploma?—I think it was in 1852.

9495. At present I understand you to say you are more engaged in other matters?—Since I found the cattle dealers were all opposed to foreign stock markets and the dead meat trade from abroad, I felt it was essential, in order to save this country, that we should work out the subject of meat preservation, and by that means effect the transportation of the cattle in a dead state, which would stop the importation of disease at once; I have been working earnestly at that.

9496. I do not ask your motives, I only want to know when you ceased your active practice as a veterinary professor?—The work in America, which was the most important investigation I ever conducted, was in 1858 and 1859. I need scarcely tell the Committee that I am in the deepest possible earnest on this question, and I am following it up very carefully.

9497. Then at present in what are you engaged?—I introduced a system, and one which in a certain sense cannot be improved, of slaughtering oxen by carbonic oxide, and preserving the meat with a preparation of chloroform and sulphurous acid; my object was to preserve large quantities of cattle. I found that the transportation of large masses of meat in a ship's hold was attended with a moulding of the meat, and I had to direct my attention to the improvements of refrigerating machines, not for the purpose of freezing the meat, but by having currents of cool atmosphere in the hold, so as to prevent the moulding; and I have at the present moment completed very costly experiments upon this very question. I am working now with respect to this subject of fresh meat transport, so as to do away with the importation of live animals.

9498. Since 1859, have you been engaged upon the subject of the importation of fresh meat?—I have.

9499. I think I understood you to say that foot and mouth disease disappeared immediately after the extinction of cattle plague?—During the process of extinguishing the cattle plague.

9500. You believe it entirely disappeared?—Yes, so far as the facts go which have come to my knowledge, it did.

9501. Professor Brown, upon being asked a question upon that point, says there was a cessation of foot and mouth disease, and that it broke out again last year; but in saying that there was a cessation, he did not wish to be understood as saying that it entirely ceased, as there were always a large number of cases; but he states, that in the lars of the Metropolitan Market there was scarcely a case to be discovered; you do not agree with that statement?—My information certainly does not tally with that.

9502. What was your information?—That the disease had disappeared.

9503. How did you obtain such information as enabled you to state that the disease had ceased throughout the kingdom?—From veterinary surgeons and from everybody I came in contact with, and my own observation.

9504. What I want to know is this, that inasmuch as it is not disputed that many cases of foot and mouth disease occur without any fuss being made about them, do you make a positive state-

ment that the disease had been stamped out in that year?—I make that positive statement as general evidence which we had before us.

9505. What was that general evidence?—That there was no foot and mouth disease existing. Of course, if the Veterinary Department had specific cases published, well and good, but the ones of proof falls upon them. We state most clearly that there was none, and they have never proved that there was.

9506. Are you not aware that it was in 1859 that the first Act was passed giving power to get returns for foot and mouth disease?—Yes, I am.

9507. Those returns could not exist in the Veterinary Department, because they had no power to call for them?—I understand that that is so; still it is a point made by the Veterinary Department, and the Veterinary Department ought to give us proof of it.

9508. But you state, notwithstanding that Professor Brown gives it as his positive statement that there were always a large number of cases, that you are sure that they were not?—So far as my information extends, there were not.

9509. Do you to that extent rely upon your information that you can assure the Committee that it was stamped out?—Yes, so far as my information goes.

9510. In spite of the declaration of Professor Brown?—Yes.

9511. The reason I ask you that question is, that the whole of your theory depends upon the possibility of stamping the disease out?—I have no theory in the matter; it is an absolute fact.

9512. I understand your suggestion to be, that we should prohibit its introduction from abroad and rely upon the possibility of getting rid of it at home when there is such a prevention of importation from abroad?—Clearly, although I certainly should not object to your following up the disease, shortening its period of staying here.

9513. You must be aware that unless it could be shown, or unless there was reason to believe that you could stamp it out at home, the prohibition of importation from abroad would not have that effect?—Of course not. I should very much like to have the opportunity of proving my point.

9514. Therefore it is a matter of great importance to know upon what grounds you base your belief, that the disease can be so easily stamped out at home, we having had this evidence. I understand you to base that opinion mainly upon the fact that foot and mouth disease was stamped out by the cattle plague regulations?—Not mainly. I look mainly during my experience of 20 years to the way in which the disease has died out on every farm, and to the way in which it has spontaneously died out in America.

9515. In what other way has the disease been stamped out in England?—We had none until we imported foreign stock in 1839.

9516. You believe that the disease was first imported in 1839?—I do.

9517. Are you aware that there are two theories about that; the theory that you hold that it owes all its strength to constant fresh importation, and the other theory that having been imported it becomes indigenous?—Yes.

9518. Upon what ground do you think that the other theory fails, that having been imported in 1839 it has become indigenous?—I can only go upon the every day experience; if you have foot and mouth disease come upon a farm it runs through

Professor
J. Ganges.
16 June
1873.

through the animals, and ceases until you bring in a fresh lot. The spontaneous origin of foot and mouth disease in this country is an impossibility. It has a short period of incubation; it is so rapid in progress that there is no material kept alive.

9518. I am not now talking about spontaneous origin; I am talking about the question, whether having been once planted in England, if it was so planted, it has taken up its abode in England, never having been stamped out, so that it has always been lurking about, and owing to causes which I cannot explain (for I doubt whether there is anybody in the profession, or anybody else, who has perfect knowledge upon the matter) that it may be suddenly revived; now I understand you to state that if we stopped the importation of foreign animals the disease would absolutely die out of itself?—Yes, I say it would.

9519. Upon what do you base that statement?—Upon the whole of my experience of 20 years with regard to cattle disease.

9520. How is that shown?—Whenever I have followed its course it has died out, and it has not originated again upon those farms where I have seen it die out until it has been brought in again.

9521. Do you believe there has been any time besides that time which you state was just during the cattle plague, and upon which you are contradicted by Professor Brown, in which that disease did not exist in England during those 20 years?—During those 20 years a large portion of the country has not been contaminated at all.

9522. I am not asking that; I am asking whether you believe there was any time except this time immediately during the cattle plague, in which you are contradicted by Professor Brown, in which the disease was entirely stamped out?—I believe not, so far as I know.

9523. How does your experience of 20 years prove that that disease can be stamped out?—Because what happens with regard to an isolated island, or an isolated farm, will certainly apply to the whole country.

9524. There is no doubt whatever that the disease gets stamped out in a farm, if that farm has no connection with any other cattle, inasmuch as I do not suppose it to be spontaneous; but I want to know upon what do you base your statement that the disease was entirely stamped out in England?—Upon my own experience.

9525. But you state that you are not aware of any time in which the disease was entirely stamped out, except during the cattle plague?—I can take you to certain parts of Wales and Scotland where the disease has been introduced and where it has died out.

9526. You are aware that there is intercommunication between all parts of England?—We know it very well from the propagation of diseases.

9527. Then the disease having died out in that part of Wales is no proof, according to your own theory, that it would not reappear in Wales if there was any foot and mouth disease left in the kingdom?—Of course it would appear in Wales if you carried it there.

9528. Now I again ask you, upon what do you base your statement that your experience of 20 years proves that the disease can be stamped out, when you state that in one year it was, which, as I say, was contradicted by other authorities, and you acknowledge to me that you know of no other year in which the disease was extinct?—I do.

base my opinion upon the experience which I have obtained with regard to the extinction of the disease whenever I have had to deal with it, in isolated patches of the country, if you choose, at home and abroad.

9529. That simply proves that in isolated patches of the country the disease, having existed, is cured or disappears; does that prove that it has been stamped out throughout the kingdom?—Of course it does not prove that the disease has been stamped out throughout the kingdom.

9530. I suppose you consider that there were several times during the 20 years in which, whether it was stamped out or not, there was scarcely any amount of it?—Foot and mouth disease varies in prevalence according to the current of the trade, but I am not aware of any year in which, if the evidence of quantity could be obtained, we should not have had a very considerable amount.

9531. You do not allude to this year in which it was stamped out?—No, of course not.

9532. I ask you whether there would not be several years within those 20 years in which there was very little of this disease, and your answer is that there was no such time?—Except at the time of the stamping-out of the cattle plague.

9533. Then your experience of the last 20 years proves that with the exception of those six months the disease was always raging in the country?—Yes, more or less.

9534. Then I must again ask upon what do you base your opinion that the disease can be stamped out of the country?—Any scientific man can only have the facts of the case before him, coming within the sphere of his observations and weigh the probabilities of the case; the cattle plague was studied in this way in my own college. The investigation in my own stables brought out facts, which could be applied to the whole country, and they convinced the whole country.

9535. You have stated broadly that the foot and mouth disease would die out of itself if there was no foreign import, and you have also said that you base that opinion upon your experience, in order that your experience should prove that it ought to show that the disease has died out. Now I understand you to state that, with the exception of one short six months, in which, differing from others, you say that the disease was stamped out, it never has been stamped out, but has always raged, therefore I do not know what experience you have had in the matter?—I have simply the experience of perhaps having worked more at these cattle diseases than any living man.

9536. Would not this experience be parallel to this case with regard to human diseases; that if typhus fever rages in a town, and owing to care, or owing perhaps to the disease working itself out, that town ceases to have any typhus fever, would it not be just as fair for you to say that typhus fever was altogether stamped out of the country, and could be altogether stamped out of the country, from that fact, as to say that because foot and mouth disease disappears upon a particular farm from isolation, therefore it has been, and can be, stamped out throughout the kingdom?—I think the inference would be perfectly warrantable upon the part of any medical man, if he cleared a village, or a town, of small-pox by vaccination, that he could clear the country in that manner.

3 D

9537. I was

Professor
J. G. Gump.
—
16 June
1873.

9538. I was talking about typhus fever, not about small-pox?—I will take typhus fever if you choose; but I took small-pox because we do not know any similar mode of preventing typhus fever.

9539. At any rate, you will acknowledge that there were times when it was worse than others?—Yes, that is the case with all contagious diseases.

9540. That being so, what do you mean by saying that millions upon millions have been lost every year by foot and mouth disease in this country for the last 30 years?—Fortunately for me, there have been intelligent agriculturists who have pursued this inquiry of late years more than I have, and I think the country has reason to be very deeply indebted to persons who have investigated in Herefordshire and elsewhere, Mr. Algernon Clarke and others, who have driven home a great lesson upon that subject.

9541. Do you adhere to that statement that you have made?—I do.

9542. I will read you again that statement that you made, that millions upon millions have been lost every year for the last 30 years throughout the country by foot and mouth disease?—I have no doubt, if Mr. Algernon Clarke were asked, he would corroborate that statement.

9543. Do you adhere to the statement that every year for the last 30 years millions upon millions have been lost by foot and mouth disease?—I do, without any limitation.

9544. What estimate do you make for the loss in past years per animal?—I cannot bind myself to figures of individual years. I have published figures in a Blue Book years and years ago, and there they stand supported by all subsequent research.

9545. You are binding yourself to figures now, because you state that millions upon millions have been lost during the last 30 years; but I want to know, from your experience, what was the average loss upon animals attacked by foot and mouth disease last year?—In Norfolk alone, in 1872, the number of cases was 200,000. I should be very sorry to pay for that loss under 3*l.* or 4*l.* a head; very sorry indeed.

9546. Taking it at 4*l.* a head, which is your maximum, and taking your "millions upon millions" to mean the lowest which they possibly can, which is two millions, that would require, in order to make a loss of "millions upon millions," with that interpretation upon them, 500,000 animals per year affected with foot and mouth disease; do you believe that for every year within the last 30 years, 500,000 cattle have been affected with foot and mouth disease?—Certainly, and more.

9547. Do you mean every year?—Yes, since 1842, I should think, or, at all events, in a very vast majority of the years.

9548. Upon what do you base that answer?—I take my own experience all over the country.

9549. Would you tell the Committee how you arrive at that?—I do not wish the Committee to run away with the idea that I have worked this question without an endeavour to arrive at a just determination. I have here a Report upon the health of stock in the United Kingdom in 1862. I only produce this to show how carefully I issued circulars to people all over the country.

9550. Do you make any estimate of the loss in 1862 with that disease?—I believe not.

9551. I want to know upon what do you base

your statement that there were at least 500,000 animals affected every year during all those years; can you tell me what was the number in 1862; do you give any number of animals which you think were affected in 1862?—I do not think I do.

9552. Is there any year in which you attempted to arrive at the number of animals that were affected?—I should suppose that I have very often done so; I know I have.

9553. Will you be kind enough to give to the Committee one of those years?—I would draw my inferences; and in lecturing to students every year for 10 years, during the time that I was a teacher, I would never touch the subject without giving them some evidence of the extraordinary losses produced by this disease.

9554. You wrote specially upon that disease in 1862, did you not?—In that case I speak specially with the mortality, and I unfortunately left that Report at home.

9555. You have made a very strong statement and from a gentleman in your position in the veterinary profession, I want to know upon what ground you base that statement; you state positively, the contrary to what we have heard, that there were no times when there was a great diminution of the foot and mouth disease, and that it has been constantly raging to the extent of 500,000 animals a year, and I ask you for your calculations for one year, and you cannot give me any year?—There are many observations which I have made which I have not published. I have repeatedly stated off-hand, and very probably in a lecture delivered in Birmingham, or Penrith, or in some other place, I may have given the facts.

9556. You have stated that you are convinced that there have been, generally speaking, at least 500,000 animals affected every year for the last 30 years; will you be prepared to bring calculations, which you have previously made, which will show that?—I can produce repeated observations which I have made, where I have drawn conclusions from my own observations in lectures, and elsewhere. I do not suppose anybody in the country is prepared to produce such calculations, unless it be the Privy Council, who spend 10,000*l.* a year to get them, and cannot.

9557. I have asked you upon what you base this statement, and you give me no ground for it?—I will give you one kind of illustration; if you go into our markets, whether you take Norwich Hill, or Allhallows Fair, I have no recollection, as a veterinary surgeon of 30 years, of those fairs being free; those are fairs where you have every year thousands upon thousands of cattle, and where every single animal entering the fairs becomes diseased. I have no doubt it is possible, from farmers and others, to obtain that evidence.

9558. Are you prepared to state, with regard to Norwich Hill Market, that there has not been a year for the last 30 years in which there has not been disease?—Certainly; I do not believe there has been a year, for the last 30 years, in which Norwich Hill has been free.

9559. You state that there has not been a year, for the last 30 years, in which there have not been thousands of animals affected with foot and mouth disease in the Norwich Hill Market?—I believe that is perfectly true.

9560. But with regard to other markets, what

has

has been the case?—They have all been contaminated.

9561. What other markets can you mention?—Inlington Market. I have never been in Inlington Market without seeing foot and mouth disease there, and the same is true of Falkirk Trist and Ballinastoe Fair, which are contaminated by our drovers going over there.

9562. Have you ever been there?—I have not been to Ballinastoe.

9563. Have you ever been to the Norwich Hill Market?—I have.

9564. About how many times have you been there?—I cannot say; I may have been there half a dozen times.

9565. You mentioned Norwich Hill Market and the Inlington Market; what other markets have you been to?—The Edinburgh Market, the Glasgow Market, the Newcastle Market, and the Dublin Market, and many more. I am not ubiquitous, however.

9566. Have you been to the Metropolitan Market lately?—I do not suppose I have been in the Metropolitan Market for one year.

9567. You cannot tell whether there is much of the disease there now, or not?—I cannot say. I saw plenty of it at Deptford, a short time ago.

9568. At Deptford all the animals are slaughtered, are they not?—Yes, but the disease can very readily be propagated, if you only let people come out with the dung upon their boots.

9569. What would you do with the people?—I would make them go out with clean shoes, if I could, at all events. By all means have a foreign stock market at every port, if you cannot have better; but I am hoping that if the Aberdeen animals can come 510 miles better dead than alive, the foreign fat stock may be transported dead also.

9570. I think you stated that the Deptford Market is not in a good state?—It was in a most filthy state when I saw it, with blood in the runs between the flags, and the slaughterhouses were in a filthy condition.

9571. What additional precautions would you have upon the Deptford Market, to prevent the disease from getting out of Deptford Market?—I would resort to every proper system of disinfection.

9572. What do you mean by that?—I would never be able in five minutes to write out rules for the disinfection of Deptford Market, or any other market.

9573. I understood you to say, in answer to my honorable friend, that you had been to Deptford Market, and that some man made a remark to you; what was that remark?—That they sprinkled common salt upon the hides as a disinfectant that they carried out a system of disinfection.

9574. Do you consider that common salt is not a disinfectant?—I do not.

9575. You have yourself taken out a patent for a disinfectant, have you not?—I have, and sold the patent; it was chloralum, or chloride of aluminium.

9576. Do you consider that much more efficacious?—Certainly.

9577. Do you know Professor Voelcker at all?—I have the greatest respect for Professor Voelcker.

9578. Is it true that he has said that "This chloralum has not a thousandth part of the anti-

septic value of carbolic acid"?—I am not aware that he has said so; he may have said it, but his opinion on a veterinary question has not the weight of his opinion on a purely chemical one.

9579. You stated that you believed that the high price of meat was entirely due to foreign importation?—Of course it is the importation of foreign diseases with the cattle; we have lost more cattle than we have imported.

9580. Do you think that it is entirely due to that?—It is partly owing to the increase of population; but we had an increase of population from 1800 to 1840, and a diminution in the price of meat, and I believe that if you only stopped foot and mouth disease, and slaughtered all foreign cattle at the port of debarkation, you would have meat in this country reduced in price within the next four or five years, and the farmers prospering.

9581. You stated that you thought the high price of meat was entirely owing to foreign importation, and now you say partly so; which answer am I to take; is the high price of meat entirely owing to foreign importation, or is it not?—It is partly owing to it, but mainly owing to it would be the most proper expression.

9582. Do you think the increased wages and the greater power of the working classes to buy meat has nothing to do with it?—I do not, for this reason: that the farmers in this country have advanced so enormously in the use of artificial foods and manures, that that has in all probability counterbalanced the increase in wages and the natural increase of consumption.

9583. And therefore it is your opinion, after serious investigation, that the great increase of wages for the last two or three years has had nothing to do with the increase in the price of meat?—It has had, taking in the view that we have not given the country a chance of increased production.

9584. Has it or has it not?—Of course, it has; they have eaten more.

9585. Do you think that if there had been no foreign importation, the increase of population and the increase of the power of that population to buy meat, owing to the rise in wages, would not have raised the price of meat?—It can only be a matter of opinion, and my opinion is decidedly, that if we had not imported a single foreign animal we should have had the price of meat lower than it is.

9586. I understood you to state that, with regard to the trade in cattle, you would return to the perfect freedom that there was before 1839?—When we have taken proper precautions to clear the country of disease, that must be our aim.

9587. You just mean that we are first to stamp out the disease?—Certainly; you must clear your country.

9588. Then putting aside what you would do with regard to keeping out the disease from abroad, what would you do to stamp it out at home; take foot and mouth disease first; what would you do with regard to that?—Whenever an outbreak occurred, I would have it very carefully attended to by local veterinary surgeons; not the inspectors who are often appointed, who are not professional men. I say that the great evil is that a number of persons who are not veterinary surgeons are employed in the Central Veterinary Department and as inspectors in the country.

Professor
J. Ganges.
16 June
1873.

9589. How would you ensure that that was done?—I would recommend that the whole veterinary profession should be linked together in a certain sense in furthering a measure of this description.

9590. Would you leave it as a matter of opinion that it ought to be put down, or would you have a law for it?—I think it is desirable to have regulations.

9591. How would you stamp out foot and mouth disease?—I would not kill the cattle.

9592. The reason why I ask you that question is, that you say you would prohibit all import from abroad; now you would acknowledge that it would not be fair to prohibit the import from abroad unless you could stamp the disease out at home; now I want to know how you would stamp it out at home?—I would rely entirely upon the very simple treatment which is known to limit the spread of the virus from a sick animal; common alum or sulphate of alumina would do it.

9593. How would you ensure its being done?—It would be very difficult to determine in a moment, but by proper inspection it could be done.

9594. You have not attended to the question; in what way you would ensure that proper curative measures were applied?—I have looked at the curative measures in foot and mouth disease as of secondary importance.

9595. But you have not looked at the question, how the Government should take care that that was done?—If we are to have efficient inspection over the whole country you can enforce it by that means.

9596. Inspection does not do any more than find out that there is disease?—You would be able to treat it afterwards.

9597. First of all you would have inspection?—Yes, I would.

9598. What power would you give to these inspectors?—In relation to foot and mouth disease, and disinfection is necessary, that disinfection should be enforced; that is all you want in the case of foot and mouth disease.

9599. Disinfection is not the word which I should have used; I thought disinfection was generally meant to imply getting rid of infection that was left in a place?—No, I refer to the disinfection of the animals, their hoofs, teats, mouths, and so on.

9600. We will suppose that Government will accept your suggestion, and absolutely prohibit all foreign import, then the question is how to get rid of the disease at home; we will take it that there is a good deal of foot and mouth disease existing in the country; how do you set to work to get rid of it; what regulations would you advise the Government to put in force?—I have far greater faith in men than in measures. Three or four very skilful veterinary surgeons would open the eyes of Government so much, that a space of a few weeks would demonstrate what I mean better than I can explain it.

9601. You believe that two or three men would be sufficient?—Yes, to regulate the inspection all over the country.

9602. I think I am not dealing unkindly with your evidence in stating that you are not prepared with any suggestion with reference to the mode in which Government should stamp out foot and mouth disease?—I say that the stamping out foot and mouth disease only requires more vigilance with reference to where it is, and then

attending to it by the use of the simplest possible disinfectants, in order that none of the poison from the mouth, teats, and feet of those animals should be spread. Whatever detail there is in the thing I need not give; the principle, I think, is very clear.

9603. Your suggestion, I suppose, is this: that duly qualified inspectors should make a survey of every herd in the country in the first place?—I do not think that is necessary.

9604. How would the inspectors find the disease out?—The inspectors would very soon find it out by an inspection of the markets.

9605. You think that inspection of the markets alone would be sufficient?—I do not absolutely rely upon inspection of the markets, but if there are regulations so that people should have to proclaim the existence of disease, I think that would be found sufficient.

9606. We have got another suggestion from you, that the people should proclaim the existence of disease; do you think that they should be bound to proclaim it?—I think it would be a very important thing. I cannot lay down the rules by which you should carry it out in two minutes.

9607. Do you feel confident that they would proclaim the existence of disease?—In many cases of foot and mouth disease they would not; it is not of the first importance with regard to the foot and mouth disease, but it is with regard to pleuro-pneumonia.

9608. It is not of the first importance with regard to the foot and mouth disease, you say?—It is very desirable, and I do think that if the people in the country saw that the disease were being properly grasped and extinguished, they would help you to the greatest possible extent.

9609. But when you say the proclamation of foot and mouth disease is not of much importance, surely, when your object is to stamp out foot and mouth disease throughout the country, it is not of the greatest importance that it should be discovered in those farms and herds where it is lurking?—The disease would die out so rapidly, if you stop the foreign importation, that we need not trouble the farmers very much.

9610. You are getting back to the opinion based upon the grounds which you have already stated; but supposing that it does not die out by itself so easily, taking that as a possibility, do not you think that it would be of great importance to find out where the disease is lurking?—I think so, certainly.

9611. I understood you to say that the owners would be loth in some cases to mention the existence of the disease?—I should think that the dairymen would.

9612. I think you stated that you would look forward to a minimum interference with the home trade, and a rational interference with the foreign trade?—Yes, precisely.

9613. What do you refer to in the latter case?—I would recommend slaughter at the ports, unless you can adopt the more reasonable system, following the Aberdeenshire, of bringing the animals from Tanning, Hamburg, and elsewhere, dead.

9614. You think that all foreign animals should be slaughtered, either in their own country or in this country?—Yes.

9615. With regard to store animals, what would you recommend?—With regard to store animals I would quarantine them, and import them only under special regulations.

9616. For

Professor
J. Gangee.
—
16 June
1874.

9616. For what time would you quarantine them?—That is the great difficulty with regard to quarantine; unless you have a far wider range of ground than you can possibly get hold of you would get a second lot of animals following upon the first, and you would propagate foot and mouth disease more than you had it before.

9617. Is not pleuro-pneumonia more likely to be confined in quarantine?—Yes, unless you practice inoculation with it; then if you had a period of 30 days that would be quite sufficient.

9618. Then the second condition of foreign interference is simply a stoppage of stock import, or else inoculation accompanied by quarantine in the case of pleuro-pneumonia?—Yes, that is so.

9619. Do you recommend inoculation for foot and mouth disease?—No, it inoculates itself with sufficient rapidity.

9620. Then you would not recommend no quarantine?—No, I would not. I think possibly we might help our town dairymen very much indeed at certain moments, because they are put to great straits, and they might undoubtedly at times from some parts of the Continent obtain cows, and if those cows were inoculated they would be a very great boon to the dairy farmers of the country; unfortunately for us the breeding stock of the country has been destroyed by the large town dairies.

9621. We have two conditions of that kind of interference; first, the prohibition of the import of all foreign cattle, unless slaughtered either abroad or at the port of landing, and secondly, either no quarantine, or very great difficulties with regard to quarantine; now what would you do with regard to hides?—Dried hides and horns could come in as they do perfectly well, because it is very difficult for them to come in contact with cattle.

9622. And a third precaution would be that no hides should come in unless they were dried or disinfected?—That is so.

9623. Did I understand you to say that even in the case of Deptford market you thought that disease might be spread, and therefore that you would want some regulations for the men who had been in charge of animals?—I think the men should all have their hands washed and their boots cleaned from what I could see of them.

9624. Would that answer your purpose?—I should like to follow the thing up and see how it worked, but I think in the case of foot and mouth disease especially, the great evil is walking along the roads with the manure about their legs.

9625. You stated that you would look forward to the minimum of interference with the home trade, and a rational interference with the foreign trade; would it not be true that your rational interference would be the maximum interference, as no one has suggested any more interference; but any one ever suggested more interference with the foreign trade than you have?—No; I was the first to suggest foreign stock markets in my letter to the "Times" in 1863.

9626. Now with regard to inoculation, you stated that upon the Continent the theorists were against inoculation, and that the practical men were for it?—Professor Gerlach uses this expression; I have read your letter.

9627. Are you aware that the Government of Germany have what may be considered a Veterinary Department, and that that Department made a report?—I am not aware of it; I have not seen that report; I have not had it sent me.

9628. I am now going to read to you this extract from the Report of the German Veterinary Department for 1870 and 1871; they state this: "As we have already suggested, it would be in the interest of a final solution of the question of inoculation which is of such great importance, to be able to found a judgement of the effects of it, at least in individual cases, upon the most exact researches. The principle *propter hoc ergo propter hoc* should have no application in science, although individuals may declare it 'ridiculous' when others endeavour, on a question of so much importance, to attribute effects to their true causes. That epoch when scientific controversies were sought to be decided by the disputants having recourse to a string of mutual epithets, is happily passed away. This mode of discussion we abandon to empirics, who do not bear in mind the connection of different symptoms, and who recognise for every fortunate issue from disease but one ground, and that one, the practice of their own remedies." I suppose you would acknowledge that that is a statement by those reporters to the German Government that they did not consider the question settled?—I really have not read the report; I do not know what it says beyond what I have heard you say.

9629. The Report says: "The results of inoculation were, as may be perceived by the reports, very variable. In many cases inoculation exercised no influence whatever upon the course of the disease; in other cases there were no more apparent outbreaks after inoculation, or else they ensued within the next eight days. Whether in these cases the animals not apparently diseased were somewhat affected, but not beyond the chronic stage, does not in any case appear." That Report is signed by Dr. Müller, of Berlin?—I know that the most distinguished men, such as Professor Gerlach, Professor Böhl and Professor Herring, support my view of the case.

9630. These are "Communications from the Veterinary Profession in the Prussian Kingdom, with the approbation of the Minister for Spiritual, Educational, and Medicinal Affairs, collected from the Veterinary and Sanitary Reports of the Imperial Government," and I see the name of Dr. Müller and Dr. Köstli, Professors of the University at Halle; would you consider that such a statement as this shows that the German Government being very anxious to get a stop to those diseases, had come to the conclusion that they cannot come to a determination in favour of inoculation?—I know that the ablest authorities in Germany have come to the opinion that it ought to be practiced.

9631. Then I suppose that we ought to pay more attention to your opinion, that those are the ablest men whom you have mentioned, than to the fact that the Government of Germany have chosen to adopt the other opinion?—Unfortunately authoritative reports are not the most reliable, as proved by the reports of our own Veterinary Department to our own Government.

9632. What experiments have you yourself tried in the matter of inoculation?—That whenever I have had an outbreak of pleuro-pneumonia to treat I have inoculated the animals, and I have seen the disease die out. I had originally tried isolation, which was very carefully carried out at times, but it requires such a variety of precautions.

9633. In how many cases have you tried inoculation?

Professor
J. Gamgee.
—
16 June
1873.

oculation?—I can only give you an idea; I should suppose I have inoculated, from first to last, 4,000 or 5,000 head of cattle.

9634. That is a large number, and I should suppose that with the attention you have paid to the matter you could give the Committee the results upon those 3,000 or 4,000 head of cattle?—I have never tabulated the whole of my investigations about it, but I have in my American report given the general history of inoculation; and I may mention in round numbers that, as a rule, I have had from two to three per cent. of loss by inoculation and the disease after inoculation.

9635. Do you mean that there has been 2 or 3 per cent. of loss after inoculation?—Immediately after; it is very difficult to determine that an animal is not in the incubative stage of the disease, so that if I inoculate cattle to-day, there may be a week afterwards an animal or two affected with pleuro-pneumonia.

9636. They were apparently healthy animals which you inoculated?—They were apparently healthy animals.

9637. And notwithstanding that they were apparently healthy animals 2 or 3 per cent. of them had the disease?—Yes, within the first fortnight or three weeks, and after that I very rarely found they had the disease except in a town dairy. In Newcastle I had a very bad case; they kept buying fresh cattle without inoculating them, and they died, and the whole thing proved abortive. Those are cases in which it is imperfectly carried out by persons who were incompetent to carry it out.

9638. Are you so convinced in favour of inoculation as a preventative of pleuro-pneumonia as to think that the Government would be justified in compelling it to be done?—I do; I think the Government should have had an exhaustive inquiry into the subject of pleuro-pneumonia.

9639. You think they ought to do so in spite of the differences of opinion in the profession at this moment?—You may have differences of opinion upon every question, even in stamping out the cattle plague.

9640. And you think the Government ought to compel inoculation to be performed?—I do.

9641. And you think that they should be responsible for trying the experiment?—Yes, as they did in the case of cattle plague; nobody else can do it.

9642. We had a veterinary surgeon here on the last day, namely, Dr. MacBride; I understood him to say that he thought that pleuro-pneumonia could only be conveyed by the breath of an animal; you do not agree with him upon that point, do you?—I do. I think that sick animals spread the disease by their breath.

9643. My question is, do you or do you not think the disease can only be conveyed by the breath of an animal?—No, I think we can convey the disease directly by the transference of the virus from a sick to a healthy animal.

9644. You think the disease can be otherwise conveyed than by the breath?—Of course you can convey it by direct inoculation.

9645. Have you any other reason to suppose that it can be conveyed by other means than the breath excepting your belief in inoculation?—Yes, because I explain what I first found out in Kincardineshire; I think it was in 1866. I stayed with Sir John Sturges-Forsyth, of Fettercairn, for some time, and he helped me materially,

and we found farms on which the offal and rubbish from a slaughterhouse had propagated the disease.

9646. You mentioned that you first started the International Congresses?—I did.

9647. Did you do that by yourself?—By myself; nobody suggested anything about it to me. I was the first to write to Professor Hering upon the subject.

9648. Did no gentleman upon the Continent assist you?—No, I wrote to Professor Hering and then to the veterinary surgeons upon the Continent to unite with me.

9649. I understood you to state that some quarantine was established in consequence?—No, at that time the regulations in Austria, if I remember rightly, were a 31 days' quarantine to prevent the introduction of rinderpest, and that long period so interfered with the trade that it encouraged smuggling, and at the Congress, through the observations of Professor Bill, and other professors connected with the Imperial Veterinary College of Vienna, a suggestion was made that the quarantine should be reduced to 10 days. I forget how soon after they carried that out. Professor Nicklas was the first that I spoke to about the opposition to inoculation for pleuro-pneumonia in this country, and he drew attention to our Australian experience as having been so decidedly in favour of inoculation, and he said that in one year they had cleared Bavaria by its means.

9650. It was the result of your meeting with the congress that the period of quarantine was diminished from 31 days to 10 days?—Yes.

9651. You quoted Mases with regard to pleuro-pneumonia; for what purpose was that?—My great object was this: any legal sanction of the trade in diseased meat is according to my views improper, both in an economical sense and in a sanitary sense. The Jews have been most careful to adopt laws, so that their people shall not eat diseased meat, and they have a special reason for being so careful, because in hot countries no doubt the chances of injury from putrifying and diseased matter to a human subject are far greater than they are here. The Jews in very early times adopted the plan of examining the animals, and especially the lungs, and seeing that there were no abscesses. Looking at the fact that pleuro-pneumonia came from the East, my impression is that in all probability the Jewish system first originated from the prevalence of pleuro-pneumonia in Eastern countries, and Dr. Livingstone has demonstrated that in hot countries like Africa pleuro-pneumonia beef is apt to produce carbuncles.

9652. You think that pleuro-pneumonia has existed in the East for thousands of years?—I have no doubt whatever that it has, like cholera and smallpox.

9653. In answering questions with reference to store stock, you spoke of the danger of the import of it, on account of the transit through Holland; what did you mean by that?—Before our British trade began, the Dutch exported their stock to the Rhine provinces, and they were as healthy as we were prior to 1830, but they began to send their cattle down towards France and into our country, and pleuro-pneumonia then spread from place to place, and at last was brought over from Holland here.

9654. What do you mean by the transit of cattle through Holland?—That the Dutch people having to supply an enormous trade here,

began to be buyers as well as sellers; they became buyers in Friesland and elsewhere.

9655. But I understood you to state that the importation of store stock was dangerous on account of the transit through Holland?—I believe so.

9656. Are you aware that the importation of store stock into Holland has been prohibited for some time?—I am not aware of it at this moment.

9657. Are you aware that our Government based the permission for Dutch cattle being imported into the interior of this country upon the fact that their Government had prohibited all import into the country?—I was not aware of that fact.

9658. You were not aware that the condition of permitting the free import of Dutch cattle was that they declared that no cattle should come into Holland from other countries?—I was not aware of that.

9659. You state that you consider there is much danger from the Dutch import?—I do.

9660. I am now speaking of our present regulations since the Act was passed; will you tell me in what cases you believe that foot and mouth disease or pleuro-pneumonia have been introduced into this country by Dutch importations?—I have not had an opportunity of following the isolated cases; if you ask me as to the general history of the disease I can afford you information.

9661. Are you not aware of any case?—I have not the slightest doubt upon the matter.

9662. You base that upon your expectation, but not upon a knowledge of any case?—No; I cannot have such knowledge; it is not my business to look after individual cases.

9663. But you are not aware of the important fact that no cattle are allowed to be imported into Holland?—I was not aware of that fact, but that would not affect me in determining whether I would allow a country to export cattle alive to this country, because I would not allow it.

9664. Do you believe that Holland is more or less affected than England is with pleuro-pneumonia?—I do not know, nor would that point affect my determination.

9665. Do you think that although the disease is not indigenous now in England, it is indigenous in Holland?—There are established stations of it in Holland, as there are in England, and Holland could get free; there is no doubt whatever about that.

9666. And notwithstanding the fact that there is no import into Holland, and yet that there is so much pleuro-pneumonia in England you would prohibit all import from Holland?—Undoubtedly I would. I would kill all the cattle at the ports of landing.

9667. You stated, in the early part of your examination, that Professor Simonds declared that foot and mouth disease might be spontaneously generated?—I think he has changed his mind very much.

9668. When did he say that?—His opinion was most strong at one time that the malady might be originated spontaneously in this country; he has changed his opinion since then. In 1864, Professor Simonds said that the foot and mouth disease, and pleuro-pneumonia, were in the air. Referring to the first Question, 1756, on the Report of the Select Committee on Cattle

Diseases Prevention, 1864, he said that it was "Certainly not highly contagious or infectious; it is communicable by infection," and then, at Question 1760, he is asked, "Do you mean that no animal with foot and mouth disease, however bad, should be stopped on importation?" and his answer was, "I think not." And then, at Question 1763, he is asked, "Do you consider the foot and mouth disease has been imported from abroad?" and his answer was "Most decidedly not." I know that his opinions are not the same now. And then, at Question 1765, he was asked, "The conclusion which you would draw from that would be, that the theory, that the foot and mouth disease was imported from abroad, and derived by contagion from foreign cattle imported, would not be correct?" and his answer was, "Certainly it is not correct."

9669. Supposing that it was an infectious disease from the beginning, and that it did not spontaneously originate in England, but was brought here from the Continent, but supposing that it has now found its home in England, and never been killed out, is it not possible for a person to hold that opinion, and at the same time to believe that in every case the disease arises from infection?—I think it is a very strange opinion for anybody to hold in 1873.

9670. Why?—From our knowledge of the facts, which led me, when cattle plague came to us, to say it was as possible to have a spontaneous birth of cattle plague in this country as to have the spontaneous birth of a lion.

9671. How is the fact of Professor Simonds stating that he does not consider that foot and mouth disease depends upon foreign importation, inconsistent with his belief, which he at present holds, that it is only conveyed by infection, because, if it exists in England, it can be conveyed from one English animal to another. Am I not right in supposing that, when you speak of the spontaneous origination of the disease, you mean that the disease originates in an animal without being conveyed to the animal?—I do not think that Professor Simonds now believes in spontaneous origin.

9672. And when I ask you why you think he did so believe, you give, as a reply, the fact that he says it does not depend on foreign importation, but that does not prove that it is of spontaneous origin; that only relates to the extent that the infection is conveyed?—At the time that I quoted, in 1864, Professor Simonds stated that these diseases travelled in the air, and might originate anywhere.

9673. My question is this, that the fact of his, or anybody else's, thinking that it does not depend upon foreign import, is no proof that they consider it to be spontaneous?—I say it is.

9674. How so?—Because the generation of one case presupposes the existence of the parent of that case.

9675. But supposing that some of the professions are right in the supposition, that having once got a hold in England it has become an English disease (and I understand that they do hold that opinion), can it not be conveyed from one English animal to another?—We know that it is conveyed from one animal to another.

9676. Surely the fact of thinking that, at the same time that they do not believe that the disease would cease in England by the stoppage of foreign import, is no proof that they consider it does not arise in all cases from infection?—Pro-

Professor
J. Ganges.

16 June
1873.

Professor
J. Gosses.
—
16 June
1873.

fence Simonds may say this, that the circumstances of the trade are so peculiar, that you may have a maldy travelling to and fro kept up in that way from the sick to the healthy animals; of course he may hold that opinion.

9677. Mr. Hareley.] You spoke about the price of beef in 1801; have you studied the price of beef from 1801 up to the present time?—I have; I got up a Table some time ago, taking the Greenwich Hospital supplies; the deviation was very slight; the prices never went up again.

9678. Do you know any circumstances in the beginning of the century which affected the price of beef particularly?—There were a variety of circumstances; the cattle plague destroyed much stock towards the end of the last century, and there were not the same facilities for reproduction as we have at the present moment; it is wonderful what the country would do if it were only permitted to exercise its recuperative powers. The wars probably affected us at the time; but I am not aware of any special cause which would have put up the price of meat at that time.

9679. Are you not aware that the wars during the first 15 years of this century materially affected the price of meat?—I have no doubt of that; but still the price did not rise immediately after 1801; the decline was tolerably steady to 1840 from the moment the Scotch people stopped the importation of live cattle throughout the country.

9680. Are you not aware that there was a great fall after peace was declared, and that many cattle dealers who had their hands full were ruined?—Yes, I believe there was something of that sort; there was a crisis.

9681. That was one material reason of the high price of meat for the first 15 years, and the cause for the fall which succeeded it; in point of fact, such was the case, was it not?—I have taken the general fact, that in these 39 years we had a reduction notwithstanding the increase of population, and a freedom from disease owing to the restriction on the importation of stock. During that time there may have been someebb and flow in the matter.

9682. Do you admit it to be the fact that there was a very considerable fall in the price of meat after the peace was declared in 1815?—I know there was a fall.

9683. And a very serious fall?—I believe so.

9684. So serious that it ruined many cattle dealers who happened to have their hands full at that time?—I suppose it did.

9685. Have you ever attempted to communicate pleuro-pneumonia from one animal to another?—Of course I have.

9686. How?—In more ways than one. I have seen a case of pleuro-pneumonia caused by diffusing through the air the serum from a lung affected with pleuro-pneumonia.

9687. Do I understand you to say that you have produced the disease by these means?—I have.

9688. In how many cases?—Of course, these experiments are very expensive, and we do not repeat them very often.

9689. For what purposes were those experiments made?—Purely for experimental purposes.

9690. Was that animal upon which you experimented isolated?—It was, of course; it was an animal chosen expressly for the purpose.

9691. Are you satisfied that the animal was in good health when you made your experiment?—I am quite certain of that.

9692. Have you any other case in which you have tried the experiment?—Yes; I have inoculated the mucous membrane through the wind-pipe.

9693. By that same process of diffusion through the air?—No.

9694. Were all the symptoms of pleuro-pneumonia developed in the animals?—The animals died of pleuro-pneumonia.

9695. The lungs showed the characteristic symptoms of the disease?—Quite so.

9696. Have you tried it otherwise?—Yes, in the areolar tissue. When the first suggestion for inoculation was made, we inoculated in the dewlap, and the pathological changes which occurred were the same as the changes which occurred in the lungs.

9697. Did animals treated in this second manner show the characteristic symptoms of the disease in the lungs?—No; when you inoculate in the areolar tissue, the lung is not affected.

9698. Without going into the different stages of the history of the disease, I understand you to say that under the second example, the characteristic symptom of pleuro-pneumonia was not manifested in the lungs?—Of course not, so far as the lungs were concerned.

9699. Why of course not?—You can obtain a like result in any part of the areolar tissue, the lungs themselves containing the same tissue.

9700. Your first experiment produced the characteristic symptoms of pleuro-pneumonia in the lungs, did it not?—Because I took care to inoculate the lungs.

9701. How did you take care to inoculate the lungs?—By causing the animal to inhale the spray of pleuro-pneumonia virus.

9702. Have you done it frequently in the dewlap?—No, you dare not do it, because you would kill the majority of the animals from the abundant exudations.

9703. You have made one experiment in the dewlap?—I have not made the experiment myself, but I have seen it done, and I have seen the car inoculated.

9704. What have you done yourself?—I have inoculated the tip of the tail.

9705. I understand you that you have produced the disease under your own care by causing the animal to inhale the spray of diseased lungs?—Yes, I have.

9706. And only otherwise by inoculation of the tail?—Yes.

9707. Have you tried any other means?—No, Professor Furstenburg, of Eldona, used to inoculate in the ear, because he said that the amount of virus required to be introduced was small, and he could control it; but, as a rule, we avoid those parts where there is likely to be an extensive exudation.

9708. In the case of inoculation of the tail, when the animal does not show the characteristic symptoms in the lungs, do you say it is pleuro-pneumonia which is communicated to the animal?—It is the same plague, or fever; there is the same exudation, but it has not the exact localities of the lung disease. I have seen a case of emphysema in sheep where the skin was not affected, and the mucous membrane was affected, and scoured; you may inoculate a specific disease in a specific part, and restrict it there. Take syphilis in a man; you may inoculate syphilis in the arm without having a chancre upon the penis, which is a very important fact, and we are bound to

weigh

weigh the subject as a whole; of course you do not have a chance upon the points if you inoculate the sum.

9709. But I understand this from you, that in a case where, according to your account, pleuro-pneumonia is communicated to an animal by means of the inoculation of the tail, the characteristic symptoms of pleuro-pneumonia are not manifested in the lungs?—Of course not; we have no change whatever in the lungs.

9710. Mr. Jacob Bright.] I think I heard you make some reference to America, in connection with cattle?—Yes; I have been to the United States, and I have been to Canada too.

9711. Have you any knowledge of cattle disease in the United States and Canada?—I have.

9712. Are they subject to the same diseases as we are here?—No, they have pleuro-pneumonia, because they have imported it twice from Holland and once from England, and in the large dairies in Brooklyn and elsewhere it has been propagated, but they had not the foot and mouth disease except when it was imported lately; and they have not the cattle plague and never have had it; they never had rinderpest, but they had that which was the reason of my being asked by the Government to make a report, namely, Texas cattle disease, which is totally distinct from any cattle disease which we have in Europe.

9713. Do you assume that those diseases in the United States and Canada have been imported from Europe?—There is no assuming whatever about it. I can give you the history of it. "The first notice of the lung plague in the United States dates back to 1843, when a German cow, imported direct from Europe and taken from shipboard into a Brooklyn establishment, communicated the disease, which it is said and believed has prevailed more or less in King's County, Long Island, ever since. In 1847 Mr. Thomas Richardson, of New Jersey, imported some English stock; signs of disease were noticed soon, and the whole of Mr. Richardson's stock, valued at 10,000 dollars, were slaughtered by him to prevent an extension of the plague." This is my official report to the Government, based upon the recorded evidence in the United States. Here is another passage taken from the Reports of the Agricultural Boards of Massachusetts: "Mr. W. Cheney, of Belmont, Massachusetts, has related the history of the introduction of lung plague from Holland into Massachusetts in 1859," and so able were the New England people that Massachusetts stamped out pleuro-pneumonia, and they have never had it since.

9714. I think the first passage you read states that one cow was introduced, and that that cow gave the disease to a shed of cattle?—That was so.

9715. In what year was that?—In 1843.

9716. The cow would have been at least a month at sea?—Quite so.

9717. Do you suppose she brought pleuro-pneumonia with her from Europe, or became ill upon the voyage?—She took the disease from Holland.

9718. How long is a cow ill with pleuro-pneumonia?—The incubative stage of pleuro-pneumonia averages six weeks, and there is a very interesting fact in relation to that, that dairymen buying their cows know whether they were going to stand sound by seeing whether they stand sound after their first period of milking, because that occupies about that time.

0.58.

9719. Foot and mouth disease and pleuro-pneumonia have both been introduced last year?—Foot and mouth disease was only recently introduced into Canada.

9720. Now it has died out?—Yes, all our reports show that.

9721. If there have been imports into Canada or the United States there may be again?—But they have only imported a few animals for breeding purposes, just as Australia does.

9722. But still that kind of importation goes on?—I presume so. They import short-horned stock, but only very valuable short-horned animals, which are known to be very healthy here.

9723. With regard to another question; you are in favour of killing all cattle at the ports and not allowing them to come into the country?—Clearly so.

9724. But still you are very much afraid that, even if we did that, we might still have the disease introduced?—It would be our own fault if we did.

9725. You expressed dissatisfaction with the condition of things at Deptford Market at present?—Very much so.

9726. Then if we had cattle coming into all our ports, and we killed at the ports, you would consider that we were in an unsafe position?—Not if we took care of ourselves; it would be better than the system we have now.

9727. Would you be disposed to go farther, and think it much better that only dead meat should be imported, and that live cattle should not be brought into our ports?—It has been my object for many years to work out that great improvement.

9728. Would you be disposed to recommend that a restriction like that should be immediately imposed?—No, I do not think the Government would be justified in introducing only dead meat until it can be proved that what happens from Aberdeen every day might happen equally well from the Continent. I am quite willing to give time to demonstrate that matter.

9729. You would not introduce foreign cattle into this country except for slaughter at the ports even, from countries where the cattle are known to be remarkably healthy?—We know, as a matter of history for a long time, that Spain and Portugal are far away from the European centres of infection, and it might be possible, and it might be wise, to make an exception for a remote corner of that description, but I do not believe there is any necessity for it.

9730. At the present time, after what you have said with regard to Spanish and Portuguese cattle, would you compel their slaughter at the port of entry?—I look upon it as absolutely unimportant. They are as healthy as our own animals.

9731. You would not compel it in their case?—I do not think there is any necessity for it.

9732. You would, in fact, admit animals freely into this country from any country abroad, if you had a sufficient guarantee that the cattle were healthy?—Not from countries east of us.

9733. Not even if you had a guarantee that the cattle were healthy?—Certainly not, from the history of the past century.

9734. You stated that from 1801 to 1840 beef had declined in price?—It had, according to the old records we have of the contract prices of meat supplied to Greenwich Hospital.

9735. Do you know how much beef had declined

Professor
J. Garrod.
16 June
1873.

Professor
J. Ganges.
—
16 June
1873.

declined in price from 1800 to 1840?—The price had declined from 3*l.* 4*s.* 4*d.* in 1800 to 2*l.* 14*s.* in 1840, whereas the population had increased from 16,000,000 to over 27,000,000.

9736. Do you attribute the decline of prices to the fact that we did not import meat?—Certainly, to the great increase of cattle. Even now, our farmers would breed more stock than they do if we would only give them an immunity from disease.

9737. Did no other general commodities decline in price from 1800 to 1840?—There may be other commodities which have declined in price.

9738. Take corn, for example; was not corn during the war much higher in price than it was in later years?—Certainly it was, but we are not so great a corn-producing country as we are of cattle.

9739. May it not be possible that if there had been a decline in the price of meat from 1800 to 1840, that arose from some other cause than the fact that we excluded foreign cattle?—I do not think so. I do not know any other cause that would operate to produce it.

9740. I understood you to say that you would import cattle with the view of disinfecting them, and that by that means you would stamp out disease; and then did I understand you to say that, having stamped out disease, you would stop the import of cattle, or that you would stop the import of cattle before you stamped out disease?—I would slaughter all foreign fat cattle at once; to-morrow morning if I could.

9741. And only fat stock?—Only fat stock.

9742. What would you do with the others?—I would not let them come in at all, except under such special regulations that they could not come in to advantage. The farmers have given up taking them, because they had so much disease. I remember in Scotland, 10 or 15 years ago, before I had so much experience as I have now, I have seen a lot of Dutch cattle bought by farmers for the purpose of fattening, but the losses were so enormous that they stopped the trade.

9743. You say that farmers have given up buying those cattle?—Yes; I would undertake to say that it is possible for the dairy-men, under very strict regulations, by proper co-operation, to be supplied with a proper number of cows.

9744. The butchers buy the fat cattle that come in, do they not?—Yes.

9745. Nobody else buys any of the others; the farmers have given up buying; is it then true that we import nothing but that which comes to the butchers?—Mainly; we have given up importing anything except cows.

9746. What becomes of the cows?—They go to the large dairies, which become large centres of infection, from the weekly purchases and sales.

9747. But you consider that, if we stop the importation of cattle, we might get rid of disease by disinfecting?—We might get rid of feet and mouth disease, most assuredly.

9748. What would you disinfect?—I believe any proper disinfectant would do; sulphate of alumina would do very well, but I believe that the best would be chloralium. I have inoculated with the virus, after it has been mixed with the chloralium, and I have never produced the disease.

9749. Professor Simonds does not believe that we should get rid of the disease by stopping the

foreign import?—In 1864 Professor Simonds said that he thought it was in the air, and he has changed his opinion since.

9750. Do you think his recent opinion is worth more than his first opinion?—I should think so, and I should hope so.

9751. But there are other veterinary authorities who have been before the Committee, who seem to have expressed regret that the Government does not try experiments with regard to cattle disease, and endeavour, in fact, to throw light upon the cure of animals?—They have; and I think, myself, that considering the little which has been done for any case where veterinary surgeons have tried to throw light upon the subject, the amount of money which has been spent by the Veterinary Department during the last few years ought not to have been spent without giving us very different reports from those we have.

9752. You think that it is incumbent upon the Government to undertake the cure of cattle?—Certainly not; the circumstances are so peculiar with regard to these cattle plagues, that it is impossible, without a long purse, to investigate them. Without the cattle plague investigation it would not have been perhaps easy to have convinced our Legislature of what had to be done in 1866.

9753. Do you think that it is the duty of our Legislature to make discoveries in order to make it easier to cure cattle disease?—I think it is the province of the Government to do all they possibly can to aid the discovery of truth in matters of such importance to the nation.

9754. Does not it seem right that if that is to be undertaken at all, it should be undertaken by some voluntary association; I suppose, after the farmers, the landowners are perhaps the persons most interested in the question of cattle disease?—The meat consumers primarily.

9755. Are not the landed gentry interested in this question of cattle disease?—They are.

9756. Do not their rents considerably depend upon the health of cattle in the country?—Considerably.

9757. Do not you think that the landowners, and the farmers together, are a sufficiently wealthy and influential class, considering their great interest in the matter, to form an association to try those experiments?—I do not care which way the money comes, if you only get the money to do it. I do think that, where it is a question of saving millions of pounds' worth of animal food annually in this country, we ought to have had, with the enormous expenditure which we have made, very different results from those which are in our possession at the present moment.

9758. Mr. Peil.] You have been in Germany yourself, have you not?—I have.

9759. Do they continue to work oxen in the plough in Germany, as they used to do?—I have not been there for three or four years.

9760. But, when you were there, was it so?—They do, in many parts of Germany, especially over the southern parts.

9761. Were you making personal inquiries among the cattle owners in Germany?—Yes, I was.

9762. Were you making these inquiries with regard to the health of their stock?—I made inquiries with regard to the health of their stock.

9763. Did

Professor
J. Gossage.
—
15 June
1873.

9763. Did you not come across a number of cattle which were employed in ploughing?—Yes.

9764. Did you observe whether those cattle were less subject to foot and mouth disease than dairy cows?—I cannot say.

9765. You did not direct your inquiries in that direction?—I did not.

9766. What made me ask you the question was this: I keep working oxen myself which have been in the midst of cattle affected with foot and mouth disease, and they have never taken the disease?—Because you took good care that you did not let them come upon your farm.

9767. They are upon the same farm, and grazing there?—I cannot speak to that point.

9768. Mr. O'Connor.] If foot and mouth disease does not come from abroad, and you find it here, it appears that it must arise spontaneously, supposing that Professor Simonds's opinion, of 1864, is correct?—Supposing Professor Simonds's view of 1864 correct, then it would be inferred that it arose spontaneously.

9769. Mr. Dodson.] If the foreign trade were converted into a dead-meat trade, from what countries could we obtain dead meat?—From the various countries that we are getting our live cattle from now. If you can get the cattle 510 miles from Aberdeen, you can get the cattle from Jutland, or Rotterdam, or from Mayence, through Antwerp.

9770. Where do you assume that these cattle are to be slaughtered; suppose they came from Mayence?—At Antwerp.

9771. And those which come from Schleswig-Holstein?—Either Tonnung or Hamburg, or some local port.

9772. In your opinion, what distance could dead meat be brought in a fit state for consumption?—I have a great belief that it would not be at all a difficult problem, commercially, that for a distance of 14 or 15 days' voyage it could be brought safely; but certainly it could be brought within a five or six days' journey; and I may mention that that is mainly dependent upon the cheapening of the production of artificial cold; we have London supplied with fish from the Dogger Bank, and they must be brought dead; and what they do is to send out steamers to meet the fishermen, and each little steamer of 200 or 300 tons has 35 tons of ice upon it; that is the quantity they want for 100 tons of fish. They are obliged to break up this ice and mix it with the fish, and the quantity required to preserve the fish from the Dogger Bank has amounted to about half or a third of the 35 tons. The fish comes magnificently, but in the coldest weather, in winter, unless they use this ice, the fish in the centre of the mass begin to putrid; but if you can bring fish from the Dogger Bank, much more easily can you bring the large dry carcasses by constant draughts of cold air passing through them. Now I have been able to do the work of 50 tons of ice, with one ton of coal, so that I have only to carry one ton of imperishable coal to do the work of 50 tons of ice.

9773. Would you bring the meat in ice?—No, what you want is a draught of cold air of a temperature of 45 or 50 degrees.

9774. Would you use any ice?—No; you would use a machine which would produce artificial refrigeration.

9775. Are those machines in use?—Some of them; all the large brewers have been using them.

9776. Have they been used for bringing in the fish?—It so happens that the greatest importer of fish, Mr. Robert Hewitt, has come to me, asking me to co-operate with him, knowing from his experience that the thing can be done.

9777. The thing has not been done yet?—No; except experimentally.

9778. If the dead meat trade were established, that process, or some other process, would have to be adopted?—During the time of the cattle plague a great quantity of meat was brought here, and they had no such provision upon the steamers.

9779. Mr. Joseph Bright.] Have you read the Report of the Veterinary Department for 1871?—I have.

9780. Have you noticed the statement in the Veterinary Report of 1871, with regard to what you have said touching foreign cattle: "That during the year 1871 no case of foot and mouth disease or pleuro-pneumonia occurred in the parishes of either Harwich or Dovercourt. These parishes contain an area of upwards of 3,000 acres, within which area are many farms and dairies. At Harwich, more Dutch cattle have been landed since the restrictions were removed than at any other port in Great Britain except London. The cowkeepers at Harwich and Dovercourt are in the habit of filling up any vacancies in their dairies with Dutch cows, and there is scarcely a farmer in Dovercourt parish who has not taken Dutch cattle into keep. Notwithstanding this, these parishes enjoy an exceptional freedom from contagious or infectious diseases amongst their stock?"—I am told that we had at that time no returns of cases of foot and mouth disease or pleuro-pneumonia; that means, so far as returns by the Department goes, but my knowledge of the returns of the Department is such, that I certainly should not accept that as a proof that it is true that pleuro-pneumonia and foot and mouth disease did not occur near those places. It may be, but I am not prepared to accept it from the nature of the statements which I find in these Reports.

9781. Mr. Clare Read.] You stated very positively that in your opinion there was no case of foot and mouth disease in this country after the termination of the cattle plague?—I said, that with the dying out of the cattle plague, the foot and mouth disease died out.

9782. Did you consult the veterinary records at that period?—Of course I did, all the time.

9783. Was there in any of the publications of the Veterinary College any record of any case?—I have never seen any record or evidence of the disease at that time in the country.

9784. Do you think that if there had been any disease it would have found its way into some of those publications?—I should suppose so; they strive to draw attention to any outbreak of cattle plague or anything else which occurred in the country.

Mr. THOMAS DUCKHAM, called in; and Examined.

Mr. 9785. Mr. *Clare Read*] I BELIEVE you are
 T. Duckham. a Farmer in Herefordshire?—I am.
 9786. And you are also editor of the "Here-
 16 June ford Herd Book"?—I am.
 1873.

9787. And consequently you are brought into constant communication with the breeders of good stock throughout Herefordshire, and I suppose a good deal throughout England?—A great deal.

9788. You have prepared a statement of the returns of foot and mouth disease in Herefordshire for last year, have you not?—Yes, I have (producing the same. *The same was handed in, vide Appendix*).

9789. Does foot and mouth disease prevail in districts where there are no foreign stock or Irish cattle introduced?—I think it has not done so.

9790. Do you think that disease becomes less virulent and less general as it extends from the infected parts?—I do.

9791. Do you know anything about Cornwall?—I was in Cornwall about a month ago, and I had a good deal of conversation with several farmers there, and they told me that the disease was introduced by imported cattle from Plymouth several times during the past year into the county of Cornwall; but the local authorities adopted very stringent regulations, and did not allow animals to be removed until a certificate of health was obtained; the consequence was, that in each case the disease was stamped out; it was restricted to the spots where it broke out.

9792. Cornwall I suppose is not a country of much transit for stock?—No, there is certainly no through transit.

9793. They do not import much, I suppose?—They do import a good deal.

9794. Where from?—From Ireland, and I believe from Spain. I saw a lot of Spanish cattle being landed at Falmouth the other day.

9795. But the Spanish cattle are fat cattle, and do not go into the farming districts?—They do not.

9796. Do you consider foot and mouth disease of foreign origin?—I do.

9797. It was not mentioned in the old writers upon veterinary science, was it?—It is not mentioned in Youatt's "Treatise on Cattle," published under the superintendence of the Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge, in 1834.

9798. What does he say of pleuro-pneumonia?—He mentions it as a peculiar disease confined to a peculiar class of cattle in a small district of France.

9799. Showing that it was not prevalent here?—Showing that it was not prevalent here; he is very clear about it. Foot and mouth disease is not mentioned at all, and pleuro-pneumonia is mentioned in that way as breaking out in a certain district in France, called *Franché Comté*.

9800. Do you think that the present regulations have been carried out well throughout England?—No, I feel confident that they have not.

9801. Do you think that the multiplication of local authorities is a bad or a good thing?—I think it is a very bad thing. I occupy land in three different districts in which the regulations have been different.

9802. Different in the three different districts?

—Different in two out of the three, and very different.

9803. You think there should be one local authority for counties to embrace the boroughs?—I do.

9804. And that it should be more or less stringent?—I think it cannot be too stringent until we have the basis of the country in a healthy state.

9805. Do you think that the farmers would be willing to submit to more stringent regulations with regard to foot and mouth disease?—A large majority of them would, I think.

9806. Those in the breeding districts, more especially, would?—Most decidedly; and I asked the parties who informed me in Cornwall, whether they submitted cheerfully to it, and they said, "Oh, yes, they were very glad the regulations were stringent."

9807. Do you think there has been a change come over the spirit of the farmer's dream with regard to these diseases; that what at one time they considered to be inevitable they now regard as preventible?—I do.

9808. Was that lesson taught them by the cattle plague?—It was.

9809. What is your opinion with reference to this country being free from foot and mouth disease after the cattle plague?—I believe the country was free. There was not a single case in my county that I heard of for a considerable time.

9810. But you are not confined to your own county; you roam about a good deal; do you remember hearing of a case at all?—I do not. I think the country was thoroughly free from it.

9811. Have you any idea how the disease came in again?—I have not any further idea than what I have read upon the subject. I have read of the introduction of the disease from the importation of foreign cattle, and also from Irish cattle, and I have also read in the Veterinary Report of the Privy Council, that foot and mouth disease was sent to Ireland from England in 1869, after the country was free.

9812. But you have no direct knowledge yourself of any fresh importation of the disease, except what you have read or heard of?—No.

9813. What has been the effect of the frequent outbreaks of foot and mouth disease, and other foreign disorders, upon the breeders of cattle?—It has had a most serious effect; a great many have given up, and others say that if they again suffer in the manner they have recently, they will certainly discontinue breeding; many of our most valuable herds have been very seriously affected.

9814. Foot and mouth disease, I suppose, is very much more virulent and destructive among breeding stock than among store or fat cattle?—Yes. This is a bundle of schedules (producing the same) from one of our parishes, and that is a return from one of our principal breeders (producing the same), in which he shows that he lost 19 calves out of 29 last year, from foot and mouth disease.

9815. What is the effect of foot and mouth disease among milking stock?—It is most serious. I should have said that the cure of these calves cost the man 390 guineas.

9816. How

9816. How came this great mortality amongst the calves, do you think; is it not very exceptional to lose 19 out of 29; of course the man took all the care he possibly could of them?—No doubt he did; in some cases the mortality was not so great, but the mortality was very great in others, as you will see from the returns here. I think we lost upwards of 1,500; 1,596 calves died.

9817. Mr. Dent.] The calves in Herefordshire usually run with the cows and heifers, do they not?—Yes, they do.

9818. Snackling?—Yes.

9819. Mr. Clare Read.] They are therefore kept in the most natural state?—Yes.

9820. The snacking of diseased milk is, I suppose, the cause of their death?—It is; but many of them were not so lost; after the disease broke out the farmers removed the calves from the cows, and did not allow them to have the milk; yet the seeds of the disease appeared, and hundreds of the animals died.

9821. Notwithstanding that they had been prematurely weaned?—Notwithstanding that they had been prematurely weaned.

9822. Can you give the Committee any instance of the exportation of this disease to the Colonies from your own experience?—Yes; in December 1871 I sent four valuable animals, three heifers and a bull, to Australia; they were shipped in the "Winifred," and every precaution was taken to guard them from disease, but when they were placed on board ship some sheep from the Metropolitan market were placed beside them.

9823. For the purpose of supplying the crew with food?—Yes; then after the ship sailed, the disease broke out, and three out of the four died, and the fourth recovered; they all had the disease; and upon the arrival of the ship it caused such a panic amongst the stockowners at Sydney, that they subscribed and paid 200 l. for the heifer that survived and sent her six miles out to sea, killed her and threw her overboard, and from that great loss has arisen, the prohibitory law now in force there prohibiting any cattle being imported into the colony from England for fear of disease.

9824. Does that rule now exist?—It came into operation upon the 10th of this month.

9825. They are so afraid of foot and mouth disease?—They are.

9826. And also of pleuro-pneumonia?—They have suffered severely from pleuro-pneumonia; that disease was taken there by a cow from England.

9827. They had had foot and mouth disease upon one occasion, had they not, in some of the Australian colonies?—I believe there was one case which broke out in Victoria, but I had nothing to do with that.

9828. What would you do with regard to improving the inspection, and the disinfecting of railway trucks?—I think that there should be a Government inspector to look after it.

9829. One or two Government inspectors, do you mean, for the whole of the kingdom?—Yes, to go through the different parts of the kingdom, to see that the trucks were kept in a proper state, and to punish the authorities, if they were not in a proper state.

9830. Do you think that the same thing should apply to fairs and markets; that there should be some Government inspector to see that the local authorities were attending to their duties?—I think it would be very desirable.

0.33.

9831. Do you think, as a rule, that markets and fairs are well disinfected and properly cleansed?—I know that our markets have never been disinfected in our county; they are properly cleansed, but not disinfected. A veterinary inspector is regularly appointed to inspect the animals brought there; but it constantly happens that he has to turn them out of the market for having the disease; this has been done after they have been brought in direct contact with healthy animals, and, as a matter of course, the market has been a very fruitful source of spreading the disease.

9832. Have you had much experience in the county of Herefordshire of pleuro-pneumonia; has your county suffered from it?—Not since the cattle plague; I have not heard of a single case. The regulations for the cattle plague completely cleared us of pleuro-pneumonia and foot and mouth disease; and I have not heard of pleuro-pneumonia since then. There have been some cases which have been suspected to be cases of pleuro-pneumonia, but I failed to know that they were so; but last week I heard of a case of pleuro-pneumonia, and the Herefordshire veterinary inspector last Saturday told me that he should go up and inspect it; I cannot say whether he has or not.

9833. It is not confirmed?—It is not confirmed.

9834. What is your idea of the proper treatment of all cases of diseased cattle in pleuro-pneumonia?—I think that isolation is highly essential.

9835. I am talking of the cattle themselves which are the subjects of disease, would you slaughter them; if a case of pleuro-pneumonia broke out in any herd, would you think it best for all parties that that animal should be slaughtered and compensated for?—Most decidedly.

9836. What would you do with the rest of the herd with which it had been associated?—I would isolate them.

9837. Do you think the period of 28 days is sufficiently long?—As I have not had sufficient experience in pleuro-pneumonia, I cannot give such an opinion upon that as I can upon the other diseases.

9838. But in stating your opinion that all cattle affected with pleuro-pneumonia ought to be killed, and the rest isolated; are you giving your own opinion only, or are you giving the opinion of those farmers generally with whom you are in contact?—I am speaking of the opinion of myself and others, and although I have had no experience in the disease personally, I have seen cases, and I feel that the first loss is by far the best.

9839. Although you have succeeded hitherto in keeping out pleuro-pneumonia, you have not succeeded in stopping foot and mouth disease?—No, unfortunately for the county, the loss was most serious.

9840. How did the disease come into Herefordshire?—By cattle and calves principally from the Bristol market last spring. I believe there were a few isolated cases in different spots in the county previous to the introduction of those calves from the Bristol market, there were two or three truck loads of them, and they were sold in different parts of the county, and wherever those calves were sold, almost in every case the disease broke out, and not only did the calves themselves die, but those that were in the herd; the disease spread like wildfire all round.

9841. I believe

Mr.
T. Doolan.
—
16 June
1874.

Mr. T. Daubens. 9841. I believe that your county was not reported to be suffering much more from foot and mouth disease in 1873 than other counties?—In 1871 I believe we were reported to be about three-fourths per cent. below the average of the kingdom. I have the Veterinary Report for 1872, which is here, and our county is not mentioned at all as being affected, although there are several counties named as being seriously affected.

9842. You do not think your county, from that report, would be worse than other counties?—Certainly not.

9843. Probably not worse than the average?—No. As a member of the Council of the Smithfield Club, I was present last autumn when the propriety of having animals exhibited in London which had previously been at Birmingham was discussed. A question arose with reference to the general state of the country respecting foot and mouth disease, and everyone around the table said it was the exception to know where the disease had not been, and gentlemen from several different counties were there. I have made a comparison of the losses, comparing Herefordshire, taking that as the average with the rest of the kingdom.

9844. You have handed in a Paper which gives a statement of the number of cattle, sheep, and pigs that were attacked with foot and mouth disease last year?—I have.

9845. How did you obtain that?—By circular letters sent to the chairmen of each of the highway boards in the county, and then subsequent letters to the waywardens in the county, asking them to submit the different schedules (one of which I have handed in) to every stockowner in the various parishes and chapelrys throughout the county.

9846. Will you hand in a copy of that circular?—I will. (*The same was handed in, vide Appendix.*)

9847. The result was, that you did not get all the returns?—No; there were nearly 1,400.

9848. Do they represent the great majority of the returns?—The great majority, there can be no question; but there were several places which suffered severely, from which I have no return.

9849. The returns contain these numbers, 34,312 cattle, 117,789 sheep, and 8,230 pigs?—Yes.

9850. You have given a detailed statement, and put a value upon those that were attacked, and those that died?—I have.

9851. And you make the whole loss to be 155,236 l.?—I do. The value was placed by the committee, which consisted of three veterinary inspectors, and also some farmers and some landed proprietors. Mr. Rankin is a landed proprietor himself; he was chairman of the chamber of agriculture last year.

9852. I will not question you with regard to the different prices; I suppose you would consider Herefordshire to contain some of the best stock in the kingdom?—Yes, I do.

9853. And that the Herefordshire stock, taken in comparison with the common stock of England, would be of superior value?—It would.

9854. And those figures are based principally upon that?—They are based upon that.

9855. Therefore, they would perhaps be rather high for the whole of England?—Yes; but to place opposite to that, we know that the returns

for Herefordshire by no means show the whole number affected, so that there is a sufficient margin left to cover the difference in value between the stock of my county and the stock of others.

9856. Then applying your estimate of the loss in Herefordshire to the whole of Great Britain and Ireland, what do you make the grand total?—Applying my estimate of the loss in Herefordshire to the whole of Great Britain and Ireland, I make the grand total of 19,510,707 l.

9857. And for Great Britain only?—For Great Britain only, I make the total 13,071,392 l.

9858. What sort of regulations have you had in force throughout the county of Hereford, with regard to foot and mouth disease, first of all; of course, you have not been permitted to move diseased animals upon the roads?—No, but there was very little care taken about it; in fact, there was not anything done until I talked strongly about it, and then the local authorities took more interest in the matter.

9859. You do not think that your county can be considered a model county then with regard to the manner in which they have carried out the provisions of the Act?—No, certainly not.

9860. When you said there were so many different local authorities; did you mean to imply the different boroughs or the different petty sessional divisions within your county?—The different petty sessional divisions within the county.

9861. You have not a uniform action?—We have not.

9862. We have had it stated that, in spite of the best regulations, the disease continued to spread; you would say that in the absence of regulations the disease continued to spread in your county?—Yes, it did.

9863. Mr. Dent. According to your account, 50 per cent. of the animals in Herefordshire were attacked with the disease?—They were, according to the returns compiled from the statistics.

9864. Thirty-four thousand out of 68,123?—Yes.

9865. You do not import many cattle into Herefordshire, do you?—We import many more now than we used to do. The effect of the disease has had such a depressing influence upon the county that we are not breeding so many now as we used to do.

9866. When did the change take place when you became more of a feeding county than a breeding county?—So many animals had been lost that there were some animals imported to replace them in the herds.

9867. But you were in Herefordshire an exporting county, were you not?—Yes, and it used to be quite an exception to see any other animal there than a red with white-faced Hereford.

9868. You exported to the midland consuming towns, and you also exported a very great number of bullocks for the grazing counties to fatten off?—Yes.

9869. Is that system now altering in Herefordshire, and are you becoming an importing county?—There are at least ten to one of Irish cattle now brought into our county compared to what there used to be. You see them in the market every market-day; therefore I think the thing speaks for itself. Of course they all meet a market, or they would not come there.

9870. Does not that seem to show that feeding cattle, in consequence of the great price of beef, and

and getting very good cattle from Ireland, has not better than breeding cattle of late years?—No, I do not think so. I think they would rather feed their own, inasmuch as they have much more aptitude to fatten, if they could ensure getting them.

9871. Then you think that Herefordshire is losing its character as an exporting county, and that it is becoming more an importing county?—It has to a small extent; we are continually having many more cattle coming from Ireland now, and they would not come unless they met a market.

9872. And you find that these Irish cattle are brought to feed, and to go out from Herefordshire fat?—Herefordshire is not a good feeding county; it is a good healthy breeding county; it is proverbial for that; I do not think there is a healthier county in England for stock than in Herefordshire.

9873. Will you explain about the Irish cattle which come into your county: what aged animals are they which come into your county?—They are yearlings, not old cattle.

9874. Are they grazed for a year or so, and then sold out to the Midland graziers, or do they go to be finished by some others?—Very frequently that is so.

9875. I see by your Return that one in four of the calves appear to have died of disease?—Yes, that is so.

9876. The disease must have been very virulent?—It was.

9877. In your county, all restrictions were almost entirely neglected, were they not?—No, not in some districts; I have the restrictions from Hereford; the Hereford local authorities had very good restrictions, but there was no one to see them carried out.

9878. Each petty sessional division had a different system, had it not?—Yes.

9879. Mr. Bighy, the other day, told the Committee that in Cheshire it was a system of blockade; that the animals were not allowed to be removed from a farm, and that every farm upon which animals were attacked was declared an infected district, and in spite of that, the disease was very virulent; now, I want to know in what different circumstances you were in Herefordshire?—In the early part of the disease in 1871, there was nothing done; there was very little notice taken of it, but in the petty sessional division of Hereford they adopted these regulations: "No person having foot and mouth disease on his farm or premises shall move therefrom, or along, or across, any highway thereon, any animal which has been within a quarter of a mile in a straight line from any animal affected with that disease, within the period of 21 days previous to the time of removal; nor without an order from the inspector, authorising such removal. The inspector shall not grant any order for removal until he shall have inspected the cattle proposed to be removed, and shall have obtained the authority of the Committee to the granting of such order."

9880. Those are about as stringent regulations as any that have been passed, I think?—Yes, those were stringent, and they were brought about in consequence of some very strong observations which I made myself.

9881. When were these regulations put in force?—These regulations were put in force in the Hereford district in the latter end of 1871, 1872.

but the disease had been prevalent in the county for a long time.

9882. It is not a fair test of restrictions in so limited an area as a petty sessional division; you could hardly tell the operation of them there, could you?—They were very carefully carried out; it was nothing unusual to see cattle going along the road with disease upon them.

9883. Mr. Clere Read.] Notwithstanding these regulations?—Notwithstanding those regulations.

9884. Mr. Dent.] Then in spite of the loss which appeared to be so grievous, it does not appear that the farmers themselves were much inclined to take any precautions?—Some of them did; some of them were careless; it was the dealers who would be driving cattle along the road with disease.

9885. Are many of the farmers in your neighbourhood dealers also?—No.

9886. Your farmers are rather small farmers, are they not?—Compared with those in some other counties they are small.

9887. Do you think the farmers themselves are inclined to take any precaution against the introduction of disease by isolating new purchases?—Yes, I think so; but I think they do not take so much precaution as they ought to do; they are more alive to the necessity of it now, after the lesson they have had.

9888. What is the state of disease in Herefordshire at this present moment?—We are almost free.

9889. In spite of having done nothing?—But something has been done lately.

9890. Have you put strong regulations in force over the whole county?—There were much stronger regulations after the middle of last year.

9891. Should you be surprised to hear that in my district, where we have put no regulations in force beyond the 57th clause, we were entirely free last week, although we are a very large importing county?—I am not surprised at it, because I think that the disease is less virulent at this time of year.

9892. But we are in a very different position from what we were at the corresponding periods in the spring of 1872 or 1871; the cases were numbered by hundreds, but from your great practical experience, have you not noticed that the disease ebbs and flows; that you have a year or two of great virulence, and then it seems to die away almost of its own accord?—Yes, that I have noticed; and I feel very strongly convinced in my own mind, that it would die away altogether if it were not for fresh seeds of disease being brought in.

9893. You think that fresh seeds of the disease are brought in from the foreign importation?—I do; and from Ireland.

9894. Ireland is not a country which imports foreign stock; the disease must be either indigenous in Ireland, or it must go from England to Ireland, because they do not get foreign stock?—My belief is that it would be one of the greatest blessings you could give to Ireland to adopt the same good regulations for Ireland that I hope you will have for England; I think that that would enhance the value of cattle in Ireland from 10 to 15 per cent.

9895. From the evidence we have had given in this room, it would appear that the Irish regulations, if carried out, are even better than the English

Mr.
T. Duckham.
18 June
1873.

Mr.
T. Dackham.
16 Jan.
1873.

English ones; that being under one central authority, they ought to be more effectual than the English ones; you would not impose any further restrictions upon Irish cattle than you would upon English ones, would you?—I think not.

9896. If you were devising a new Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act, what would you do first of all with regard to the foreign trade; would you prohibit the foreign trade entirely?—I would, entirely; that is to say, I would have water-side markets at the port of debarkation for foreign stock with abattoirs attached.

9897. And you would have them all slaughtered?—I would have them all slaughtered, and I think by such a regulation you would make free trade in cattle a great blessing to the kingdom, and instead of that it has hitherto been a curse.

9898. Have you had any practical experience of the foreign trade?—I have not, except that I know disease is continually being brought in.

9899. Have you any reason to know, from your personal experience, that disease at the present time, under the regulations of the present Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act, is brought in by foreign stock?—Only from reading the Veterinary Report of the Privy Council.

9900. The animals are slaughtered at the port, if they are found affected, are they not?—That is so.

9901. But you have no means of tracing, since the Act of 1869 came into force, any outbreak of pleuro-pneumonia, or foot and mouth disease, in consequence of the importation of foreign stock?—I have not, because I am many miles from any port.

9902. At this present moment diseased animals and all the cargo in which they are found are slaughtered at the water-side markets, and that apparently should be a check upon the disease?—But the question is, are the vessels that bring them over thoroughly disinfected afterwards. Some vessels return and fetch another cargo and land them, and if they happen to pass the vigilant eye of the inspector, we have them upon our markets by the side of our own stock.

9903. The rules for disinfection, provided they are carried out, are, I believe, stringent ones with regard to ships, just as they are with regard to railway trucks; but you are not satisfied that they are carried out?—That is what I mean.

9904. You would altogether exclude the importation of any store cattle?—My opinion is, that the supply of store cattle from foreign countries would never be very great, and I think the risk is too great to run for the very little value which is to be attached to the foreign store stock.

9905. Having put the foreign trade under those regulations, would you slaughter in all cases of pleuro-pneumonia which occurred within the country?—I should certainly slaughter all the animals which were affected with pleuro-pneumonia.

9906. Then what would you do with respect to foot and mouth disease?—I should isolate the animals affected with that disease, and prohibit their removal.

9907. And you would not allow them to be removed without a certificate of health?—That is so, and they should be thoroughly disinfected afterwards. I had the disease in my herd as nearly as possible this time twelve months, and I made what I call my hospital meadow, and I put a horse there, and removed all the diseased cattle

into this meadow, and as fast as any animal sickened I placed it down there; I kept that one meadow as a hospital, and by that means I limited the disease to less than half my herd.

9908. It is rather curious to see the percentage of the mortality of animals affected; I see it is something like 1 in 4 in calves, 1 in 35 in cows, and 1 in 120 of the fat beasts?—Yes, something like that.

9909. Do you not put down a large proportion of loss for store cattle, namely, 21 upon store animals, attacked and recovered?—No, I am quite satisfied that they do not make the same class of animal after they have recovered; I have heifers which were attacked last year, and which have now recovered; but the horn is now coming off the hoofs.

9910. You would not agree in the theory that they fatten all the faster after they have recovered?—No, I believe the people are very much deceived with reference to that.

9911. Have you heard that said?—I have, but I think it is a misconception arising in this way. We are accustomed, when the animal is taken ill, to see the animal in a very depressed state and looking very bad; it has not had time to lose the flesh upon it, it has suddenly thrown down; but as soon as an animal begins to recover he fills out and looks almost as well as he did before. I have seen several herds which had the disease last summer looking very badly last winter.

9912. Did the disease remain a very long time with you; did it last in the individual animals a very long time?—The virulence of the disease did not last above nine or ten days, but they were sick for some time, and the effect of the disease was the horn coming off their hoofs, consequent lameness, tumours, and barrenness in the cows.

9913. Mr. Berkeley.] You want to have a Government inspector of railway trucks?—I do.

9914. If you had an inspector specially appointed for your county, is there anything to prevent him from looking after the cleaning of railway trucks?—No, but I think that one man could do more than one county ordinarily.

9915. Would you approve of one inspector being specially appointed to see after the carrying out of the cattle disease regulations in one county?—Yes, unless it was a very small county.

9916. If you had such an inspector to be responsible for carrying out the Act generally in that county, would he be able to look after the railway trucks?—No; I think the man who looked after the railway trucks should be quite an independent man altogether; upon the same principle that we used to have men to look after the mail coaches at one time, and if he found that the railway companies were neglecting their trucks and summoned them, they would very soon become alive to that, and remedy it.

9917. Is there anything to prevent the local inspector, in his county, from doing so now?—No.

9918. Would he be able to undertake the duty?—Yes.

9919. He has an opportunity of seeing the trucks in his county, and seeing them standing at the station, and seeing whether they are in a good state or not?—Yes, he has.

9920. Are you satisfied with the present state of the constitution of the local authorities?—I am not.

9921. What

9921. What change would you wish?—I think it would be very desirable to have one county board.

9922. Consisting of what?—Farmers and landed proprietors, and that they should appoint their veterinary inspector.

9923. Then would you have a board formed by election?—Yes, I think the court of quarter sessions could do that; unless we had a county financial board, and then it certainly should be the county financial board.

9924. I presume you would think that the court of quarter sessions should nominate proprietors and tenants?—I think that would be quite sufficient; I do not see any necessity for election by the ratepayers of a board of that kind.

9925. Do you think that the farmers would have any more confidence in a board if the farmers had the election of part of them?—I do not think that they would.

9926. Would you wish to see the borough and county authorities united?—Yes, I think it should be one board for the whole.

9927. To include all the boroughs within the county?—Yes, and have one general system. For my own part, I am very strongly against permissive laws; I should like to see one general law.

9928. Is there any point in carrying out the

Cattle Diseases Act in which the interests of counties and boroughs are necessarily at variance?—No, not in my opinion; for I think it is quite as much a consumer's question as it is a producer's; I think the consumer is very deeply interested in the health of the herds and flocks throughout the kingdom.

9929. You would recommend the appointment of an inspector for each county to carry out the whole of the provisions of the Act, whatever they might be?—Yes.

9930. And the formation of a county board to exercise a general control over cattle diseases, and the carrying out of the provisions of the Cattle Diseases Act within that county?—Yes.

9931. Mr. *Cure Reed*.] Have you had many cases of abortion from foot and mouth disease?—Yes, and a great many cases of barrenness; some of my best cows have gone off barren.

9932. Did they lose the season for calving?—Yes, I have only one calf, and I should have had a lot four or five months ago.

9933. You have only one calf now, you say?—Yes, I have only one calf now, and that came on Saturday, and I ought to have had 15 or 16.

9934. Mr. *Dent*.] Have you any farmers put upon your sub-committees by your court of quarter sessions?—Yes, there are one or two in each petty sessional division.

Mr.
T. Deekham.
16 June
1871.

Thursday, 19th June 1873.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mr. James Barclay.
Mr. Jacob-Bright.
Mr. Callan.
Mr. Cawley.
Mr. Clay.
Mr. Dent.
Mr. Dodson.

Mr. William Johnston.
Mr. Kavanagh.
Mr. Moncell.
Mr. O'Connor.
Mr. Pell.
Mr. Clare Read.
Mr. Ridley.

CLARE SEWELL READ, Esq., IN THE CHAIR.

Mr. JAMES ODAMS, called in; and Examined.

Mr.
J. Odams.
19 June
1873.

9935. *Chairman.*] You have had some considerable experience in the foreign cattle trade, I believe?—In the landing of foreign cattle.

9936. Would you tell the Committee in what special way you became interested in that matter?—My first appearance with regard to this cattle question was in the year 1866. I was in the Metropolitan Market, and I there saw an animal of which Professor Simonds had been making a *post mortem* examination in the presence of several scientific men. I was so forcibly struck with the malignant nature of the disease, that I called upon Professor Simonds the following morning, telling him that I had at the water side a number of sheds which were unoccupied in consequence of the American War, and that I should be very happy to allow the Government the use of them, for isolation, for a month or two months, during the time the calamity was existing.

9937. You are now speaking of cattle plague, I believe?—I am now speaking of cattle plague in the year 1866; that was my first introduction into the matter, and Professor Simonds told me that I must see some influential members of the Government and bring the matter before them. I accordingly saw Mr. Ward Hunt, and he with Lord Buryleigh, the present Marquis of Exeter, came down and looked at the sheds; then they brought the matter before Parliament. Some discussion took place upon it, and one honourable gentleman said that he had met with some old woman on the banks of the Thames who had some petroleum barrels to sell, and therefore they put the matter aside. At that time I addressed a letter to our agricultural papers, stating that I thought that all animals coming in the holds of vessels should be slaughtered when landed. At that time also I was possessed of a small piece of land, about 10 acres, which I thought exceedingly well adapted for these foreign cattle coming into the port of London to be slaughtered at. It was the nearest piece of land available at that time, and I accordingly wrote a pamphlet upon the subject. This question has been before the public since that time, and, in advocating this course, I was in favour of a foreign market on the banks of the Thames. The Corporation, in

their wisdom, thought fit to take it to another site, and, as you are aware, they have erected another market there, although I think there can be little doubt but that they have gone upon the wrong side for the sake of the public, still there is a market, and it is not used to an extent which is remunerating them.

9938. Have you now any pecuniary interest in that land or in the trade at all?—None whatever in anything connected with cattle; excepting as a small producer occupying a small farm, I have no interest whatever in the cattle trade.

9939. You occupy a small farm in Hertfordshire, and beyond that you have no interest whatever?—Beyond that I have no pecuniary interest whatever; the land is sold; I have no petroleum barrels, neither have I any blood, which some of those gentlemen said I wanted. I have no particular calling for anything.

9940. Can you tell the Committee at what time this wharf of yours was used for the purpose of a cattle market; was it first used as a place for landing cattle?—It was, I think, for a short time used for the landing of cattle from scheduled countries. After that, when pleuropneumonia broke out, the Government issued orders that those animals which were found to be affected upon arrival should be slaughtered. They telegraphed to me from the Privy Council Office requesting me to provide for a certain number of animals. I went up, and I think it was Mr. Eardley Wilmot who was then at the office, told me that he would send Professor Simonds in the morning to let me know the requirements. I saw Professor Simonds the following morning, and he said, "We shall require slaughterhouses for at least 300 bullocks, and 1,000 sheep; how long will you be before you can get them ready?" My reply was, "A fortnight." And I believe they were ready within the fortnight. During that fortnight the French war broke out, at all events it was about that time, and a very large quantity of animals, in addition to the usual importation, were sent to this country. Slaughter room for 300 was so insufficient for the enormous importation that some little confusion was the result, and I think I saw Mr. Forster,

Forster, at all events I saw some one connected with the Privy Council, whether it was Professor Simonds or Mr. Forster I cannot at this moment remember, but Professor Simonds told me of the restrictions. I said, "I must lay out a large sum of money; is this thing to remain or not?" He said, "I can give you no guarantee, Mr. Adams, but I may tell you that these restrictions rather than he relaxed will be more severe." I went on and provided accommodation, till at least there was room for 700 bullocks a day, and about 4,000 sheep, to be slaughtered. I spent in round numbers about 12,000 *l.* in erecting temporary slaughterhouses, and I may say a market.

9341. Mr. Keworth.] Where was this?—Upon the other side of the water, just below the entrance to the Victoria Docks.

9342. *Adams.*] How long was the market held at this wharf of yours?—From the commencement I think it was about 11 months; I am speaking from memory.

9343. And then it was suddenly abandoned?—It was very suddenly abandoned; I think so suddenly that the treatment which I received at the hands of the Government was not such as any Government ought to apply to any private individual after what I had done for them.

9344. The Government came to you in their emergency, did they not?—Yes, they telegraphed to me to provide accommodation, and I went on expending money night and day, Sundays and all, to meet the requirements of this trade, and they abandoned it without the slightest intimation, although I was at the Council Office upon the very day when the orders for the "Gazette" must have been issued. I had a letter in my hand which I took there for Mr. Forster, stating that I had then made arrangements for the conveyance of dead meat into the manufacturing districts at a less cost than they could convey live animals. I went to the Privy Council Office about one o'clock on a Friday, and when I returned into the City, I met Mr. Gebhardt, the salesman, who told me that the German cattle would all be free upon the Monday, and Saturday's "Gazette" brought out an Order to that effect, those gentlemen leaving me with provender for 50,000 animals upon my hands, without the slightest intimation. I was then landing 15,000 animals per week, about 12,000 sheep and 3,000 bullocks.

9345. What became of those sheep and cattle. Did any of them continue to come to the wharf?—Not one of them; they were all landed upon the Monday. Some of the men who had their slaughterhouses there sent a few, but very few; the whole place was, I may say, annihilated.

9346. The first intimation you had of the relaxation of the Order which abandoned your market was from Mr. Gebhardt, who was a German salesman?—That is so.

9347. How long previously to this was it that you had spent any amount of money?—The two last slaughterhouses I think had not been used a week, but I should tell you that I saw Mr. Forster a fortnight before this Order was out, and I told him that I had had applications from Mr. Brewster, and several large carcass butchers, that they required more accommodation, and I said to Mr. Forster, "Shall I be justified, sir, in laying out more money?" He certainly did not give me any encouragement, but I said, "What

am I to do; here are these animals coming, they must be slaughtered; they say that the trade is ruined," and he said, when I left him, "You must do as you think proper." I saw Mr. Brewster afterwards, and I consented to lay out a further sum of between 600 *l.* and 700 *l.* It was for additional sheep slaughterhouses.

9348. What sort of condition was the market in during the latter days of it?—In a very excellent working condition; there were no complaints; I had nothing whatever brought before me in the shape of complaint from any parties. There were covered sheds for bullocks; there were large racks and troughs put into all the places where they were kept in the covered sheds, and I think I may say that the general body of the trade were very well satisfied.

9349. Then for a certain portion of those 11 months were all the foreign sheep and cattle confined to this market, or did some of them go away?—I am not able to tell you whether the whole of them came or not, but there must have been the great bulk of them come. I was doubting whether Holland was at that time an unscheduled country or not.

9350. Did Spain and Portugal come to you?—Spain was not a scheduled country, but we had a great many Spanish bullocks.

9351. But all the German and all the French cattle imported into the port of London certainly came to your market?—The French cattle were prohibited from coming after a very short time. We had only four weeks of that trade in consequence of there being a disturbance upon the other side; the French public would not allow the animals to be sent across.

9352. There was no restriction on account of the cattle plague existing in France, was there?—No.

9353. You say that the market was in very good order, and that you had no complaints?—We had no complaint whatever.

9354. In what way was the great bulk of the meat removed from your market?—The great bulk of the meat was removed in vans to the Smithfield Market.

9355. Can you give the Committee any particulars with reference to the transport of dead meat direct from your market into the manufacturing districts?—Yes, I can.

9356. Will you be kind enough to do that?—During the time the market was at my wharf, there were several buyers who used to come up from Manchester, Birmingham, Wolverhampton, I believe, and from other places, who bought somewhat largely for the manufacturing districts. One man from Manchester on certain occasions, when the trade suited him, bought probably 2,000 or 3,000. I have sent away as many as from 600 to 700 a day by railway direct from the wharf into the manufacturing districts, and upon inquiring the freight, I found that the carcasses of those animals, with all that pertained to them, all the edible offal with the skins, were conveyed to Manchester at something like 4 *d.* per head less than they would have gone in the shape of live animals.

9357. Could you give the Committee any idea of the cost of conveying a dead sheep with its offal to Manchester, or to the Black Country?—Yes; at that time (I do not know whether there are any fresh regulations now or not) a seven stone sheep would go for 1 *s.* or 1 *s.* 2 *d.*

9358. That would be less than the carriage of the

Mr.
J. Adams.
29 June
1873.

Mr.
J. Odgers.
23 June
1873.

the live animal?—It would be less than the carriage of the live animal from our metropolitan market to Manchester; that was the freight which they told me they paid; that was Mr. Brown, who is now dead; and a Birmingham butcher, whose name I forget, told me that the freight was less to Birmingham than he could get them for from the Metropolitan Market by rail alive.

9949. During what part of the year was this?—It was through the summer, because I remember well our boring holes through the tops of those covered carriages to get additional ventilation beyond what we had, to put the iron across them to hang the sheep up by; it must have been during the hot weather; it was during the summer months that the German cattle were coming.

9950. Did you send beef as well as mutton?—I think there was very little beef sent; I do not remember carcasses of beef going; those men were sheep butchers, and I think they confined themselves more particularly to that line.

9951. Did you hang the carcasses of sheep up in the vans, or were they packed?—They were hung up upon the shambles.

9952. And you are quite positive that they took the edible offal away?—Yes, I saw it put in the trucks every day.

9953. It went where?—A large quantity of it went to Birmingham, and a large quantity to Manchester, and I believe some went to Bradford.

9954. Then the opinion which has been stated that if this dead-meat market for foreign cattle was established at Deptford, it would deprive the inhabitants of the east end of London of their offal, is all moonshine?—Quite so.

9955. Because here you took it from your wharf?—Yes, and sent it down to the manufacturing districts in the same truck with those animals which were suspended from the rails.

9956. How was this offal taken; was it put in baskets or put upon the floor?—It was put upon the floor.

9957. And it was not hung up?—No, it was not hung up; they generally pack their offal in casks in sending offal from the Continent, or in sending it from Harwich.

9958. Have you ever seen any offal coming from the Continent?—No, I have not.

9959. But you know that it does come?—Yes, I know that it does come, but not in large quantities, I think.

9960. But for the purpose of being eaten?—I should think so. I know that from Harwich, when they have been slaughtering there largely, it has come up in casks.

9961. Did you ever hear any of those butchers complain that they had lost the offal, owing to the long transit?—I have heard of a great many complaints from butchers.

9962. But with regard to any of those butchers who took offal from your market to the manufacturing districts, did you ever hear any complaints of their having lost the offal?—Not a word, nor did I ever hear of the meat arriving in bad order.

9963. Although you are quite sure that it was carried on through the summer?—It was through the summer months.

9964. Have you any opinion to offer with reference to the introduction of pleuro-pneumonia into this country by means of Dutch cattle?—I think we have had a very great deal of pleuro-

pneumonia introduced into this country by means of Dutch cattle.

9975. Do you mean cows and store stock?—Both cows and store stock. With regard to cows it is a known fact that a very large quantity of them are now being weekly imported into this country with the germs of pleuro-pneumonia in them. The Jews, who are large consumers of foreign meat, have a great aversion to buying Dutch cows from the fact that some portion of the inside frequently adheres to the carcass. They adopt the same salutary measures when they send their meat inspector, who is authorized by the Chief Rabbi to prevent any animal which had anything adhering to its carcass, from being consumed by their community; they will not allow them to consume it.

9976. If there is any adhesion of the lungs to the carcass?—Yes, if there is any adhesion of the lungs to the carcass.

9977. Do you happen to know anyone who has suffered at all, in your locality, from the introduction of Dutch cattle to his farm?—I knew several individuals, but I do not know that I should be discreet in mentioning their names, because, after the Report which has emanated from the Veterinary Department of the Privy Council, stating that no direct information has come to them of pleuro-pneumonia being sent from Holland, I perhaps might be thought somewhat presumptuous in mentioning the names of people, and I do not think, as they perhaps have evaded to some extent the giving of notice to the inspector, that I should be right in doing so; but I know that I could mention at this moment half a dozen farmers, amongst my own connections, who have suffered, and suffered severely, from pleuro-pneumonia this last year, entirely owing to Dutch cattle coming from Harwich.

9978. You mean to say that they bought the cattle at Harwich?—They bought the cattle at Harwich, and they took them to their homes, and they lost considerably by them.

9979. Is it not the fact that, as a rule, the Dutch cattle are very often subject to pleuro-pneumonia?—There is no question about it. I believe, from my own observation, that this pleuro-pneumonia is brought on from the climate and constant exposure to the moist earth which they are obliged to graze upon in Holland, and that the germs of pleuro-pneumonia are embedded in calf or more of their constitutions.

9980. Do you think those animals came over here with the germs of pleuro-pneumonia in them?—I think they do, and I think that we adopt the most developing causes for the spread of that disease when they come in the holds of those vessels, subject as they are to the extremes of heat and cold.

9981. Of course those cattle are so subject to foot and mouth disease as any others?—Yes, it is fever brought on by privation; nothing more or less.

9982. Have you seen any foot and mouth disease amongst Spanish cattle?—I have very badly. I remember a cargo coming to my wharf very well. I forget the name of the vessel, but she had 100 bullocks on board. Mr. Gibbard called upon me to say that he had 100 coming from Vigo, and he had a telegram stating that some of them had the foot and mouth disease.

9983. You are confident that Mr. Gibbard himself had had a telegram to this effect from Spain?—He told me so.

9884. So that the cattle were actually diseased when they were put on board?—He told me they had foot and mouth disease, and he asked me would I land them. I said, "Yes, I believe I shall be compelled to land them."

9885. Then when we hear of Spain and Portugal never having had foot and mouth disease, that seems rather to contradict that statement?—That is a fact.

9886. What became of those 100 bullocks?—They arrived at my wharf, and Professor Simonds came to look at them. Mr. Gebhardt had made very strenuous efforts to endeavour to get those animals, or some portion of them, those that were not affected, to the Metropolitan Market, because they would have made a little more money than by being slaughtered at the water-side. During the quarantine 13 more of these animals dropped down with foot and mouth disease, and in the morning when Professor Simonds came down he separated the 75 from the 23 that were affected with the foot and mouth disease. The 75 were driven along the public road, and sent to the Metropolitan Market.

9887. Was that with the authority of Professor Simonds?—It was in his presence, for I met Professor Simonds coming away from my wharf, and I expostulated with him upon what I thought the indifference of such a procedure.

9888. When was this?—I have not the dates with me; it was during the time I was landing cattle in the year 1870.

9889. It was after the passing of the Act of 1869, was it not?—Yes, it must have been.

9890. So that here we have a direct instance in which the local veterinary inspector of the Privy Council authorised the removal of 75 cattle which had been berried with animals suffering from foot and mouth disease, and allowed them to be driven along the public road?—Yes, and put into the railway trucks and sent to this Metropolitan Market, although, I should tell the Committee, there was no necessity for sending them along this road, because the railway ran alongside into my wharf where they were.

9891. When these animals got to the Metropolitan Market I suppose they were slaughtered?—I should apprehend so. I think nothing went from the Metropolitan Market at that time, but sheep, of course, would walk over the same ground, and would convey the foot and mouth disease, I apprehend, as well as bullocks.

9892. From your experience in the meat trade, are you convinced of the advantages of the dead-meat trade?—I think there could be no doubt about that, if you take into consideration for one moment what has been going on yearly or weekly from Scotland. I think it would be almost a blot upon the commercial men of London to say that we cannot send mutton from London to Aberdeen, as well as they can send beef from Aberdeen to us.

9893. You think that if they can send the beef, we ought to be able to send the mutton?—Unquestionably.

9894. Which do you suppose suffers most from long transit, beef or the mutton?—Either will keep about the same time, if they are killed under proper conditions.

9895. Do you know anything about the port of Harwich?—I have been to Harwich. I have

been down there to see some Dutch stores landed there, after I had refused landing Dutch stores in London; the Government then would not allow me to land anything else. I saw a quantity of Dutch stores there.

9896. In what condition were they?—In the most miserable condition you can imagine animals to be in to be alive.

9897. You mean, being in a poor condition from emaciation?—They were in a wretchedly poor condition.

9898. Do you recollect at what time of the year this was?—In the spring; about April or May.

9899. Did those animals seem to have suffered much upon the voyage, as well as being in a poor condition?—No doubt they must have suffered upon the voyage, but the state they must have been shipped in must have been something exceedingly bad. I believe that it was in consequence of the scarcity of grass in Holland at that time.

10000. There was a scarcity of provender in Holland at that time, I suppose?—I should expect so, from the state in which these animals arrived here.

10001. Do you think that private slaughter-houses ought to be abolished in a great city like this, and that there should be public slaughter-houses?—Yes, I see no objection whatever to that; of course, private interests would suffer, but I think the public would be benefited.

10002. You do not think that turning the whole of the trade into a dead-meat trade would be any detriment to the public?—I do not, for I think the public would be gainers by having the animals slaughtered as near as possible to where they are fed, if it could be so arranged; there is no doubt that the loss in the intermediate transit of cattle is something very great.

10003. With regard to the transit of cattle by sea, what is your opinion of the conditions of that trade?—I could only give you my opinions of the conditions of it, by what I call comparison. I think when we consider that those animals have flesh and blood identical with our own, and if we just inquire what is going on around us as regards ourselves and animals, we might then come to something like a solution of the problem. You and the other honourable Members of the Committee must be well aware of the enormous sums of money which have been expended, and are now being expended in almost every town in England, to get rid of the sewage. Why is that? Simply because, if sewage matter be allowed to remain where deposited for 12 hours, it generates gases which, if you and I were to inhale, would produce disease. We had a painful illustration of that at Scarborough last year, when we nearly lost the Prince of Wales. With regard to animals, there is scarcely a day passes, or a tide that washes upon this shore, but brings with it a cargo of animals of the same flesh and blood with ourselves, compelled to breathe those very gases for periods from 12 to 48 hours. We must either be mad in expending so much money, or we are very great fools in allowing these blood-poisoned animals to go into the country. I do not mean to say that it is so bad all through the voyage, but when you come into the stream, you cannot breathe the air for five minutes. I have looked into the holds of those vessels, and I could not bear to stand over them for two minutes.

Mr.
J. Adams.
—
19 June
1872.

10004. You think that those gases are a very fruitful source of propagating disease?—There is no doubt about it: we have the evidence of some of our most eminent sanitary authorities telling us that three-fourths of the diseases to which human beings are subject are distinctly traceable to blood poisoning, and that those diseases are amenable to human treatment for prevention and cure.

10005. You have seen animals landed at your wharf apparently suffering from being in those badly ventilated holds?—There can be no question about that with their eyes starting out of their heads; you cannot describe at all times what an animal is feeling.

10006. But you think, as a rule, there is a considerable amount of suffering which cattle endure?—There must of necessity be so under the most favourable circumstances under the most improved system of ventilation. Notwithstanding you admit that, there must of necessity be such gases inhaled by these cattle as must contaminate their blood. Vessels are frequently stopped through fogs in the river; they must turn off their steam, they cannot go in fogs, and the cattle being laden as they are and jammed, inhaling these gases is most injurious to them.

10007. You consider also, I imagine from a pamphlet which you sent round to the different Members of the Committee, that cattle on transit by rail require to be watered and fed more frequently than they are?—I think that the main causes of those diseases are the privations which cattle undergo from the want of proper shelter, food, and water during transit, whether by land, sea, or rail; the whole system wants revising; there is no question that it is the greed of men wanting a higher speed and more profit, which brings about these things.

10008. Which increases the propagation of diseases; you do not suppose that these diseases generate spontaneously in this country?—I could not speak about that, because I do not know anything about it, and those who speak about them know as little about them as I do. With regard to the diseases of human beings, we know that diseases often step over one generation. I am a living illustration of this theory; my father suffered from gout, and I had a brother who died from gout. Some years ago I had a small eruption on the forehead, and I went to Erasmus Wilson, and he said, "That is suppressed gout; you must avoid all farinaceous substances, and beer, and so on." I am not a man given to high living, but if I have a busy day, as they say, I have my silent monitor to remind me of it.

10009. Have you any observation to make with reference to fairs and markets?—I say that no ruminating animal ought to go for more than eight hours without food and water. I have heard several gentlemen say that animals do not take any injury by going 12 or 14 hours without food and water, but I have yet to learn that if you violate the laws of nature you can do so with impunity; they will fall back upon you.

10010. Mr. Bareley.] You think that under present arrangements the cattle are kept too long in the trucks without food and water?—Unquestionably; if you will allow me just to give you an instance of what has occurred only within the last few days at the Bath and West of England Show; a friend of mine sent some Alderneys there, and I think Mr. Clarke told you of the journey down, which occupied some-

thing like about 13 hours under the most favourable circumstances, because the gentlemen who sent them paid an extra rate for them, and put them in horse boxes; they were then 13 hours in going, and in coming back the same animals were 21 hours on the journey. They left Plymouth on Friday, the 6th of June, at eight o'clock, and arrived at Paddington on Saturday afternoon at five o'clock in the evening, and the man in possession of them had to hire a porter at Didcot to give him a little water, and he managed to get some grass off one of the omnibuskings at one of the stations to give these animals for food.

10011. A man came in charge of them from the show, did he?—From Plymouth; those animals were at the Bath and West of England Show the week before last.

10012. Was there a man in charge of those animals?—There was.

10013. Are there not certain stations in the way where he could have got water for the cattle?—No; that is the man's report, that he had to give an official at Didcot some money to get the animals some water; he could not get any at any place that he stopped at.

10014. According to the Privy Council Order there is a watering station at Didcot; there are three watering places at Bristol?—But you cannot get at them from the ordinary truck.

10015. How many animals were there in a truck?—I should think that there were four.

10016. The man had to take the water into the truck to the animals?—Yes, he had.

10017. Do you know anything about the way in which fat cattle arrive from Aberdeen?—I have seen them landed when they used to come round by steamer; they used to arrive in tolerably good condition.

10018. But coming by rail, do you know anything about the condition in which they arrive?—I have no experience of cattle coming by rail, but I have heard that they lose something like a shilling per day by railway transit.

10019. Should you be surprised to hear that all the butchers who consign the cattle are quite satisfied with the existing arrangements as regards transit?—For the fat animals I should not, because they might be, but if they were sending Scotch steers to this country, I doubt whether they would be; but I should imagine the trade is better organised between London and Aberdeen for cattle than it is by other routes throughout the country; in fact we have not what I call proper arrangements for cattle in other parts of the country.

10020. The regular journey between Aberdeen and London is 36 hours; do you think that that is too long?—Decidedly; there can be no question about it, if we follow nature, and I think that is the best guide for all of us.

10021. How do you account for it, that the people who send the cattle, and at whose expense they are sold in the London market, do not complain about the state of the market?—A fat animal coming from their stalls would not take perceptible injury. When a man's stomach is full, and it is the same with an animal, he can travel and he can undergo greater privations, having just come from his breakfast table, or the animals from where they are fed, than upon an empty stomach. Those fat cattle from Aberdeen would not take much harm, although I think it is cruelty to an animal under any circumstances.

to allow him to go so many hours without food.

10032. Do you know whether the butchers keep the animals for a certain number of hours before killing them?—I am aware that they fast them, and a very excellent plan it is, as it allows the blood to cool.

10033. How long do they fast them?—Twelve hours, but you are fasting those thin animals which have nothing inside them.

10034. Is it the same with the Dutch animals, which you say are such beautiful looking animals?—Yes, and I should say the same of the Irish animals; they are just in the same wretched condition.

10035. Would you make a difference between fat animals and store animals; I am talking of the railway journey just now, because by sea they do offer them a little water and hay?—I would have every animal come under proper conditions, whether it came by sea, rail, or road; they should never be allowed to go without proper provision within a limited space of time.

10036. Would you make a difference in the treatment of store and fat animals?—No, I would make a general rule, because if you made any particular law you would have it evaded directly. If it was a store animal you might be told that it was fed as a fat one, and you would open the door to evasion in many ways.

10037. Supposing the owner of those animals would not pay the shilling additional for any improvement in the mode of transit?—Then I would make him pay, and I would compel the railway companies to charge, and I would compel the authorities in the case of animals being exposed for sale by auction, to make a charge upon those animals for the same purpose.

10038. I suppose Mr. McCausland, the honourable Member for West Aberdeenshire, is a great authority upon cattle?—Yes, he should be.

10039. Are you aware that upon a previous occasion he made this statement, that he did not approve of the watering of cattle by rail, when the length of the journey was under 30 hours, whether fat cattle or otherwise?—If you do not give them rest and water, I should very much think he was quite right, but if they had rest, food, and water, the food would be better assimilated with the water, and the animal would be better fitted to commence his journey again; it would be the same if you put a lot of water into an animal just before he started, it would wash through him, and be rather prejudicial than otherwise.

10040. I understand you to say that you do not approve of the import of foreign cattle alive?—I do not approve of that, unless they are brought here under proper conditions. I say that all animals coming in holds of vessels never ought to be disseminated amongst our flocks and herds; it is a question for you with regard to the small number of foreign store animals which come over here, whether it is worth while running so great a risk as we have done for so trifling a benefit as we get from the small quantity of imported foreign store stock.

10041. Do you know much about the sources of supply of foreign store stock?—I know that the sources of supply have been very much drawn upon lately; we are obliged to go very much greater distances after stock, and in doing so I am inclined to think that we run still greater risks, because the farmers then bring animals

from the interior, and the conditions under which they bring them are so bad, that when they bring them on board those vessels, they run a great risk of disseminating disease when they come here.

10042. Do you think that without any restrictions at all, we should get a larger supply of store animals from abroad into this country than we do now?—I think not, because the greater portion of the animals are used for draught purposes.

10043. Then your evidence comes to this: that you are in favour of a very considerable transit of animals by sea, and you wish the conditions under which foreign animals are imported to be greatly improved, especially with regard to the ventilation of the holds of vessels, and that on their arrival here you would kill them all at the port of landing?—I would recommend you to bring them under the best conditions you possibly can, but if they are obliged to inhale those bad gases, I would never allow them to be disseminated amongst our own flocks and herds.

10044. But do you think it advisable under all the circumstances of the case as regards the importation of foreign store cattle to permit the importation of foreign store cattle at all into this country?—I would not stop a hoof coming into this country from any country. I do not see that there is any necessity for it; if they come under proper conditions, I say let them come.

10045. What would you suggest as the proper conditions for store cattle?—With regard to foreign store stock, I do not think you can exercise authority upon the other side for bringing them to the seaports under proper conditions, but if you could, the same as you can regulate it for Ireland, there would not be one-half the danger. Even if you had cattle from Russia at this moment, there would not be half the danger to this country, if they came to our ports under proper conditions, that is to say, if they had proper rest, food, and water, before being shipped.

10046. Do you think it would be practicable for this country to enforce what you would consider proper conditions for the import of foreign cattle?—They could not do so. I quite think they could not exercise any authority over foreign powers before getting their stock to the port of embarkation. The Government might suggest the means, but I do not think, knowing what cattle dealers are, that those suggestions would be of any use; those animals go for days and days without food; they are exhausted, and are masses of skin and bone, and a great many of them are almost brought to death's door by privation before they are shipped.

10047. It comes to this, that you do not consider it practicable to admit the importation of foreign store stock with safety to the herds of this country?—Certainly not.

10048. Mr. Ridley.] You were saying something with regard to these Dutch cows coming into London, and Dutch stores coming into Essex; are they still coming at the present time?—I believe they are, but I have not followed the market recently.

10049. When you spoke of pleuro-pneumonia having occurred from these importations, are those cases of recent date?—Yes, they occurred last autumn.

10050. In consequence of this pleuro-pneumonia amongst the foreign cattle, has it been the

Mr.
J. Odams.
19 June
1873.

Mr.
J. Coleman.
19 June
1879.

habit amongst farmers to cease buying foreign stores?—Most of the best farmers have ceased buying them now.

10041. Where do the Dutch cattle go to now?—The importations have not been so large lately; there is less to send, and, I believe, the prices which they realize have not been sufficiently remunerative to induce the exporters to increase the trade.

10042. With regard to this question of dead meat, I see that in the evidence which you gave upon a former occasion you stated in general terms that you did not think the dead meat trade ought to be encouraged?—I am not sure that I said so then.

10043. Have you now seen reason to change that opinion?—I have.

10044. This was in 1868. When you said that, I apprehend you meant that foreign cattle should be imported into this country, but that they should be compulsorily slaughtered at our ports?—Yes.

10045. You stated then I think that there would be a considerable injury to the poor of London with regard to the supply of the edible offal if the dead meat trade were to be encouraged?—If the dead meat trade of the country were to be encouraged at the outports, I probably might have said so.

10046. Now you know of your own knowledge that the edible offal can be carried by rail without detriment to it to the large towns in the north of England and elsewhere?—Yes, quite so.

10047. Mr. W. Johnson. } Do you prefer that cattle should be carried on the deck of a steamer when they are imported, or in the holds?—Most decidedly, I prefer that they should be carried on deck.

10048. Have you any idea of the proportion in which cattle are imported into this country, in the holds and upon deck?—I have no reliable data that I could give you, but I should fancy, taking the cattle boats, that there would probably be two-thirds below, and one-third above, but I am speaking at random. I have no data to go upon.

10049. You spoke of noxious vapours existing in the holds after the animals had been knocked about at sea; have you any idea what would be the best plan for disinfecting; what are your ideas upon the subject of disinfecting?—Of course there should be the greatest cleanliness by ablution and carbolic acid; the greatest cleanliness should be observed; I may say that I was at Bristol about six weeks ago, and I there saw one of the Waterford boats, and I must give them very great credit for the great cleanliness of the vessel that I saw there; it was undergoing ablution at the time.

10050. What cattle diseases have you principally had personal experience of?—The first year I bought 15 Irish heifers in the month of September, and after I had had them about a fortnight or three weeks by walking amongst them I observed one of them standing alone with her back up. My foreman was with me and I said: "That animal has the lung disease," and I immediately sent for a veterinary surgeon and he pronounced it to be so. The veterinary surgeon said: "You must isolate this animal and give notice under the provisions of the Act that these animals are diseased;" and I immediately ordered the animal to be locked up, and I gave it the most nutritious food I could get, and

during the next three weeks I lost seven more of them, and I have no doubt they all had the germs of disease in them, but I managed to put sufficient flesh upon the remainder to make them fit for the butcher before they died.

10051. Do you know what part of Ireland they came from?—I do not know; I bought them from a dealer in an inland town.

10052. Do you know the state of health in which the Irish cattle usually arrive?—When I was at Bristol I went into the market, and I think it was "The Gipsy" from Waterford had brought between 300 and 400 head of cattle. In going through the market I certainly saw from 300 to 400 Irish animals varying in ages from six months to 18 months, or two years, and I am sorry to say the condition of these animals was not creditable to any country or to any body of men sending them. I went to one of the dealers and I said to him: "How much for these 20 steer?" and he said, "14 £ a piece," and I said, "That is a very large sum of money for such poor animals," and he said, "Sure, your honour, have they not just come off a journey; if you turn them into a bit of grass they will swell like a loaf of bread in a pail of water."

10053. Were there any symptoms of disease in these cattle?—I saw nothing of the kind, but this morning before coming here a gentleman came into my office, and I told him I was coming up here, and he said, "You may rely upon it that until some greater cure is taken of these cattle we shall still have these diseases;" he said: "I was at the Bristol market upon the 13th of March this year. I bought 35 Irish heifers, and they averaged me 13 £ a piece." If you will allow me to say so, I think herein consists what I call one of the main causes of disease from Ireland; it is primitive. To tell me that an animal two years old should only be worth 12 £ is to tell me that that animal has been literally starved for the greater portion of its life; our yearlings are worth that; you have the same sires in England and the same dams, and yet here is a lot of two-year old heifers, worth only 12 £ a piece; I have not been much in Ireland, but I can tell that a very large portion of the Irish stock are never put under cover from the time they are dropped in the field to the time they are brought into this country.

10054. You are not aware that there are some districts in Ireland where they are very well taken care of?—I know we have some very excellent Irish things, but I never knew a two-year old Irish bullock to reach a hundred stone; it is simply because they do not begin right. They do not begin at the beginning and treat them well in their younger stages.

10055. Is it not the practice to send them over to England as stores, in expectation that they will be fattened when they come over here?—Yes, but they should be sent in store order. Do not imagine that I have the least prejudice against Irish stock; we want all that we can get.

10056. Do you think that they may leave Ireland in a tolerably good condition, and suffer in transit?—No doubt they do; if they are in a low condition they suffer still more. This gentleman says, in reference to his stock which he bought upon the 13th March last: "Some have calved since I had them. I sent them to the Audley End Station (in Essex). They left Bristol at five o'clock in the evening, and they arrived at their

their destination about 10 o'clock on the following morning; the journey occupied about 17 hours." These cattle were driven a distance of about six miles to his homestead, and they fell down with the foot and mouth disease. They were all down with it, and he thought he should have lost some, but he says now they are nearly recovered, and they are doing well.

10057. What part of Ireland did these cattle come from?—They were bought in Bristol market.

10058. The report of the North East Agricultural Society says that the counties of Down and Antrim are quite free from foot and mouth disease?—No doubt those cattle were free, but from the very fact of their being jammed together for so many hours their feet became inflamed, and inflammation followed, and they have got foot and mouth disease now in various districts.

10059. Do you think it possible that they caught the infection in the Bristol market?—That I could not say; there is the result; they might have caught the infection there.

10060. Have you any suggestion to offer to the Committee with reference to the best means of preventing the spread of foot and mouth disease?—Yes, my suggestions are these, that in Ireland, where you have no great distances to bring your cattle to seaports, I say that before they put them on board vessels the animals ought to be rested, and fed and watered, for about six or eight hours, and never under any circumstances would I allow them to travel by rail for periods of more than eight hours without food and water. We have refreshment rooms for ourselves, and we should be glad to pay 3s. or 4s. a head more for those cattle if we knew that they came under proper conditions.

10061. Then with reference to travelling by steamers, have you anything to say upon that subject?—You cannot adopt any satisfactory method to bring cattle here. You must bring them under the best circumstances, but what I say is, let the conditions before they are put on board be proper; let them have food, rest and water. They come out of those heated vessels, and they are put upon an open truck, and they go through the air at 20 or 30 miles an hour; heat and blood cannot stand it. We get those animals diseased, I have no doubt, to a great extent from privation.

10062. Mr. Kewenagh. You make rather a complaint against the Irish farmers for the treatment of their stock; do you think that it is possible for the Government to make rules that the Irish farmers should treat their stock differently?—No, certainly not. I only say that I should be very glad to see it, as it would be to their interest as well as to ours that they should keep their stock properly, because it would pay them to do so. As I say: Look at a two-year old heifer, worth at the present time only 18*l*. It is preposterous. Anything like a good short-horned heifer would have been worth 25*l*. in our market. I do not think you could exercise any legal supervision over men feeding animals, but what I would say is this, that where they bring those animals from their own homesteads to fairs and markets, the authorities should see, during the time they are there, that they should be fed and watered; and if you will come into the Metropolitan Market I will point out to you hundreds of animals which have gone without food and water for 18 or 20 hours. They are tied up short by the neck, and
638.

after they are sold they stand there for hours, then they are taken to a railway station, again trucked until the train goes to the next fair without bit or drop.

10063. You think that three privations are the main source of disease?—In my opinion they are the main sources of disease.

10064. Do you think that these 35 heifers bought in the Bristol market would have become diseased unless they were brought in contact with infection?—I do not know but what the infection might have been latent in them, but they are put under such conditions that whatever disease may be enfolded in their constitutions is sure to become developed by the conditions you put them under.

10065. You stated that the feet would be sure to become inflamed?—We have had Swedish cattle coming over the Bay of Biscay unable to stand, having lost their hoofs in holding on to the deck in a rolling sea, but the fever I refer to is brought on by privation.

10066. You stated that you would not stop the importation of a single hoof into this country?—I would not.

10067. But you afterwards seemed to think it was a question whether it was wise to run the risk of disease being disseminated among our flocks and herds for the sake of the small number of foreign stores which are brought here?—I am talking of foreign stores, because you cannot put the foreigners under the same restrictions as you can the English people. The distance from which those stores come is very great, and the privations which they undergo are very great, and you cannot enforce restrictions on the other side of the water as you can here, but if you give them, as I suggest for the Irish horse, food, water and rest, and put them on the decks of vessels, you would have little or no disease.

10068. But I thought you stated that you thought the Dutch cattle, from the nature of the ground upon which they feed, had the germs of disease born in them?—Yes, I think so.

10069. Under what conditions would you avoid the disease in them?—Simply by not putting them under the developing causes, not putting them into the holds of vessels, and by giving them when they travel food and water, that would enable them to resist the disease.

10070. If they had the germs of disease in them, would it not be dangerous to import them?—No, because you can put sufficient flesh upon them at two years old, before these diseases are developed.

10071. Then I understand that you really are not opposed to the importation of foreign stores?—No, I say only bring them here under proper conditions, and if you cannot enforce the conditions, then slaughter them.

10072. Do you think it is possible to enforce the conditions?—Yes.

10073. How would you recommend that the Government should do so?—I would recommend that wherever cattle are for sale, accommodation should be provided for them at the railway stations and at all landing places both for embarkation and debarkation; you have only got to organise a system, and the railway companies would fall into it, and further the terms upon which those cattle were to be conveyed across; it is simply a question of organisation.

10074. You would not touch the Dutch imports?—That is a question for the Committee to determine,
3 G

Mr.
J. Adams.
19 June
1873.

Mr.
J. Odgers.
14 June
1873

determine, whether it is worth while to run the great risk which we have incurred for the small benefit which we get from the Dutch stores.

10075. That is what I was asking you; do you think it is worth while?—I do not think it is. If you could put Holland under the same conditions as you can put Ireland, then it might be.

10076. But under the present conditions of Holland, I understand it is your opinion that it is not worth while to import Dutch store stock?—Under the present conditions under which Dutch store stock are conveyed from Holland it is not.

10077. If the Government could make a rule that they should come upon the decks of vessels, would you allow them to come in that way?—Yes, if you could enforce the proper conditions preparatory to their being shipped upon the other side.

10078. But how could you do it?—That is what I say is the difficulty; in Ireland you could.

10079. Considering all these things, I understand you that you would recommend stoppage of the import of Dutch stores?—Under the present conditions I would.

10080. Considering that the Government cannot enforce these conditions?—Supposing that the Government could enforce, or endeavour to persuade, the Dutch Government to send those cattle to those ports, under proper conditions, then I say, bring them on deck here and feed, and rest, and water them, and then I do not think we should be under any great apprehension of disease as we are at present.

10081. If that could not be done, you would be against the import of Dutch stock?—Yes. I ought to mention to you, that the Dutch Government are fully alive to the enormous losses which they sustain from pleuro-pneumonia, because they have just exhausted a fund which Government had given for the sufferers; the whole of it is expended, from the granaries of Holland having suffered from pleuro-pneumonia.

10082. Then, with regard to the fat stock, I understand you to recommend that they should all be slaughtered at the water-side?—I am quite of opinion that there is no necessity, in a national point of view, why fat stock should not be slaughtered where landed.

10083. You do not think that that would have the effect of all raising the price of meat?—No, I am convinced of this, and I have said so for years, that if you had only adopted a system of slaughtering years ago, we should never have had beef and mutton at these fabulous prices. I do not know whether this notice has been called to the attention of the Committee. It is from the hutchers of Edinburgh, dated the 10th of June 1873; it is most alarming, to my mind; it says: "The hutchers of Edinburgh, in view of the present exceptionally high price of stock, find it necessary to quote the following scale of charges for the best qualities of butcher meat from this date till further notice, viz., for cash or monthly payments: best quality, per pound, roast beef, 1s. 3d.; boiling ditto, 10d. to 11d.; stewing ditto, 1s.; steaks, 1s. 3d. to 1s. 8d.; legs and loins of mutton, 1s. 1d. to 1s. 8d.; chops, 1s. 4d.; boiling ditto, 10d. to 1s.; inferior qualities at lower prices."

10084. Are you of opinion that if the Government now suddenly stopped all fat stock going inland, except as dead meat, that would not have

the effect of raising those prices?—It is a difficult matter to say what would be the effect at the present time with regard to any fresh movement in stock, because the supply is so critical; I do not think any man can form an opinion as to how prices might be affected by any fresh movement.

10085. Do not you think that it might deter foreign stockkeepers sending over their fat cattle, if they were confined as to their market?—No, not at all. I know that that opinion has been expressed, but I do not think that it had any influence upon exporters to this country. So long as our market affords any benefit to foreign towns, we shall get them; it is a question of pounds, shillings, and pence entirely to foreign producers.

10086. It is as a question of pounds, shillings, and pence that I asked you whether you thought their slaughter at the water-side would have the effect of deterring them from sending their cattle over?—No, I think not, so soon as you get the matter settled, because we have had so many changes, first admitting freely, and then slaughtering at the water-side, and then scheduling and unscheduling, that I think if you once settle the question of slaughtering at the water-side, the foreigners would be no sufferers by that slaughtering at the water-side.

10087. You do not think there would be much danger of spreading disease by taking cattle inland for slaughter?—Yes, I do. All cattle which have been poisoned, as I call it, by these games are sources of danger.

10088. Even for slaughter only?—Yes; and if you can get meat as cheaply into the country as you can the live animal, what is the good of running the risk.

10089. That is a thing which I am persuaded of?—We have had practical demonstration of it, and it has been proved over and over again in my own neighbourhood. There are two butchers within seven or eight miles of me, and for the last 40 years they have sent meat to the London market, some hundred carcasses twice a week, and although they have a railway running parallel with them, they do it now.

10090. Why is it that beef is not sent?—It is not many country butchers who can keep so very large a quantity of hullocks, but they can weekly send up a large quantity of sheep.

10091. But I understood you, that it was the buyers from the country who came up to the Metropolitan Market and took the meat down to the country?—Yes, in some districts. For instance, in the south; the Brighton men, and that class of men, where they do not grow enough for the district.

10092. Would not such large manufacturing towns as Birmingham, Manchester, and Leeds require to send to London, if you stopped the import of fat stock?—They could get the meat as cheaply from the water-side market.

10093. But why was it that they did not get it; you stated that the chief meat taken into the country was mutton?—Because they could get beef in the country.

10094. They would not want to come to London for the beef?—No.

10095. Mr. Josiah Bright.] You were asked by the honourable Member for Belfast whether the compulsory slaughter of animals at the water-side would tend to diminish the importation of animals, and I understood you to say it would not;

Mr.
J. Odgers.
19 June
1873.

net; have you paid any attention to the effect which the compulsory slaughter has had with regard to the importation of cattle?—I cannot say that I have looked at the matter with regard to compulsory slaughter. I see that we have not had the large importations of foreign cattle that we used to have, but I do not attribute that to the measures which were adopted here for compulsory slaughter. I think that the market which has been created in all foreign countries, the increase of wages, and the prosperity of artisans, and other things, have induced them to become very much greater consumers of meat than they used to be.

10095. You were stating it to be your opinion that the higher prices upon the Continent, and the higher wages at home, and so on, have greatly increased the price of meat in Edinburgh, and that that was one of the reasons why we did not get so much meat here, and I ask you whether that was not the cause of the increase of price in this country?—There has been an increase in the consumption; where we used to have a pound of meat consumed by the artisan class, we have a ton now.

10097. I think you gave an opinion indicating that disease had done so much to increase the price of meat; do you not think that the increase of the demand for meat in the country had been also a very powerful cause?—No doubt, there are combined causes.

10098. Then with regard to your opinion, that slaughtering at the water-side does not diminish the import of cattle, I want to know whether you have any accurate knowledge upon that subject?—I have no statistical knowledge with regard to the quantity, but I can scarcely conceive that it has had any injurious effect.

10099. You have not, for example, inquired into the result of scheduling any particular country with regard to the amounts imported from that country?—No, I believe the scheduling and unscheduling of countries which has been going on for several years has never affected to any considerable extent the supply to this country.

10100. That is your opinion?—That is my opinion.

10101. But I asked you whether you had gone into the figures and facts?—No, it is quite foreign to me.

10102. Therefore you think it better to form an opinion without reference to the facts?—So far as they are within the observation of everyone, it must be seen that the slaughtering of cattle to the extent that we have done has not to any very great extent deprived us of any large quantity of cattle coming over here.

10103. You would admit that it is an important question whether it has or it has not?—I quite admit that, and I admit also that the other is a very important question with regard to the dissemination of disease by these animals.

10104. But admitting that it is a very important question, do you think that it is wise for a gentleman to come here and offer very strong opinions upon that point, if he has not gone very carefully into the facts?—I think there are no facts you could go into which would counteract this fact, that the losses which we have sustained in this country through the introduction of disease are nothing compared to the small quantities we have received less since the Orders have been issued for slaughtering at the port of landing.

0.68.

10105. That is a separate question from the question of the health of cattle at home; you have given an opinion of what would be the result of a slaughter at the water-side, and all I wish to call your attention to is this, that you are giving a strong opinion without having gone into the facts; now the opinion which you have been expressing with reference to the possibility of slaughtering all cattle at the water-side without diminishing the imports is an opinion, I think, held chiefly by the agricultural witnesses and by the veterinary witnesses, is it not?—Yes, and I think by a great number of others, independently of those.

10106. The largest meat consumers perhaps are the populations of the large towns?—Yes, quite so.

10107. Do you know whether that opinion exists in large towns or not?—I should imagine not, because I think you would find very few men who have private businesses in any town who would wish to see the organisation of their business interfered with, but that the consumers in large towns would be injured by the price of meat being enhanced to them, I am decidedly of opinion that they would not. I have said, and say again, that you can send meat through the country without endangering our stock and at a less cost than you can send live animals.

10108. But seeing that the representatives of large towns (I do not mean the Parliamentary representatives, but representatives in other respects) have entertained an opinion quite opposite to that which you are expressing, do you still adhere to that opinion?—I think, that just as you say that I have formed an opinion with regard to the importation as being lessened, those gentlemen must have formed a hasty opinion upon a subject of that kind when they have had no experience of the cost of conveying dead meat to manufacturing districts.

10109. I believe that the cattle of Spain and Portugal have never been subject to disease which would make the people of this country afraid of those cattle?—Generally speaking, from my own experience, the cattle from Spain and Portugal are exceedingly healthy. I have said that a great deal of disease arises in Holland and Ireland too, from the wet, moist climate; but in Spain we have very little disease certainly, which is to be attributed, I think, to the atmosphere in those districts, but we have had disease from there. I have already stated that a large cargo came to my wharf with foot and mouth disease.

10110. Are you aware that in the year 1868, and I do not know how much sooner, the cattle of Spain and Portugal were not allowed to come into Liverpool except to be slaughtered at the water-side?—I cannot say that I am aware of any such regulation. I was not aware that Spain was scheduled.

10111. Are you not aware that Mr. Horsfall, the then Conservative Member for Liverpool, opposed that in the House of Commons?—That circumstance is not known to me.

10112. But if the Liverpool people urged their Member strongly to protest against the exclusion of Spanish and Portuguese cattle, excepting on the ground that they should be compulsorily slaughtered, and the Liverpool people took that view, it was clearly their opinion that the interests of the community would be interfered with?—Yes, that the private interests would be interfered with, and the interests of the town.

10113. Is

Mr.
J. Odgers.
—
19 June
1873.

10113. Is it not likely that the people of Liverpool, and an intelligent man like Mr. Horsfall, their Member, should understand the meaning of those restrictions which you wish to impose?—We know that those objections are raised very frequently by people who have an interest in the matter; for my own part I can see no reason why the people of Liverpool should be at all injured whether those cattle had been slaughtered where they were landed, or whether they had been allowed to be slaughtered by butchers in different localities.

10114. Is it not likely that the Liverpool people took a correct view of their own interests?—Unquestionably, we all think that.

10115. And therefore that the compulsory slaughter of healthy cattle at the port of Liverpool was injurious to the interests of that large community?—I should question whether the community of Liverpool have ever had any practical experience to any extent, because I have said before, and I now repeat that at whatever port you land cattle where you have railway facilities for getting the carcasses away, you never do injustice to the consuming community; you may do injustice to others, but not to the consuming community.

10116. Have I not told you that for years they had a free importation of those Spanish and Portuguese cattle, and that when that free importation stopped, and they were compelled to slaughter at the waterside, the whole people of Liverpool backed their Member in protesting against those restrictions, and that protest prevailed at the House of Commons?—I think I remember the circumstances, but I say in answer to that: tell me if you can by what means you can prove that the public who consume that meat at Liverpool were put into a worse position by the meat being slaughtered there than if the live animals had been imported. There is a certain inconvenience to private people, but, as far as the general public were concerned, I cannot see how they are affected.

10117. You will quite admit that it must have affected them, or they would not have carried their point?—As regards the general community, if you have railway facilities adjoining the wharves where those foreign cattle are landed, I cannot see how you can affect them, whereas, as you are aware, the losses we have sustained by the dissemination of those animals have been something frightful, and you see the result at the present day in the price of meat.

10118. I am not aware of that loss from the dissemination of those animals; your opinion is, is it not, that we should be free from disease if we had no foreign imports?—No, I do not say that; I say if you did not disseminate blood-poisoned animals amongst our own stock; I am not bold enough to say that any plan I could suggest would give us immunity from disease.

10119. Even though we kept out every foreign animal, we might still have pleuro-pneumonia and foot and mouth disease?—Certainly we might.

10120. Are you not aware that we have had scientific witnesses, as they are called, who have said that if we kept out all foreign diseases the diseases would die out altogether?—I am not bold enough to say that. Look at these places; we know this, that if you put out an old hunter in the winter, he will turn out a roarer, and so will a bullock do just the same. How do we

get consumption in our own lungs? It is in just the same way.

10121. You are of opinion that the effect of shutting out foreign cattle would be to diminish but not to exterminate disease in our own country?—It might diminish the disease, but I do not think it would exterminate it.

10122. Mr. Dent.] According to your belief, pleuro-pneumonia may arise from exposure to adverse circumstances?—Unquestionably.

10123. And not always from contagion?—Not always from contagion. I believe that a great many animals have the germs of pleuro-pneumonia embodied in their constitutions, and only want the developing causes.

10124. Mr. Boreing.] Have you any facts to submit to the Committee in support of that opinion?—Only from what I see; that we get the great bulk of those diseases from damp countries, namely, Holland and Ireland, where the animals are constantly exposed to damp.

10125. Have you seen disease arise in animals native to this country, under circumstances which led you to believe that it was of spontaneous origin?—No, I have no experience of animals being kept under those conditions, or exposed to those privations, because in my county we winter our stock in yards; we do not allow them to remain in the open.

10126. Then, so far as your experience has gone, as regards animals, natives of this country, pleuro-pneumonia does not originate in such animals?—I do not mean to say that we do not have cases of pleuro-pneumonia occasionally, which may originate here, but it is so rare an occurrence that I am inclined to think that the great bulk of those animals which suffer from that disease are those which have been exposed, as I have said before, to the influences which cause disease of the lungs.

10127. Have you ever had under your personal observation or experience any animals, natives of this country, in a case in which you had reason to believe that the disease did originate in those animals, and was not communicated to them by contagion?—Yes, I think I remember an instance, although we could not trace the exact cause of it. There was a calf belonging to a friend of mine, the late John Clayton, amongst his short-horned herd, and I think I heard him say that upon the dissection of that calf, there was some adhesion of the lungs to the carcass, and he thought that it was the germs of pleuro-pneumonia.

10128. Are you aware that there are adhesions of the lungs in other diseases than contagious pleuro-pneumonia?—I am not aware of that; I am not sufficiently acquainted with cattle pathology to tell you that.

10129. Chairman.] You have no veterinary acquirements whatever?—I have not.

10130. You do not pretend to understand the pathology of diseases?—I do not.

10131. I suppose you are aware that there were the same privations undergone by Irish cattle years ago, and that they then came in a healthy state?—Yes, but Irish cattle were of a different breed than from what they are now; they are not so acclimatised now; they are bred from calves from Cheshire and other places where they are not subject to the same privations, and as you get a finer breed you get less constitution.

10132. But there was no case of pleuro-pneumonia

Mr.
J. Adams.
19 June
1873.

mania before 1839 ever known in the kingdom?
—I am not aware that there was.

10143. Therefore your idea of spontaneous origin is simply put forward as your own opinion; you do not profess any particular knowledge of these diseases?—I have no scientific knowledge of the matter. I only look at it in the broad light as regards diseases amongst ourselves, and I think any person pronouncing any dogmas upon disease gives a very wide field for doubt.

10144. You told the Committee, in the course of your evidence, that you sent several carcasses of sheep, when the foreign market was at your wharf, to Manchester; was there any large number of carcasses sent in that way?—Yes, between 600 and 700 a day frequently.

10145. And during the whole time they were sent from your wharf you did not hear the hutchers who took them to Manchester complain of any losses?—The best proof of that is, that they continued to send them as long as the cattle came, and they would not have continued the operation if they were losers by it.

10146. The cost of sending them dead was cheaper than sending them alive?—It was.

10147. Mr. James Bright.] Have you not upon this subject very much changed your opinion of late years?—I have never changed my opinion upon the fact of slaughtering all animals which come in the holds of vessels. I have always held that opinion from the first hour I saw them arrive till the present hour.

10148. You published a pamphlet upon this question of dead meat, did you not?—Yes, I did.

10149. I think you were examined before a Committee of the House of Commons some time ago?—I was.

10150. Have you always held the opinion that all animals coming to this country should be slaughtered at the water-side?—All animals coming in the holds of vessels.

Captain JOHNES SMITH, called in; and Examined.

10150. Chairman.] You are Chief Constable of Cheshire, are you not?—I am.

10151. Have the orders of the local authority for the county of Cheshire been carried out through you?—They have, altogether. I have acted as chief inspector of the county since the cattle plague ceased, and under me the police have strictly carried out the Orders in Council.

10152. Do you complain at all of want of uniformity between the orders which obtain in certain districts, and your own?—There is a want of co-operation with the boroughs; their interests do not unite with ours; it would be very desirable if we could unite the local authorities in counties, with representatives from boroughs, so as to have uniformity of action, and secure their co-operation.

10153. Do you think it would be a good plan to have a county board, upon which the local authorities of the boroughs should be represented?—I think so.

10154. Do you think if the boroughs were fairly represented upon the Board, they would object to act with the county authorities?—I have no reason to think so at all.

10155. Have you put the Act in strict force in Cheshire?—We have; I may say that we do.

10141. In what way do animals come to this country?—The great bulk come in the holds of vessels.

10142. And the others on deck?—Yes.

10143. Do you think it might be safe to admit those that come on deck?—If they are shipped under proper conditions, and come here under proper conditions.

10144. But you were of opinion, at one time, that slaughter at the port of entry was dangerous to the well-being of the people?—I cannot bear in mind that I ever expressed an opinion with regard to the port of entry. I referred to the different ports throughout the country. We had not then the facilities that we have now.

10145. You were asked if it would be a great injury to the poor of London, and you said that it would?—It would if they were deprived of the edible offal; there is no question about that. If you could not get offal within their reach, it would be a great injury, but I do not think that I said that if you slaughtered the cattle in the reach of a great consuming district, it would be an injury to them.

10146. You were asked whether the dead meat trade should be encouraged, and you said that you thought it should not?—I was not aware of the facilities we had for getting dead meat through the country at that time.

10147. Chairman.] You sent this offal to Manchester, did you not?—Yes, we did.

10148. And it may be that the experience of the success of the dead meat market at your wharf changed your views upon certain subjects?—Unquestionably, when we found it could be conveyed at comparatively less cost than that of the live animals, thereby diminishing the risk of disseminating the disease.

10149. And without any loss to those who took the meat from your wharf to the manufacturing districts?—Quite so.

have even gone beyond the strict line, for this reason, that there was an impression that cattle could not be removed from any part of an infected district. I allowed that impression to have way, and therefore we have had a greater observance of the rule than we should have had.

10156. What has been the result of your strictness in Cheshire?—There has not been a decrease, but after that question I think there is another question which should be asked, viz., what might be the result of doing away with all restrictions, because that is the only alternative, and it is a dangerous one.

10157. Will you give the Committee the result of your restrictions upon the movement of cattle; has there been any decrease of the disease?—No, there has not been any decrease.

10158. But there has been an increase of foot and mouth disease and pleuro-pneumonia?—Yes, in Cheshire during the last three years and 10 months, foot and mouth disease has increased each successive year, pleuro-pneumonia remaining about the same.

10159. What is the state of the county of Cheshire with regard to pleuro-pneumonia?—It is more free than it has been at any period.

10160. Have you any inspection of railway trucks?—No, that is left altogether to the railway

Captain
J. Smith.

Captain
J. Smith.
29 June
1873.

way authorities. I have only proceeded against one company. I find that that is a very difficult thing for the police to interfere with; indeed, it would take the whole police force of the county to carry it out; you would have to watch every station. I have a letter upon that very subject, in answer to a letter from Lord Penrhyn sent me by the lord lieutenant of the county, and my answer is, "I have considered the subject of Lord Penrhyn's letter, and from my own observation quite agree that railway companies are not carrying out the Act in respect to cleaning trucks, &c., and although I have not yet proceeded against them, I am quite ready to assist in doing so; but I am inclined to think that instead of the local authorities attempting this, it would be more advisable that the Privy Council, who have reserved to themselves power to employ their own inspectors for any special purpose, and who have an unlimited jurisdiction, should undertake and follow up this part of the Act. 1st. Because to secure a conviction it must be proved that the truck has been used during the 24 hours in question. 2nd. Because to prove the offence evidence may be required through and beyond the jurisdiction of several local authorities." Therefore it would be impossible for the police in any one county to attempt to carry out that part of it. "3rd. Because Government could more effectually fight such powerful antagonists, who invariably appeal from all decisions gained against them by weak opponents. 4th. Because I personally, and all the inspectors under me, have, under the Cattle Diseases Act, especially since the Privy Council issued a declaration to be made in foot and mouth, as in pleuro, an amount of work that, if still further increased, would materially interfere with the more important police duties. Further, in respect to the supply of water and forage to animals in transit by rail, as the Privy Council have notified their intention of issuing rules, and have, with a view to frauding them, called on railway and other companies to offer suggestions, it occurs to me that it would be well to wait until such rules are issued." I did not wish to increase the duties of the police.

10161. It is your opinion that railway trucks should have some central authority to inspect them?—I think that there should be permanent inspectors appointed for that sole purpose, who should go with the trains and follow them down; that is the only chance of conviction under the Act of Parliament, unless the Act of Parliament were altered to the effect that each time they re-loaded they should be cleaned; it is not so at present.

10162. You do not think that the cattle trucks are properly cleaned and disinfected?—No, I do not.

10163. And you are unable to put the Act in force by the agency of the police?—Decidedly.

10164. You are of opinion that some sort of roving inspector, appointed by the Privy Council, should be the proper authority for carrying out that portion of the Act?—That is my opinion.

10165. With the aid and assistance, or some aid and assistance, from the local authority to back him up?—Yes, he should have all the assistance he could get from the local authority.

10166. Do you think there are many cases of undiscovered disease in Cheshire?—I am inclined to think not, and we almost invariably get convictions when we do discover them, because,

although I carry out the Act by the police, I have power to call in a veterinary surgeon whenever I thinkit requisite. Whenever there is a point in dispute I always do so, and get a certificate from the veterinary surgeon. There is another reason why I do not think the disease is concealed to any great extent. We had only 150,000 cattle in Cheshire, and upwards of 55,000 of these were returned as diseased last year, so that I do not think there can be many cases concealed.

10167. What are the regulations with regard to foot and mouth disease?—To declare a district infected as soon as the disease appears.

10168. What is the district?—The farm; and, as I said, the impression was, and exists now, that the whole farm is embraced, whereas that is not so, because the animals that were not in contiguous fields would not be declared infected, but we have carried that out so as to embrace the whole of the farm, and I have allowed that impression to continue. In addition to that, we resolved that animals affected with foot and mouth disease, or berried with those which were affected with foot and mouth disease were not to be removed without a license from the local authority, whether for immediate slaughter or otherwise. In all cases it is specially referred to me to ascertain the circumstances attending each before I allow a license to be given; and thirdly, it was resolved that sheds and places used by animals affected with foot and mouth disease are forthwith, after being so used, to be cleaned and disinfected to the satisfaction of the inspector." That is also invariably carried out.

10169. The inspector being a police officer?—The inspector being a police officer; either a superintendent or a sergeant, as a rule. Then there are certain rules for carrying out the disinfection, which we have very strictly enforced. "1. That the owners, lessees, or occupiers of places used for the holding of markets, fairs, exhibitions, or sale of animals, or for the lairage of animals, be required to cleanse these places from time to time, at their own expense. 2. That the owners, lessees, or occupiers of those places be required to disinfect the same, or any specified part thereof, from time to time, at their own expense, when the inspectors of the local authority are of opinion that the circumstances are such as to allow of such disinfection being reasonably required. 3. That the modes in which such cleansing and such disinfection shall be effected shall be as follows," and so on.

10170. You seem to have carried out the orders for disinfection very rigidly?—Very much so; there is no doubt about that.

10171. Have you found the disease break out again upon a farm after disinfection?—No, very rarely; the same as in cattle plague. Out of 17,000 buildings which were disinfected, we had not a single recurrence of disease. The police had been specially instructed in the process of disinfection.

10172. What has been the expense of carrying out your inspection?—It has not averaged 300*l.* a year.

10173. Of course it must have put a very great additional labour upon the police?—It has; so much so, that I have been very much inclined to complain that it interfered with our police duties; but still I knew the advantage it was to the country, because these diseases have caused a loss to the county of Cheshire double

the whole county rate during the last year, and during the last three years.

10174. That is to say, in losses from foot and mouth disease and pleuro-pneumonia?—Yes.

10175. Have you increased your police force in consequence of these extra duties being put upon them?—Yes, slightly; I was offered by the court of quarter sessions, or they gave me to understand, that if I wished to make special application for extra men, I should have them, but I have tried to avoid that as much as possible.

10176. Therefore, although you have not been put to any great expense, there must have been a very great deal of work done by your force?—An immense deal of work.

10177. Without much extra remuneration?—The police sergeants and superintendents get what we call special duty allowance, and if it is requisite to employ a conveyance, they get the cost of that.

10178. What suggestions have you to make with reference to amending the existing Orders?—If it were possible, I should recommend that owners of newly purchased stock should be compelled to isolate them for 14 days, for that is where I find the danger arises in Cheshire, in people buying fresh stock from our fairs and markets, and we almost invariably trace the breaking out of foot and mouth disease to those new purchases. I took it upon myself to attempt to carry that out, and I am glad to say that I never found any opposition upon the part of the farmers. I issued this circular myself. "These diseases having considerably decreased in the county; the chief inspector thinks this a suitable opportunity to caution all purchasers of cattle invariably to keep the same during a limited time, say not less than a fortnight, altogether separate from their other stock." I think our farmers have always pulled with me, never against me; they have tried to carry that out too.

10179. What is the date of that circular?—April 1872. I took upon myself also to give another order in addition to that, that all unaccommodated owners of stock, when a case of disease occurred, should be forthwith warned of it, which I considered very material, because stock, you know, in adjoining fields look over the hedge at each other, and breathe the same breath, and so get the pleuro-pneumonia; whereas, if an owner knew of the existence of disease on his neighbour's farm he would remove his stock to a greater distance.

10180. It is necessary for an owner of diseased stock now to give notice only to the police officers; would you think it necessary that he should give notice also to his neighbour?—Yes, I caused that to be done, and I think it would be well to make it compulsory.

10181. Have you any further suggestion to make to the Committee?—In the event of the disease becoming so serious as it was last year in Cheshire, averaging 5,000 or 6,000 cases a week, I should certainly advise that all movement should be suspended for a month, for it is a most serious loss to the county; last year it was at least 80,000*l*. I should recommend you to suspend the movement of all cattle for a month as an experiment.

10182. You would recommend stopping all fairs and markets during that month?—It is not the slightest use alone, but only as an addition. We tried it alone, and it was of no avail, because—

cause during the time we stopped the markets and fairs they held private sales; they did not stop private sales. I have a Return by which I see that there were between 3,000 and 4,000 head of cattle sold during that time besides sheep and swine. Then we found also in the surrounding boroughs and counties that their fairs rather flourished more when ours were stopped.

10183. Did you allow permission for movement under license during the time for immediate slaughter?—Yes, for immediate slaughter, but all the cases were referred to me, and I should recommend, in cases of pleuro-pneumonia, that the beasts should be killed immediately. I would induce the owners to kill them for the purpose of meat, because we know that veterinary science is no more advanced in pleuro-pneumonia than it is in cattle plague.

10184. They only know that the way to get rid of it is to kill?—That is so; they know nothing about it, and with regard to foot and mouth disease it is just the same; they only know of preventive measures; they know of no curative measures at all with regard to it.

10185. Have you any further suggestions to offer with regard to the alteration of the Orders?—No, I think not. I should like to suggest, in regard to veterinary science, that it would be a very advisable thing if the Veterinary Department of the Privy Council itself were to issue some sort of notice of remedial measures, to say what they think themselves is best for the treatment of foot and mouth disease, or best for pleuro-pneumonia. We have had no notice of that kind, and I should think it would be very advisable that that should be done.

10186. What treatment would you recommend?—I do not feel able to give an opinion upon that subject, but should recommend killing for pleuro-pneumonia from want of remedial measures.

10187. If you had immediate killing, I suppose you mean compulsory slaughter and compensation to the owner?—No, I do not. I mean immediate killing for the purpose of making meat out of it, the farmers putting the money into their own pockets.

10188. But if you had to kill a store animal which might possibly recover from pleuro-pneumonia, it would not be worth perhaps one-fourth dead of what it was alive, and it would surely be rather hard to compel a man to kill that animal without compensating him?—I have a very strong opinion upon compensation. As regards Cheshire, we were cruelly punished for killing our own cattle for the benefit of the country at large; we were allowed to pay for it all.

10189. If it were a general law throughout England that in cases of pleuro-pneumonia every animal affected should be at once slaughtered and the owner compensated, do you think that would be the best means of getting rid of pleuro-pneumonia?—I do, in the absence of remedial measures.

10190. Mr. Dent.] Did I understand you to say just now that you had been cruelly punished in Cheshire, and that Cheshire had suffered for the benefit of the whole country?—Under the Order in Council they killed their cattle, and then they had to tax themselves to pay for it by a county rate.

10191. Under what Order in Council was that, and when?—The 23rd February 1866.

10192. You are alluding to cattle plague, are you

Captain
J. Smith.
—
19 June
1873.

Captain
J. Smith.
—
19 June
1873.

you not?—Yes, there is no compulsory slaughter in the case of foot and mouth disease; and our local authority have not adopted it in respect to pleuro-pneumonia.

10193. In what way did Cheshire suffer more than any other county in which cattle plague was existing; such as the East Riding of Yorkshire, for example?—Because, unfortunately, cattle plague was existing there to a greater extent, and they had to kill pretty nearly all their cattle, and Cheshire being a dairy county they suffered more in consequence.

10194. Was not it supposed that the disease spread very widely in Cheshire on account of the obstinacy of the Cheshire farmers and landowners in not slaughtering the animals which were affected?—I do not know that we were more obstinate than the rest of England led by the "Times" newspaper were. That powerful paper wrote very strong articles against pole-axeing. The disease originated with us in 1865, and lasted up to February 1866, and up to that time the veterinary inspectors tried every possible nostrum to cure the beasts.

10195. Was not it a matter of common report, probably from the circumstance of its being a very large dairy and cattle-breeding county, that Cheshire was against putting the pole-axe remedy in force?—I do not think it was so more than other counties, or more than the general public, or more than the "Times" newspaper. Professor Gangee stood alone at that period.

10196. That was in the early stage of the attack; in fact, before the Act was passed which enabled compensation to be given; every one then tried to cure the disease?—My answer to you relate to the period before the 23rd February 1866, when slaughter became compulsory, and compensation also compulsory.

10197. Did you have any great amount of slaughter in Cheshire before compensation became compulsory?—Yes.

10198. Had Cheshire to make up that loss from the county rate?—They had to put their hands in their own pockets for that also.

10199. From the county rate?—The landlords subscribed for that; from the 23rd February 1866 there were 36,000 cases that died, and for those 36,000 cases the landlords of Cheshire raised a subscription to compensate the owners of this stock.

10200. That loss of compensation cannot be said to have been caused by the Orders in Council, and could not have come upon the county rate because the animals died?—No.

10201. But Cheshire was not put under any more peculiar circumstances than any other county, except from the stock of cattle it had; by law it was not put under any peculiar circumstances for the benefit of the country at large, was it?—I fancy that the cause of their being put in that unfortunate position was, that the disease was more prevalent there than in the whole of England put together.

10202. But your statement is, that Cheshire suffered such enormous losses for the benefit of the whole country in consequence of the Orders in Council; I cannot understand what grounds you have for making that statement, because Cheshire was in no different position by law as compared to any other counties?—I think that to compel any one locality to kill their cattle for

the benefit of the surrounding districts, and to make them pay for it out of their own rates, is an injustice.

10203. Then you would not say that Cheshire was placed in any worse position than the East Riding of Yorkshire was the other day when they had an outbreak of cattle plague there?—No, I suppose they had to pay it out of the county rate also.

10204. You would make compensation in cases of cattle plague national, and pay it out of the Imperial Exchequer instead out of a local rate?—I would either do that or pay it out of a poll-rate upon every head of cattle in Great Britain.

10205. You do not speak of veterinary surgeons very highly?—I should be sorry to apply their principle of treatment to our own diseases. As regards pleuro-pneumonia, I have tested it in every possible way. I have told veterinary surgeons to give me a certificate of the state of health of certain stock, and they have brought me a certificate that the stock was perfectly free, and yet the disease broke out within a few days in several cases.

10206. Are your veterinary surgeons in Cheshire, generally speaking, members of the Royal Veterinary College, or are they the country-doctors of the country?—There are some few country-doctors, the others are qualified members of the College of Veterinary Surgeons, but I think, with certain exceptions, that the standard of their education might be raised.

10207. Do you think the one class knows any more of the diseases of cattle than the other?—I do not think they do in pleuro-pneumonia. I have tested pleuro-pneumonia, and I find their knowledge of it most indefinite; the period of incubation is quite unknown. They cannot tell you when it may appear; just so with regard to the duration of it.

10208. With respect to remedial treatment for foot and mouth disease, have you had much conversation with farmers, practical men, and others, with regard to what should be done?—Yes, constantly; without saying it in a boastful way, I may say that few people in England have had more experience than I have, both of foot and mouth disease and pleuro-pneumonia, and cattle plague, unfortunately, and I have constantly conversed with farmers and others in reference to these diseases.

10209. Confiding ourselves to foot and mouth disease, what is your idea of the best treatment for that disease?—That I am not at all prepared to offer an opinion upon; I have no veterinary knowledge whatever; the thing is quite beyond me.

10210. But you have seen a great deal of the disease, and have conversed with many practical men about it, and I should have supposed that you would have gathered an idea from them of what was the best treatment?—There is a great diversity of treatment, but the general thing is to let it run its course, and to take care of the beast; there is no veterinary science required in that.

10211. I wanted to see if your experience accorded with that which has been expressed in this room, and which has been expressed in the Veterinary Report, namely, that the best way of treating foot and mouth disease, is to take care of the animals and let them alone?—That seems to be the best to do, simply, because there is no remedy known.

10212. Yes

Captain
J. Smith.
—
19 June
1873.

10212. You appear to have been entrusted with very large discretionary powers, both by your magistrates, and also by the farmers, who did not oppose them, in Cheshire; you seem to have been trusted with power, even beyond the Act?—I have gone beyond the Act from the want of knowledge on the part of the farmers, and, I believe, to carry out these Acts properly, there should always be some person at the head with authority to do so.

10213. When did you begin to put all these stringent precautions into force?—From the date of the Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act.

10214. Then in fact from the date of the Act you have had as stringent regulations with regard to foot and mouth disease as you were empowered to put in force by Act of Parliament?—Yes.

10215. I believe you have had foot and mouth disease as badly in that county as in any county in England?—Worse, I think.

10216. Not worse, not so bad as Herefordshire; I think Mr. Duckham gave us a larger percentage than yours; you were only 56,000 out of 130,000, but in Herefordshire they have had 34,000 out of 59,000, which is a larger proportion than yours?—It is.

10217. Was foot and mouth disease very fatal in Cheshire?—We have lost about 1,000 as near as possible out of the 130,000.

10218. That is about one in 130 of the stock; now upon what do you base your calculations of the loss?—Upon the milk of the stock, and the condition of fat stock, taking the one with the other; that also derived from inquiries of all practical men, butchers, farmers, and others. I put it at 2 l. a head, taking them all round.

10219. You have not many fat stock in Cheshire, have you?—We do feed some, but the chief quantity of stock as a matter of course is dairy stock.

10220. And you keep a good many heifer calves to replenish the dairies, do you not?—Yes, we do.

10221. To what do you trace this excessive amount of disease in Cheshire, having put the Act as you say so stringently into force?—It is a very difficult question for me to answer when I recollect that veterinary science told us it would take months and months for cattle plague to be got rid of in England, but it vanished all in a moment, and no one knew where it went to, although we had graves everywhere, and everything was supposed to be so highly contaminated as possible, yet in a moment it vanished.

10222. You believe that these diseases come and go in spite of what man can do?—They do, just as cholera does; that vanishes and no one knows where it goes.

10223. In spite of any regulations or any restrictions diseases ebb and flow in waves and we have to control over them?—I believe that to be the case, so far as the former part of question, but rules to control should not therefore be neglected.

10224. That is your experience as chief inspector of the county of Cheshire, where you seem to have very thoroughly and very completely put the Act in operation?—I apply that both to cattle plague and foot and mouth disease. I could give you an extraordinary instance with regard to cattle plague. Two of the inspectors who had large quantities of diseased stock under their charge, had stock of their own, and they

went in amongst them every afternoon without disinfecting their clothes, and their own stock never caught the disease; it is impossible to say how; some take the disease and some escape it.

10225. You do not attribute the spread of disease, so much as Mr. Bigby did, to the continual bringing in of fresh cattle into Cheshire from other infected districts?—I give that as one of the causes, though I do not think that that is the sole cause. I say with regard to all these various contagious and infectious diseases, it is very difficult to say where one ends and the other begins. There are other causes. I believe that I was one of the first to show that the disease always obtains its minimum in April, and its maximum in September or October; we know that the animals are imported mostly from the former month, when the increase commences.

10226. About what time do you commence your importation of cattle into Cheshire from Ireland?—From about the middle of March to the end of April.

10227. Do you buy the Irish stores in calf?—Yes; and in the autumn they sell out their surplus stock.

10228. Would you endorse an opinion which has been expressed, that the diseased animals which are exhibited and sold in Manchester, Salford, and other markets, all go from the county of Cheshire?—There is no doubt that slink butchers are all about, and if we can get hold of them they are brought up and punished; but if they can get hold of a diseased animal they send it, either to Manchester or Liverpool, from Cheshire, but I think that will equally apply to every other county.

10229. Then, after all your experience, since 1869, with regard to foot and mouth disease, do you think we are doing any good at all by these stringent regulations?—I think the only answer I could give to that question would be by asking, "Take off all regulations, and see what would be the result." I could not say.

10230. A Herefordshire witness stated that, for a considerable period, they had no restrictions, and that every man did as he liked. Herefordshire, like Cheshire, is a large breeding county, and Cheshire, as Mr. Bigby says, was in a state of blockade, and the disease has raged very nearly as virulently in Herefordshire as it did in Cheshire, so that would rather lead breeders to suppose the restrictions were of very little avail?—The present regulations have not decreased the disease, but I should like, when it arrived at the state it did in Cheshire, 5,000 or 6,000 cases a week, that we should suspend all movement, and try that.

10231. Would it not be better, when we are nearly free from disease throughout the country, to put in force a restriction of that kind, and not allow any cattle to be moved from any diseased centre. Should we not be more likely to put it down, when we are almost free from disease, than when we are full of it?—I do not think that the present state of the country would warrant such an experiment; it might if you were losing 70,000 or 80,000 a year, but when it is at the minimum, I do not think that the farmers would be likely to submit to such restrictions.

10232. Your farmers got fairly frightened, and they were willing to submit to such restrictions?—I hardly think they would be now in the present reduced state of the disease.

10233. Mr.

Captain
J. Smith.
19 June
1873.

10233. Mr. Boreley.] Do you think it would be a very considerable advantage to the efficiency of carrying out the Act that there should be only one local authority in the county of Cheshire?—I do; and that that local authority should issue all orders, and as I said before, there should be one man to see that those orders were properly carried out.

10234. Do you think that there should be much discretion given to the local authority, or would you then have general regulations simply, not permissive, throughout the whole country?—I think the local authorities could be safely entrusted with large discretionary power.

10235. That is to say in the county of Cheshire?—In all counties, I think, judging from the local authorities and the county authorities, which are the Court of Quarter Sessions.

10236. Do you think that in the various counties the action would be likely to be uniform?—No, there would be difficulties in securing uniformity.

10237. Then supposing a county adjoining Cheshire declined to make regulations which the county of Cheshire thought necessary, would there be any feeling between the two counties?—The other day when we anticipated the cattle plague coming to Cheshire, the local authority of Cheshire issued certain orders to meet the possibility of that attack, but they were neutralised and rendered inoperative by the other surrounding local authorities not doing the same.

10238. Is it not one of the essentials of success in dealing with disease all over the country, that the local authorities should have one uniform action in the same circumstances?—It would be better that it should be so.

10239. You say that the regulations that were prepared to meet that circumstance would have been rendered almost inoperative by the want of similar regulations in the adjoining counties?—In the case I instanced.

10240. And such cases would occur not infrequently, would they not?—No doubt, they would; it would be far better that the Order should come from the Privy Council.

10241. Were you in charge during the time of the cattle plague in 1866?—I was chief constable, but I was not chief inspector at that time. It was not until the end of it, October 1866, when I was appointed inspector. That was just after the last cases, and then they thought it would be better that I should take upon myself to act as chief inspector of the county.

10242. Do you think it necessary that the chief inspector should be a veterinary surgeon?—It is not the slightest use that I can see, because I have full power to call in a veterinary surgeon, and I often do it; sometimes I have taken two, sometimes three. I may mention a case in point. The cattle plague with us ceased in October 1866, and 10 months afterwards there were cases at Hartford, in the centre of Cheshire, which some of the veterinary surgeons of the county insisted upon was a return of the cattle plague. I went down there, and I was equally certain, though I had no veterinary knowledge, that it was not so, and we requested the Privy Council that Professor Brown should come down, and he came, and declared it not cattle plague; but our veterinary surgeons were not satisfied, and we got, at great expense, Professor Gamgee to come down, and he confirmed the opinion of Professor Brown. On this occasion a large

number of the veterinary surgeons of the county attended.

10243. You, practically, have found yourself at no material disadvantage in carrying out the Act in Cheshire, although you are possessed of no veterinary science?—No, because cattle plague you can tell by the eye, and foot and mouth disease you can tell by the eye, and pleuro-pneumonia veterinary science knows very little about until developed.

10244. You have found from your experience that you can place very little reliance upon the experts of veterinary science, if you go into the country?—You cannot generally, although there are clever exceptions.

10245. You said that the cattle plague disappeared mysteriously?—It did, because veterinary surgeons led us to believe that 75,000 head of cattle being buried about Cheshire, and hay, straw, manure, chippings, and everything else being contaminated, we were all an infected country; whereas, in fact, it vanished so we know where, just as cholera does.

10246. Did you not slaughter out the disease?—We slaughtered out from the 23rd of February.

10247. By vigorous slaughtering out you reduced the disease in three months to very narrow limits, did you not?—Yes.

10248. You began by slaughtering it out in the first week of March 4,238 animals, and that number was reduced to 69 per week in the last week of June?—We slaughtered on the average 4,000 animals a week for the four weeks in March.

10249. Is not that a simple explanation of the disappearance of the disease?—No, I do not think it is, any more than it would be of the cholera. After a time, after killing so many people, cholera disappears in this country the same as in every other country; it is the most mysterious thing why it disappears.

10250. Assuming the contagion of the cattle plague was not in its nature of a permanent character *per se*, that is, where it is non-existent in animals, would it not be intelligible that if you slaughtered out the animals and the contagion was not existing in living animals, you would soon succeed in killing out the disease?—Yes, it would tend to that result.

10251. You were misled, in fact, in the opinion that it could not be exterminated by the opinion that the disease would retain permanently its virus of contagion?—Yes; whereas by killing the animals we did get rid of the disease very quickly, and the infection vanished.

10252. Do you think that Cheshire is more exposed to the risk of contagion than other parts of England?—Without being able to account for it, I am very much afraid that we are.

10253. From your observation, do you think that a considerable number of diseased animals come from Ireland?—I do.

10254. And a large proportion of the imports into Cheshire come from Ireland?—Yes, they do.

10255. And come from Wales?—Yes; but the majority of them from Ireland.

10256. The Welsh animals do not bring disease there, do they?—No; I have heard of very few cases.

10257. I suppose on account of the risk of the disease the Cheshire people can buy the cattle which are brought from Ireland more cheaply than if they had a higher character for health?—I do not know that.

10258. I suppose

Captain
J. Smith.
—
19 June
1873.

10258. I suppose the people of Cheshire know that there is some risk in buying Irish cattle?—I do not believe they would buy them in the belief that that risk existed when they were buying them, but they may bring pleuro-pneumonia, and you may get the vets in the county to look at the beast, and they might have pleuro-pneumonia in incubation without their finding it out; and if there is a stock of a hundred that has got foot and mouth disease among them you may take out those that are affected to-day, and the rest may have the disease probably to-morrow.

10259. But disease does exist in animals coming from Ireland?—No doubt.

10260. That must affect the price given for the beasts?—Yes, but beasts are difficult to get now; farmers must give a good price for them or they would lose them, and they must have them in order to stock their farms.

10261. In Cheshire they cannot get milk cows upon terms at all reasonable except from Ireland, and to Ireland they must go for them?—Except to a certain extent, but Ireland is the great market for supplying cattle to Cheshire in the spring.

10262. Have you any knowledge of cases in which foot and mouth disease has been brought by these cattle into Cheshire?—Yes, we have had several cases in which we have punished parties recently for the introduction of disease by Irish stock.

10263. Would it not very much assist the case if you prohibited the import of all animals into Cheshire?—I do not know how we could have got animals upon our farms if we had done that.

10264. You do not think that such a measure would be practicable?—I do not think so. I think a far more practicable measure would be to have a period of quarantine at the port of debarkation.

10265. What length of quarantine would you suggest?—I think as regards pleuro-pneumonia no time would be long enough, but as regards rinderpest or foot and mouth disease 10 days would be sufficient to show it.

10266. Do you think that farmers would be very willing to help you in killing out pleuro-pneumonia if they got no compensation when their animals were killed?—I could not say that.

10267. Do you think the prospect of getting considerable compensation would induce the farmers to aid you in reporting the disease?—Yes, if they get a liberal compensation.

10268. But you do not consider it practicable to discover pleuro-pneumonia in a herd by inspectors placed throughout the country?—Certainly not in the state of incubation. To test that question I have given orders that my inspectors should occasionally take veterinary surgeons to fairs and markets, and try to discover cases, but they have never discovered a case, and I do not think they can. I do not believe anybody can unless it is developed.

10269. I suppose it is very important in putting down disease to have an early discovery of it before it had made any spread in the herd?—Yes, certainly.

10270. Of course the great object is that farmers should be induced to report the disease as soon as it made its appearance?—Yes; no doubt. The great drawback to that, as in the case of cattle plague, is the greed of human nature. Too often farmers want to sell their

stock, and they keep the disease concealed until they have sold them.

10271. Mr. Dodson.] You told the Committee that there is but little concealment of disease?—There is but very little; a case was told me not long ago of a farmer who had kept the disease concealed, but that was almost a solitary case.

10272. Mr. Barclay.] What kind of disease was that?—Pleuro-pneumonia.

10273. Foot and mouth disease is much less easily concealed than pleuro-pneumonia, is it not?—Very much less so, because foot and mouth disease is visible to the eye, and pleuro-pneumonia is not.

10274. What do you do with pleuro-pneumonia in Cheshire now?—Out of the last thousand cases we have had in the three years and nine months, they have killed for meat about one-third; another third have been killed for burial or dip, and only a third have recovered.

10275. You have attempted to kill out pleuro-pneumonia in Cheshire, have you not?—No; there is no compulsion about the slaughter of those animals.

10276. The local authorities have not resorted to slaughter compulsorily in cases of pleuro-pneumonia?—They have not.

10277. Do you think it would be a wise thing for them to do so?—I do.

10278. Have you traced out any cases of pleuro-pneumonia?—Yes, many of them.

10279. How did pleuro-pneumonia come into the country?—By being brought from other stock, or communicated from other stock or fresh purchases; and there also have been other cases in which there has been no fresh cattle purchased, or any possibility of stock approaching diseased animals. I know that is contrary to the opinion of science, but that is what we have found.

10280. That is if there have been no fresh imports into the herd for a considerable period?—And no possibility of other cattle approaching those cattle, and yet pleuro-pneumonia has appeared amongst them.

10281. Have you had any experience of how long pleuro-pneumonia might remain in an incubative stage in animals?—I have known cases in which the incubation of disease has lingered for weeks and months, and where it has lingered upon a farm for many months, and where they got a medical certificate to say the farm was clear, and then two or three months after there has been another case. The disease varies in all its forms so much both in duration and incubation, and also in cessation of infection.

10282. But the disease in Cheshire, as in a good many other cases, has spread by farmers suspecting that they have disease amongst their herds, selling them at the market, and disseminating the disease throughout the country?—No doubt there are cases of that sort, because if they have got foot and mouth disease the Act says they shall give immediate notice; and it is quite possible that a man has sent the stock he wished to sell and sold them, and then given notice immediately after sale.

10283. You are speaking of foot and mouth disease, are you not?—I am speaking of foot and mouth disease and pleuro-pneumonia.

10284. The facilities for doing such a thing would be greater with pleuro-pneumonia than with foot and mouth disease, would they not?—Yes.

10285. Pleuro-pneumonia being so much more difficult

Captain
J. Smith.

19 June
1873.

difficult to discover until it is at an advanced stage of the disease?—Yes.

10286. Have you had any cases in which you could trace pleuro-pneumonia to cattle imported into the county from Ireland?—Yes, I have a certain number of cases here; I have known 16 cases which I have traced from Irish stock brought by our Cheshire farmers.

10287. Within what time?—That would vary in each case.

10288. But over what period were the 16 cases spread?—The first case occurred in December 1871, and the last case is October 1872, that is 16 months.

10289. In 10 months you have had 16 cases of separate introductions of disease into Cheshire by Irish cattle?—Yes.

10290. Besides others in which you might have been unable to see the disease?—Yes, there might have been other cases.

10291. Were you able to trace the disease in those 16 cases to your satisfaction?—Yes, quite clearly.

10292. Could you infer, or have you any means of drawing an inference, whether the diseased animals had caught the disease upon their way, or had it before leaving Ireland?—I could not form any opinion upon that.

10293. Did the disease appear in the earliest stage, or was it some time after they were brought home?—I could not say with reference to that.

10294. How do those cattle come to market?—They come across from Dublin to Holyhead or Liverpool, and thence by road or rail.

10295. What would be the period of transit?—That I do not know. I know nothing connected with the disembarkation of cattle either at Holyhead or Liverpool.

10296. I am not quite sure whether I understood that you would be prepared to maintain the present regulations as regards foot and mouth disease?—Yes, and I would recommend the isolation of fresh purchased stock, and warning the surrounding owners of cattle; and in cases where there is a very large amount of disease I would try the suspension of all movement of cattle for a limited period as an experiment. I believe, myself, that that would stop the disease.

10297. You spoke of isolation; do you think that upon a great many farms isolation is practicable to farmers, in winter, for instance?—It is subject to exceptions as regards farmers holding a limited quantity of land, and to a small man with a couple of fields, or even one field, with two or three cows, it would be a very difficult thing.

10298. How would you make a rule which you would not be prepared to carry out in all cases?—That would be a very difficult thing, unless you were to do that which I do not think I would recommend, namely, have a large field engaged for the purpose.

10299. Then this recommendation of isolation, although you recommend it very strongly to farmers, you do not see your way practically to enforce?—No, not without exceptions.

10300. How could you make numerous exceptions to a general rule?—I am not at all prepared to answer that any more than when in times of cattle plague the order was to bury diseased beasts upon a man's land; you might have said then how could he do that upon a little bit of a field of half an acre perhaps, or less.

10301. Even if the present orders of the Privy Council were rescinded you would have no doubt

about the necessity of continuing foot and mouth disease in the Act, so as to make it illegal to move animals affected with foot and mouth disease along a public highway?—Certainly, as regards any animal affected with a contagious disorder I would make it an offence to move it along a public highway.

10302. The result of your observations, with regard to pleuro-pneumonia, is to lead you to the opinion that the most economical way would be to slaughter out the animals as soon as they were affected?—Yes, that is so.

10303. The same as in the cattle plague?—Yes.

10304. And in order to induce the farmers to report cases of disease, you would give them compensation for the loss of the animals?—Yes, I think it would be necessary to make it known that the compensation should come out of a government fund, or a poll-tax upon cattle. They are suffering from the old plan now, and will for the next 30 years. I may mention that in the orders for the prevention of rinderpest which were lately issued, we found a great difficulty about footpaths; there appears to be no legal power to stop footpaths. Now, in many footpaths going across farms, to have these slink butchers going about, would do a great deal of mischief, and, if it were possible to stop up footpaths, it would be a very great advantage.

10305. What is the rule you have passed in Cheshire, which you wish to make applicable to footpaths?—We were obliged to accept it as it was, because we could not alter it.

10306. What is the regulation you would wish to make?—To stop footpaths.

10307. Would you wish to stop the public from walking across footpaths in infected districts?—Yes, in infected places.

10308. You contemplate the possibility of people walking over infected places carrying the disease from those infected places to some other places?—Yes. I believe that an immense deal of mischief was done during the cattle plague by the slink butchers; they were the birds of prey, and when they found a case of disease had occurred, they would try to purchase the animal; they were always going about to see how they could carry on their trade.

10309. And then they went to look at other animals?—Yes, and it was even said with worse motives; that they walked about for other purposes, but whether they did carry contagion on purpose or not, I cannot say.

10310. Mr. Ridley.] You would not extend that power to ordinary farm occupation roads, would you?—I would, if they were open to the general public; that is to say, if the general public had a right of way, I would.

10311. Do I understand that you have a regular inspection of all fairs and markets in Cheshire?—Frequently; not invariably.

10312. You have a great number of fairs and markets all over the county, have you not?—I do not know that we have more fairs and markets than other counties, in proportion to the size of the county, but we have a large number.

10313. At all these fairs and markets, is there some inspector, either a veterinary inspector or a police inspector, who could see if there was any flagrant case of an animal suffering under infectious disease?—I have tested that occasionally, but I have never been able to discover an animal suffering from pleuro-pneumonia, or foot and mouth disease, in a market.

10314. But

Captain
J. Smith.
19 June
1873.

10314. But if there was an animal in a herd suffering from foot and mouth disease or pleuropneumonia, what would be the proceeding of the local authority?—We should look up the whole stock, and then take proceedings against the owner.

10315. What means would you have for looking up this stock?—We have the power to seize stock and arrest owner.

10316. But what would you do with the animals?—As we have done before; we get some place for the purpose; we fatten them in a field, and so on; we have done that in several cases. We had great trouble with an Irishman not long ago, who went through Cheshire with some cattle; he travelled at night, but we caught him at last, and we brought him before the bench, and he was heavily fined.

10317. Do you meet each month in Cheshire, and report to the adjourned sessions with reference to the number of cases of disease existing in the county?—I do.

10318. In the month of April you are at the lowest?—Yes, as a rule, from April to May, those are the two principal months of minimum.

10319. Do you recollect what your return was of foot and mouth disease last April?—We got down to 32 cases in April 1872, and in April 1873 we had got down to 10 cases.

10320. Have you yet made out the cases for May?—Upon the 7th of June we had only six animals under treatment for foot and mouth disease; that is the lowest number we have ever had during the last three years and ten months.

10321. And you attribute that distinctly to the fact that no fresh cattle have been recently brought in?—I will not say that.

10322. Cattle are mostly brought into Cheshire during the month of April, are they not?—It is usual to do so.

10323. Notwithstanding that, there has been a decrease of foot and mouth disease?—There has been a great decrease; but then I think other causes must operate upon foot and mouth disease, and I think science should be able to tell us sooner or later something about it. I think it must go with the weather, that winter and summer must have some effect upon it. There was one gentleman who advanced the theory that rain and evaporation accounts for the decrease of the disease; if so, it would not account for the decrease last year, because last year we had more rain and less evaporation than any other year of late, and yet we had more foot and mouth disease.

10324. With regard to disinfection, have you carried out any orders for the purpose of seeing that railway trucks are properly disinfected?—No, it is a duty which is quite impossible for the police to perform.

10325. Are you not aware that it is done in the county of Northumberland by an inspector who travels about for the purpose?—No, but that is the only way in which the matter can be done; it must be done within 24 hours after the use of the truck.

10326. But if successful prosecutions had been instituted against such parties you would not say it could not be done?—That is proof of it.

10327. In the cases you have investigated, of the spread of foot and mouth disease from any particular centre, have you been able to form an opinion whether any of those cases have arisen from the cattle travelling in dirty trucks?—I could not say that.

- 058.

10328. Would you attach importance to the rigid carrying out of the transit orders of the Privy Council?—I cannot answer that question as regards railways.

10329. Have you formed an opinion with reference to whether it is worth while for the county to pay an inspector for the purpose of seeing that those orders are carried out. As far as your experience goes, does it lead you to think that it is worth while?—I do not think it would, if the inspector's jurisdiction were confined to Cheshire alone, because the railways lead out of Cheshire on all sides; we are interested in Cheshire by railways on all sides; I do not think a comparison between Northumberland and Cheshire would be a fair way to test that, because the latter county is a main artery of communication between Ireland and London. When we lately anticipated the possibility of rinderpest coming, the local authority stopped cattle being brought into Cheshire from Yorkshire and Lincolnshire; the police tried to effect it; we had 61 stations, but if cattle dealers chose they could run the cattle to Manchester or Liverpool, or any surrounding counties, and then run them into Cheshire, and then they would not be any longer cattle from Lincolnshire or Yorkshire. We know what cattle dealers will do, and it would take all the police of the county to watch 61 stations day and night.

10330. Mr. W. Johnston.] Cheshire has been unfortunately one of the counties in England in which various forms of cattle diseases have prevailed, has it not?—Yes, very much so.

10331. The disease has been imported from Ireland very much, I believe?—It has.

10332. Have you the statistics of the importation of cattle from Ireland?—I have not.

10333. Is there a direct importation into Cheshire from Ireland?—Yes, by Liverpool and Holyhead.

10334. Have you any statistics of the number of calves sent over to Ireland?—I have not.

10335. Are you aware that calves are sent to Ireland from Cheshire?—I am not aware of that.

10336. We have had evidence before this Committee that a good deal of disease has arisen in Ireland from calves imported from Cheshire?—I do not know of a case.

10337. You do not know of any case of the exportation of calves from Cheshire to Ireland?—I never heard of such a case.

10338. Mr. Jacob Bright.] Have you formed any opinion as to what would be the effect upon cattle disease at home by the exclusion of foreign cattle?—I have considered the question, as a matter of course. I have considered that it would throw great difficulties and great impediments in the way of trade.

10339. In what way would it throw difficulties in the way of trade?—By stopping importation, for the meat market especially.

10340. Of course, if you stop importation, that would put a stop to the trade; but what is your opinion of the effect which would be produced upon disease in cattle at home by the stoppage of all continental trade; do you believe that to stop continental trade would be a good means of reducing or of getting rid altogether of disease at home?—I do not think it would be possible to do without continental trade for meat market.

10341. Admitting that it were a possibility that we could exclude absolutely all continental cattle; do you think it likely that we should en-

Captain
J. Smith.
—
19 June
1875.

joy immunity from disease at home?—We should enjoy immunity from rinderpest and cattle plague, and we should enjoy immunity, as far as Ireland is concerned, from foot and mouth disease.

10342. Do you believe, with regard to pleuropneumonia, foot and mouth disease, and other diseases which have been very fully spoken of here, that we should be almost free from those diseases in Great Britain and Ireland if we had no intercourse with the Continent?—No, I should say not. I think the disease is in a stage in which it is very apt to reappear in this country even without any further importation.

10343. You think that the disease, in fact, is indigenous in this country?—Yes, I think foot and mouth disease especially is now.

10344. And pleuro-pneumonia?—Yes, and pleuro pneumonia. Pleuro-pneumonia has been known many years, and foot and mouth disease is only the return of a disease which was known years ago in the country.

10345. What was that disease?—It was the same disease, known as foot and mouth disease.

10346. At what period was that?—I am not prepared to say.

10347. But you think that the notion, that to exclude foreign cattle, would make us free from disease is Utopian?—I do not think that to exclude the importation of continental cattle would free us from foot and mouth disease or pleuro-pneumonia.

10348. You stated that it appeared to you that rinderpest had disappeared from Cheshire, as I understand, and probably from the whole country, but certainly from Cheshire, very much as cholera disappeared?—Yes.

10349. That is to say, that the disease and the poleaxe killed a certain number, and then the county was free again?—Yes, just so.

10350. But if rinderpest had disappeared as cholera disappeared, it would have disappeared without the poleaxe at all, only not quite so soon; that is to say, if you are right in comparing its disappearance with the disappearance of cholera, there, even without any compulsory slaughter, the rinderpest would have disappeared?—I think it might have done that, but that would have been at the cost of the greater part of the cattle. But with regard to cholera we have remedial measures, and, as a matter of course, save many lives, but we have no remedial measures with regard to rinderpest.

10351. You say we have remedial measures; do you think the remedial measures applied to human beings are very superior to those applied to cattle?—I think so.

10352. Some professional men apply remedies which the greater portion of the profession maintain are all bumbling?—I quite agree with that; I should like to mention that the only grievance which I have heard from farmers in connection with the Orders in Council, is the want of power to inspectors to do what they do upon the appearance of disease, which is to declare a place infected. I think it would be well if power were given to inspectors to declare a place disinfected also, because it is quite possible that in a county like Cheshire, where there are 5,000 or 6,000 cases a week, there are places where it would be impossible for the Committee to declare those places disinfected, therefore I think if inspectors had the power to declare those places disinfected, or if the local authority had the power to depute it to inspectors to declare a place disinfected,

subject perhaps to their after approval, that would be a very great advantage; it is the only grievance; I know that it would be impossible for the Committee to carry that out, unless they sat every day, and hence the grievance of a farm being kept as infected many days after the period when it ought to be declared disinfected, or free from infection.

10353. Mr. O'Connor.] I think you stated that you found the stoppage of fairs and markets of no use?—Yes, of no use whatever; the private sales counteracted it. During the time that we stopped fairs and markets, they sold 5,000 cattle, sheep, and swine.

10354. And cattle were moved about from place to place?—Yes, cattle were moved about from place to place after the sales; we prevented their congregating upon one farm cattle from various owners.

10355. You stated that you would not recommend such an extreme measure as the stoppage of all movement except when the disease was very prevalent indeed?—Except it is very prevalent indeed; and then I think it is an experiment well worth trying.

10356. You stated that you get a great number of diseased cattle from Ireland; is it not the fact that almost the great bulk of your cattle come from Ireland?—They do, the great bulk of them.

10357. It does not follow that they bring the disease from Ireland, but the great bulk of cattle being Irish cattle, when they are brought into Cheshire it is quite possible that they will contract the disease in Cheshire?—The animals are sold so soon after their arrival that the disease is more likely to be brought from Ireland than contracted in Cheshire, and the price has gone up so, that where we used to buy a cow for 10*l*, now we cannot get it for anything like that price.

10358. It has been said that there is much more disease in Cheshire than in Ireland; would it not be quite probable or more likely that the cattle imported into Cheshire caught the disease there, where the disease was prevalent, than that they caught it in Ireland, where the disease was not so prevalent?—That is a possibility, provided that they get away free from Ireland, but they are generally sold so very soon after they arrive, that I think the presumption is clear that they bring the disease with them from Ireland.

10359. You have no proof that these Irish cattle were affected with foot and mouth disease immediately upon their arrival?—Several cases that I have recorded prove that the animals had just arrived.

10360. But as a general rule, if you find a herd of cattle which have originally come from Ireland catch the disease, you immediately say that this disease came from Ireland, because the cattle came from Ireland?—The animals are sold as soon as they possibly can be, and hence the presumption.

10361. Cattle coming to Cheshire are immediately set down as bringing the disease from Ireland without any strict investigation as to where they caught it, but being Irish cattle you assume that they brought the disease from Ireland?—I assume it generally, because the disease appears after their purchase.

10362. Mr. Clay.] It has been stated that if the trade in live cattle between this country and the Continent were altogether stopped, it would

not raise the price of meat; is that your opinion?—We could not do without live cattle from the Continent for the meat market.

10363. Mr. Cusley.] I think you stated that you have satisfied yourself that in those particular cases the cattle from Ireland had not had the opportunity of taking the disease between the time of their being landed and their being sold in Cheshire?—Not to my knowledge; they were sold immediately after arrival.

10364. The disease in those cases was brought by the cattle, and from the time the disease broke out you inferred that they could not have caught the disease in the market, or between the market and the farm?—I do not think they could, and I should apply that more particularly in Irish cattle to cases of pleuro-pneumonia than of foot and mouth disease.

10365. Foot and mouth disease being developed more rapidly than in pleuro-pneumonia?—It is so very immediate in its appearance.

10366. In answer to a question put to you as to whether you agreed that the larger portion of the diseased cattle sent into Manchester and Salford came from Cheshire, I think you alluded to the slink butchers?—I think those are the only people who would do a thing like that.

10367. I think I also heard you say something with reference to dressing cattle?—We have caught them in several cases dressing diseased cattle.

10368. In that case it is the meat which is smuggled, not the carcass?—Not the live animal.

10369. What would have been your answer with reference to the amount of cattle coming to the Salford and Cheshire markets?—I do not think that you could get more than three or four cases a year of diseased animals being taken from Cheshire to the Salford market.

10370. But you think it is quite possible that slink butchers may get in a diseased carcass?—I do.

10371. With regard to footpaths, would you really accomplish anything unless you stopped the footpaths entirely through a farm?—I would stop them, except for the owner's use alone, during the time the farm was an infected place, as regarded cattle plague.

10372. But in order to accomplish anything you must make that absolute throughout the county, to stop all footpaths running through any part of one farm which was infected?—You must.

10373. You say that the slink butcher is travelling about seeking for diseased places; if he is travelling about upon public footpaths, is it not natural that he should enter a farm which is not infected?—It is a very important matter to deal with them, and keep them from infected farms.

10374. You want to shut out a man who has infection about him from the free farms?—I do, but if he is kept away from infected farms he can do no possible mischief in non-infected farms.

10375. Mr. Clay.] Supposing you could shut up these footpaths as you wish, do you imagine the restrictions would be effective, unless you kept policemen, or some men or other, constantly upon the watch to prevent persons going in with the disease?—In the event of an attack of cattle plague, I would have the footpath surrounded by a cordon of police, besides calling on the owner to assist.

0.58.

10376. Would not that be a very expensive plan to carry out?—It would be expensive, but it would be safer in the end, and cheaper also.

10377. Mr. Knapp.] You stated that foot and mouth disease and pleuro-pneumonia were epidemics, that is to say, you could not trace their origin or spread?—Foot and mouth disease, I think, has become a regular epidemic in the country.

10378. You think that it is indigenous?—Yes.

10379. You stated afterwards, that if all import from Ireland were stopped, Cheshire would enjoy immunity from disease?—If I said "immunity," I could not have intended to convey immunity altogether; it would cut off one source of disease from us.

10380. You think that the stoppage of all import from Ireland would not secure you from disease altogether?—No, not altogether; it would cut off one source of disease.

10381. You mentioned 16 cases of cattle having come from Ireland; you can give the particulars of each of those cases, can you not?—No, I can give you the heading of each case only.

10382. I should like to know them?—Upon the 1st of December 1871, a lot of Irish cattle were bought, and foot and mouth disease appeared upon the farm of the Honorable Edward Kenyon immediately after purchase.

10383. Who brought these cattle?—An Irish cattle dealer whose name is not here.

10384. I should like to get the name, if you could get it?—I could get it, if you so wish it.

10385. How long was it, after these cattle were sold by the dealer, that the disease broke out?—I could not answer any of the details of those cases in that way, either as to names or anything else, because they are taken from the books, as a mere summary of evidence.

10386. If you cannot state the time that elapsed from the time of purchase till the disease broke out, how do you know that those cattle brought over the disease from Ireland?—From inquiries made and information obtained.

10387. You must know how long it was since those cattle were landed in England?—I could have ascertained all that, but I have only got the heading of the different cases; I have not got the details.

10388. You are satisfied that these cattle were really landed in a diseased state from Ireland?—I could not be prepared to swear that, but as soon as they are landed they are sold, and it is from being sold as soon as they come over from Ireland, that we think they bring the disease to us; if the cattle had been any time in Cheshire, it might have been said they caught the disease in Cheshire.

10389. But you are not prepared to say that they came over from Ireland diseased?—We know nothing about the port of disembarkation in any one case.

10390. Is it not rather hard to give Ireland the credit of it if you cannot absolutely say that the disease is not caught in England?—I cannot go beyond my own knowledge.

10391. Still your accusation against Ireland is rather a sweeping one, that we supply you with all the foot and mouth disease and pleuro-pneumonia which you have?—I corrected myself upon that point. I say that it is one source of our danger, but I have said also that I believe it is indigenous now.

3 H 4

10392. You

Captain
J. Smith.
19 June
1873

Captain
J. Smith.
19 June
1873.

10392. You believe it to be a great source of your danger?—Yes, I may say the chief source.

10393. In the other cases have you got the particulars more definitely than in the case you gave me, or are you in a position to prove that those cattle were diseased when they were landed?—I could not give you the slightest proof of that from the document in my hand.

10394. You stated that within the last few years, three years I think you stated, foot and mouth disease had increased very much in Cheshire?—Yes.

10395. Notwithstanding the increased strictness?—Notwithstanding that.

10396. You referred to a circular which you circulated, and you stated I think that the farmers voluntarily adopted the restrictions you suggested?—Yes, they did to a certain extent.

10397. The restriction was that all cattle newly bought should be isolated for 10 days?—Yes, that was only a recommendation; I had only power to do it as a recommendation, and I believe the farmers did carry it out, but there was no compulsion upon them to do so.

10398. But still you believe that the recommendation was carried out?—I do to a certain extent.

10399. If that recommendation was carried out, would that not prove that the disease could not well have come from Ireland, if every new head of stock from Ireland was isolated for 10 days?—If that was done in all cases it would go very far to prove that the disease could not arise from Irish purchases.

10400. How long ago was it that you recommended the isolation?—This circular is dated 1872.

10401. And notwithstanding that that recommendation was issued in 1872, from 1872 to 1873 the disease was very bad?—Very bad indeed.

10402. Can you tell the Committee how the general supply from Ireland comes into Cheshire?—By road and rail from Liverpool and Holyhead chiefly; those are the chief ports of disembarkation of Irish cattle for Cheshire.

10403. Do they come direct from Liverpool into Cheshire without stopping any time or going anywhere?—That is again a question I could not answer.

10404. Is it not the fact, or have I been wrongly informed, that the animals are very frequently driven through Wales before they are offered for sale in Cheshire?—I should say not, and if they were, there is less disease in Wales than in any other part of Great Britain, so much so that there was hardly a single case of cattle plague in Wales; whether it was attributable to the elevation of the country or not, I do not know, but it does not apply to Wales.

10405. Perhaps you are aware that we had only one case of cattle plague in Ireland?—I am aware that there were very few cases.

10406. Is there a distinctive difference between Irish and Welsh cattle, so that on looking at a beast, you could say this animal is an Irish animal, or this is a Welsh animal?—Any dealer could tell that at once.

10407. The difference of appearance is so marked?—I think so, generally. I could in many cases tell myself, although I do not profess to have any general knowledge upon that point.

10408. You are not in a position to state whether all the cattle which come from Ireland

come directly from the ports at which they are landed into Cheshire?—I know nothing about that.

10409. So that the animals may go elsewhere and contract the disease upon the road?—They must pass through us, certainly; they must pass through Cheshire, unless they go the Manchester way, and then they go upon the border of Cheshire.

10410. But still they do not always come directly to Cheshire from the port of landing?—No, they do not always, but they do generally.

10411. I think you stated that you could hardly account for the fact why Cheshire suffers more than almost any other county from disease?—I cannot.

10412. You do not think that the farmers in Cheshire are at all careless with reference to the sanitary arrangements about their stock?—No, I do not think so, more than other counties. I have no reason to think so myself.

10413. Are their homesteads as close as in other parts of England?—I should say so. I have not the same knowledge of other counties in farm matters as I have of Cheshire, but I have never observed anything of that kind. There must be something peculiar to Cheshire, but I do not know what.

10414. It is more of course a dairy county?—It is one of the great dairy counties of England.

10415. And necessarily the cattle are tied up in sheds?—Yes, but there is this peculiarity, that during the time the cattle are tied up the disease seems to be at its minimum; during the winter months.

10416. Of course there must be a great many calves born in Cheshire?—Yes, as a matter of course.

10417. You do not know what becomes of these calves?—I do not know, but a question was asked with reference to the trade with Ireland; I never heard of Cheshire sending over calves for sale to Ireland, any more than sending horses; it is very rare if it is done.

10418. Of course something must be done with the calves?—No doubt, but the calves do not satisfy the requirements of the farmers themselves, and so we purchase foreign stock, and sell the calves for meat.

10419. Is it the habit of Cheshire farmers to rear their own calves?—Yes, to some extent, but they send a large number to Liverpool and Manchester for the meat market.

10420. I have been told that a great many are brought into Ireland?—I am not prepared to say that, for I never heard of a case.

10421. You stated that you also attributed to Ireland the blame of giving Cheshire a great deal of pleuro-pneumonia?—I believe that.

10422. Do you know whether pleuro-pneumonia has been at all prevalent in Ireland?—According to the statistics it has, and according to the statistics I have received from the Veterinary Department; Professor Brown told me that Ireland was teeming with pleuro-pneumonia at one time.

10423. With regard to the liability to disease which you admit exists in Cheshire, have you ever heard it attributed to the fact that dairy-men force too much milk as they say out of the cows, that is to say, they milk them too much, and injure the cattle by that means?—No, I never heard such a thing mooted?—I think I should have heard it if it had been a common topic at all.

10424. [Cheshire.]

Captain
J. Smith.
19 June
1873.

10424. *Chairman.*] Have you had any difficulty at all in your prosecutions in proving a knowledge of the disease on the part of the person sending the cattle?—Not the least, because in every case where it is not admitted by the owner, a veterinary surgeon is invariably employed to give me a certificate of the fact of the disease. That is produced before the magistrates. I never allow policemen to give evidence of disease before magistrates.

10425. The Act says, if he could not with reasonable diligence have obtained knowledge of his cattle becoming diseased?—That is always a fact left for the decision of the magistrates in hearing a case.

10426. Have you ever had a conviction fail in consequence of that?—Yes, convictions have failed in consequence of the magistrates believing that the owner could not reasonably have known of the existence of the disease.

10427. In cases of foot and mouth disease, as well as pleuro-pneumonia?—Yes, both.

10428. Do you believe in the spontaneous origin of those diseases?—I do; I believe they are very much like cholera and other diseases which visit us, and we know very little about their diseases; they travel with the atmosphere. I believe that there are atmospheric causes which we do not seem to understand. I believe that is one cause of those diseases coming and going.

10429. That would point to the facility and stupidity of all restrictions?—The only way to test that is to do away with them and see what the result would be.

10430. We never had those restrictions until 1819 in the case of foot and mouth disease, and we never had so much of it as we had last year?—But you could not possibly make the deduction that restrictions would add to the disease; that would be an impossibility. It must have been that it would be possible to reduce the amount of disease but not to increase it.

10431. But if your principle is right that these are simply epidemics over which we have no sort of control, I should have thought that all the expense and trouble you have been to in Cheshire was wrong from the beginning?—What I spoke of was the coming and going of these diseases. I believe they come and go in the atmosphere, but I do not think that supersedes the necessity of having rules to govern them when they are here.

10432. You think that these diseases are produced by contagion, which you cannot trace?—Yes; I could give cases in which there was no apparent possibility of contagion, and where foot and mouth disease, pleuro-pneumonia, and cattle plague have appeared.

10433. Have you ever known cases breaking out upon a farm, either of foot and mouth disease or of pleuro-pneumonia, or of cattle plague, where the disease was not known in the district

within a radius of 10 miles?—Yes, certainly it has appeared beyond 10 miles. I am not prepared to give you a case, but I have no doubt there have been cases in which it has been a greater distance away than 10 miles.

10434. It has been in the district?—It has been in the country. When the district was surrounded we did not get any cattle plague into Wales.

10435. But you never sent any cattle there?—Cattle were travelling else by.

10436. Are you not aware that Wales is like the remote parts of Ireland, and does not import any cattle?—They may communicate it one to the other; that is the way it was carried through Cheshire and on to other counties; it is communicated from farm to farm, and so might have been into Wales.

10437. *Mr. Barclay.*] Was there not an Order in Council prohibiting the import of cattle into Wales?—I do not recollect that.

10438. *Chairman.*] Some counties entirely isolated themselves, did they not?—I do not recollect that; but the elevation alone prevents the cattle plague from going into Wales, in my opinion.

10439. *Mr. Peff.*] You know the fable of the Wolf and the Lamb, the lamb being below the stream and the wolf above; is it not the fact that the disease cannot go up a stream, and that as regards Wales, cattle are constantly coming out of Wales, but never going into it; is not that really the case?—I do not think that that would be susceptible of proof. I know gentlemen, who live in Wales, who get cattle from England often.

10440. They would be great shorthorn breeders. I do not whether Lord Penrhyn has any of his thoroughbreds at his Welsh place, if so, he might be taking some from Northamptonshire, but as a rule there is no store stock taken into Wales?—There is no cattle trade into Wales except the owners of lands import cattle into their own estates. I could give many cases of that; Flintshire and Denbighshire import many English cattle.

10441. *Chairman.*] Flintshire had the cattle plague, had it not?—Only just upon the borders, but not beyond the borders, but Flintshire is a flat country like Cheshire, to a great extent.

10442. *Mr. Ridley.*] Is it not the fact that the Flintshire dealers come to the Cheshire markets to buy cattle?—Yes, sometimes.

10443. Was there cattle plague in Flintshire?—In some parts of Flintshire. I cannot speak with accuracy with respect to Flintshire; but speaking of Wales generally, cattle plague was almost unknown; that was attributed generally by scientific people to elevation, and the disease did not get beyond the borders of England; Flintshire, as a matter of course, is almost in England; indeed, one portion of it being on the Cheshire side of the River Dee.

Thursday, 26th June 1873.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mr. James Barclay.
Mr. Jacob Bright.
Mr. Collins.
Mr. Cavley.
Mr. Clay.
Mr. Dent.

Mr. Dodson.
Mr. William Edward Forster.
Mr. Kaymah.
Mr. O'Connor.
Mr. Pell.
Mr. Clare Read.

THE RIGHT HONOURABLE WILLIAM EDWARD FORSTER, IN THE CHAIR.

Mr. WILLIAM CLODE, called again; and further Examined.

Mr.
W. Clode.
—
26 June
1873.

10444. *Chairman*] I HAVE called you chiefly on account of one or two answers which you gave to the honourable Member for Norfolk, with reference to the cost of the Veterinary Department in comparison with other offices; you say that Dr. Farr, the superintendent of statistics, has about 800*l.* a year; is it Dr. Farr's business to advise any Department of the Government as to what may be called discretion, or is his office the very important office of superintending statistics?—His office proper is that of superintending the Statistical Department of the General Register Office; but in consequence of his great experience and special qualifications he is frequently called upon to give advice upon various matters to other departments.

10445. You are aware, I suppose, that one great business of the Veterinary Department is considering whether, and to what extent, the trade of the country should be interfered with?—Yes.

10446. And I suppose you are aware that it is the business of the secretary to be informed upon that point, and to advise the political officers of the Government?—No doubt.

10447. I suppose I am right in saying such advice as that requiring immediate action does not fall upon Dr. Farr?—Advice of quite as much importance is required of him.

10448. I am not asking about the question of importance, but I am asking about advice which requires immediate action, such as whether an order should be issued affecting the price of food in London?—I am not aware.

10449. I understood you to state, in answer to Question 8423, "Do you think that, as a general rule, throughout the whole of the Government offices, the officers of the Privy Council Department are paid more highly than those of other departments?" that "they are not paid more highly than a certain class of departments which are understood to be of the first class, such as the Home Office, the Foreign Office, the House of Commons, and so on; but as regards the general offices of the middle class, they are decidedly higher;" what do you allude to there?—I state, as a matter of fact, that they do receive higher salaries than the officers and clerks in many of those other offices.

10450. What officers of the Privy Council Department are you alluding to?—Excluding the central office, I am alluding more particularly to the secretary, the chief clerk, and other clerks of the Veterinary Department.

10451. As regards the secretary, I have asked you a question with regard to his duty; now, with regard to the chief clerk, will you inform me in what offices chief clerks are paid on a lower scale?—The clerks in my own office, the Registrar General's office, are paid lower salaries.

10452. What are the first-class clerks in the Veterinary Department paid?—The first-class clerks have a minimum of 250*l.*, rising 15*l.* a year to 400*l.*

10453. What are your senior clerks paid, of which I see there are 14?—They are paid a minimum of 300*l.*, rising 15*l.* a year to 450*l.*

10454. It does not appear to me that that's lower?—If you will allow me I will endeavour to prove that it is lower.

10455. You think that the duties are more important?—No; the actual remuneration, without reference to duties, is relatively higher in the Veterinary Department of the Privy Council than in many other Departments.

10456. You think that a minimum of 200*l.*, rising to 400*l.*, is higher than a minimum of 250*l.*, rising to 450*l.*?—Yes, under the circumstances.

10457. Why is that so?—The figures, regarded by themselves, would seem to refute my statement; but those who have had an opportunity of making statistical analysis a branch of study, are well aware of the danger of drawing conclusions from figures alone, without considering the collateral circumstances. It is necessary to bear in mind the length of time the office has been in existence.

10458. I do not think we can go into that question. I understood you to state that you consider the payment now to be relatively higher?—Yes. But I think it is necessary, to establish my point, that I should make certain explanations, which I will do, with your permission. May I be allowed to state that it takes an average of from 15 to 20 years to get into the senior class in my office, whereas the senior clerks of the Veterinary Office have come into their posi-

Mr.
W. Clode.
—
of June
1873.

den almost immediately. The question is not whether 420*l.* is a higher salary than 400*l.*, but whether a maximum salary of 420*l.* deferred from 20 to 25 years, is not of less value than one of 400*l.* which is enjoyed almost immediately.

10459. I understand you that the fact of your office having been long established, and of there having been a great deal of work in it, is a reason why there should be a higher salary?—I think so.

10460. Now, you were comparing your office with the Local Government Board; what is the payment of a first-class clerk in the Local Government Board?—The payment of first-class clerks in the Local Government Board is 400*l.*, rising 20*l.* to 600*l.*

10461. And the Board of Trade?—The salary of a first-class clerk commences at 525*l.*, rising 25*l.* a year to a maximum of 800*l.*

10462. And a second-class clerk?—£400, rising 20*l.* a year to 600*l.*

10463. I have already asked you the salary of the first-class clerks in the Veterinary Department, which commences at 250*l.*, rising 20*l.* to 400*l.*?—Yes; but under circumstances which are not comparable with those of other departments.

10464. With regard to your answer to Question 3407, you stated "Dr. Williams, the secretary of that department, thought it advisable to have my report set up in different type from that in which it had been prepared and printed." Upon what do you rest that statement?—Upon the fact that he did so.

10465. Will you refer to the mode in which he did that?—I prepared my report in conformity with plans which I submitted to the then secretary of the department, Colonel Harness, which plans were approved by the then Lord President of the Council, and the report was commenced upon that basis. I completed it, and that is my report as completed (*producing a volume*).

10466. But where is the statement that Dr. Williams thought it advisable that your report should be set out in a different type?—He did not say so, but he carried it out in fact, as I shall show.

10467. I suppose you are not aware of the fact that it was the Stationery Department that required that the report should be set up in a different type?—I was not aware of that fact.

10468. I am informed that the reason why it was set up in a different type was, because the Stationery Department determined that it should be done so, in order to prevent the precedent of that type for that kind of report or return being established in future?—There are plenty of specimens of that kind of type, of which I can show you examples.

10469. Mr. Barclay.] What I understood you to say in regard to the senior clerks in the office is, that if a clerk reaches a salary of 400*l.* in five years you would consider that he is more highly paid than if he reaches a salary of 450*l.* in 25 years?—Yes, I consider so.

10470. Mr. Clode Read.] How long do you say a clerk is in reaching the highest pay in your office?—It takes about 25 years to attain the maximum salary of the senior class, 420*l.*; and there are clerks in that class who have been over 30 years in the service.

10471. What do you say is the extent of the pay which these clerks receive as a maximum?—£420, and my point is, that 420*l.* a-year is a

deferred for the before mentioned number of years is a lower rate of salary than 400*l.* which the clerks of the Veterinary Department come into within a far less number of years.

10472. Chairman.] I suppose you are aware that in organizing the office and arranging the payment you have to consider what the duties of the clerks would be?—Yes; that is one element.

10473. It ought to be a very important element?—It is not the sole element.

10474. But where there is an office which must be naturally divided into three branches, you put at the head of each branch a clerk?—Yes.

10475. And would you not consider the duties which that clerk would have to perform, and in considering that, would you not consider the duties he did perform?—I should consider the duties which the clerk would have to perform; but I should also consider the time he had been in the service.

10476. But would you not consider that if the office was a new one, the duties would have to be performed at once, and performed skilfully; and you would be obliged to have the knowledge and the ability to take charge of a room at once, and that, consequently, you would be obliged to put this gentleman in a position at once, which would, in a long-established office, only be acquired after several years standing?—I should not expect to find the necessary knowledge and experience in a newly-appointed clerk.

10477. Mr. Clode Read.] What do the three first-class clerks receive in the Veterinary Department?—£400, is the maximum of the class.

10478. What is the difference between a first-class clerk and a chief clerk?—A chief clerk has the control of the clerical work of the entire department, but a senior clerk is a clerk who has obtained the rank by reason of long service and experience, and he has certain specified duties to perform without troubling himself with the duties of anyone else.

10479. Have you such a thing as a chief clerk in your office?—No; there is a secretary, and the heads of departments are called superintendents.

10480. Chairman.] I suppose you are aware that none of the first-class clerks in the Veterinary Department have at present reached their maximum?—I am aware of that.

10481. Mr. Clode Read.] I wish to ask you a question or two with reference to your report; do you think that Dr. Williams was justified in delaying the publication of the report for three years?—I do not think he was justified.

10482. You say he went to the expense of reprinting it?—That expense was incurred unnecessarily, I think.

10483. What is the difference between your report and Dr. Williams's report, as represented by the three years' delay?—My report substantially was brought up to the end of the year 1866. That time was fixed because it was believed, when the orders were given to me, that the cattle plague would be at an end at that time; therefore, the Tables were completed up to that period. But subsequently there were certain fitful outbreaks of this disease, and I embodied all such outbreaks as occurred up to the time of my leaving the Department, in a Supplemental Table. Subsequently to that, there were 195 attacks which Dr. Williams added to my report.

10484. How much is there of Dr. Williams's,

Mr.
W. Clode.
—
26 June
1873.

and how much of yours, with regard to the first part of it?—About 30 pages of Dr. Williams's.

10485. Out of how many?—Out of 234.

10486. *Chairman.*] When were you directed to prepare that report?—In the autumn of 1866.

10487. Was any Minute sent to you in reference to that matter in 1867?—Yes, there was.

10488. Did that Minute state that it was the opinion of the chiefs of the Veterinary Department that the report should be confined to bare statistical statements?—Yes.

10489. Was the report confined to bare statistical statements?—As far as it well could be.

10490. Just referring now to page 28, do you consider the statement of what William of Malmesbury said, a statistical statement? I will read it: "This county, so long noted for its excellent pasture, is thus alluded to by William Camden, the distinguished topographer and Clarenceux King of Arms, in his well-known account of Britain: 'This county, as William of Malmesbury saith, is scarce of corns, but especially with wheat, yet plentiful of cattails and fishes,' and so on?—That was interesting information. It was not objectionable, in my opinion.

10491. It was certainly not objectionable; but am I not right in stating that this was the Memorandum that was sent: "It has been today decided, that the Tables shall be in such a form as will give as much information as possible on the face of them, and that any remarks Mr. Clode may wish to make shall be as short as possible, and shall be confined to bare statistical statements, leaving the reader to draw his own inferences from them." That was dated the 19th of March 1867?—But I had nearly six months prior to that received instructions to prepare my report.

10492. Have you got with you your first directions to prepare that report?—I have not; it is many years since I left the Department. I have no opportunity of referring to the official papers.

10493. *Mr. Barchy.*] What were the instructions, so far as you recollect?—About the end of July, when it became a question whether the usual quarterly report should be prepared or not, I expressed to Colonel Harness my opinion that it should not be published but that, in lieu of it, a report embracing the whole period of the outbreak should be prepared, and printed. He asked me to submit to him plans of that report, and I did so. He referred those plans to the Lord President, and they were approved of; and upon that basis I continued my report, until I received, on 19th March 1867, other instructions from Dr. Williams.

10494. You intended to give a brief history of the disease for the whole period that you hoped it was to last in this country?—Yes.

10495. *Chairman.*] What were your directions to do?—My directions were to prepare a statistical report of the cattle plague from the time it commenced up to the end of year 1866.

10496. Have you got the terms of that direction with you?—No, I have not.

10497. *Mr. Clare Read.*] This report gave a brief outline of the progress and extent of the cattle plague in various counties in England?—Yes, it did.

10498. Was that report ever published?—It was never published; it was partly reprinted and appended by Dr. Williams to his report, which embraces less than three pages of matter.

10499. I believe that would have been an exceedingly valuable contribution at the time that it was written; but, of course, it was very little use three years afterwards?—Such was my hope. I think that the limitation of my duties at that stage was an unjustifiable proceeding upon the part of Dr. Williams.

10500. *Chairman.*] Do you consider that it was Dr. Williams's limitation?—Practically so. Of course it came forward as the act of the Lord President; but it is not unusual for the chief of a department to act on the recommendation of the secretary.

10501. Do you suppose that a Minute which was necessarily signed by Dr. Williams, as the secretary of the department, purporting to emanate from the political head of the department, was not issued with their knowledge and under their order?—It was certainly done with their knowledge, and I believe on the recommendation of the secretary.

10502. It is a very strong charge to make against the secretary, that what he conveys is the organ of his political chiefs is his doing and not their doing; what reason have you for that statement?—I presume that he made certain recommendations. These Minutes were inconsistent with previous instructions which I had received from the predecessor of Dr. Williams.

10503. *Mr. Karsaugh.*] With regard to the salaries, which you have mentioned, of the different officers, do you consider that the clerks in the Veterinary Department of the Privy Council are too highly paid?—I do not consider that the clerks in the Veterinary Department of the Privy Council are too highly paid. I merely stated that as compared with clerks in other offices they are more highly paid.

10494. Do you consider that the other clerks are too stingily paid?—I consider that in a number of instances they are.

MR. ALEXANDER WILLIAMS, called again; and further Examined.

Mr.
A. Williams.
—

10505. *Chairman.*] WERE you in the Privy Council Office in November 1866?—I was.

10506. What position did you hold; were you Secretary then?—I was re-appointed Secretary upon the 27th of November.

10507. I see there is a letter, signed by Mr. E. Harrison, on the 23rd of November 1866; he signed that as deputy clerk of the Council, did he not?—Yes, as deputy clerk of the Council.

10508. At that time, that was the firm in which the orders of the Lord President were conveyed?—Upon money matters, or anything connected with expenditure.

10509. I believe that, in that letter, there is something with regard to the Return, which Mr. Clode is requested to prepare?—Yes. "The Lord President is informed that Mr. Clode (who has been temporarily transferred to the department under Colonel Harness from the office

office of the Registrar General) is now superintending the correction of the returns which have been published with a view to the preparation and publication of our general and final return, showing, first, 'The state of the disease in each county for each week since the outbreak of the cattle plague; and, second, the total loss from the disease in each petty sessional division of the country.'"

10510. Is there any other official letter with regard to this Return, until the Minute upon the 19th of March 1867?—None, that I am aware of.

10511. It was first mentioned as a Return; how did it come to be considered as a Report?—That I believe was introduced by Mr. Clode; as far as I know, I gave no authority for it.

10512. There is a Minute of the 19th of March 1867; will you just read it (*handing the note to the Witness*)?—"Referring to the statistics relating to the cattle plague, now in course of preparation by Mr. Clode, it is proposed that the Tables shall be in such a form as will give as much information as possible on the face of them, and that any remarks which Mr. Clode may wish to make shall be as short as possible, and shall be confined to have statistical statements, leaving the reader to draw his own inference from them. It is proposed that Professor Simonds and Professor Brown be called upon to draw up a joint Report on the disease generally, and on the present outbreak more particularly. The Secretary then proposes to preface these reports with some general remarks, and to embody the whole in a Report to the Lords of the Council." This was submitted to the Lords of the Council upon the 19th of March, and a Minute is added by the Duke of Marlborough: "Reports not to be too lengthy. Approved, Marlborough."

10513. Then I think the Duke of Marlborough took that into consideration, and that was what he instructed you to do?—Yes, very carefully; with Lord Robert Montagu, I believe it was.

Mr. ANTHONY GEORGE ROBINSON, called in; and Examined.

10524. Mr. Clode Read.] I BELIEVE you are largely interested in the import of foreign cattle?—I am.

10525. And have been in the trade for many years?—Yes.

10526. Are you an importer from Portugal, of foreign cattle?—Yes, I am.

10527. Are you a carrier from Germany, Holland, and Russia?—Yes.

10528. How long have you been engaged in that trade?—Since the import of foreign cattle was permitted, or very soon afterwards.

10529. You have had very considerable experience in the import of foreign cattle, have you not?—Yes.

10530. Do you know anything about the countries from which we import foreign cattle?—Yes, I do.

10531. What is your opinion with reference to the increase that we may expect from Europe of foreign cattle?—My opinion is that, except from Russia, you can expect very little increase.

10532. Why is that?—The increase of con-

10514. Why was the Report, together with the Returns sent in by Mr. Clode, put up in a different type from that in which it had been prepared?—I was informed by the clerk who took charge of the editing of it, that the Stationary Office objected to having it in that type, as it would be a precedent for other Returns, and would be more expensive than the ordinary plan.

10515. Mr. Clode stated that you delayed that Report; did you do so?—I never delayed it a day; it was delayed for Professor Simonds to add his Report to it.

10516. Therefore it was not correct to say that you delayed it?—No, it was not.

10517. Mr. Clode.] It was Professor Simonds who delayed it?—Certainly; there might have been two or three days that I took to look over it finally; but except that, it was Professor Simonds who kept it back.

10518. Mr. Clode Read.] The Report was delayed three years, was it not?—I could not say that. The cattle plague did not cease till September 1867.

10519. Mr. Clode.] Was any remonstrance made to Professor Simonds, or whoever did delay the publication?—Yes, many.

10520. Mr. Clode Read.] You were not the secretary to the department all that time, I believe?—I was secretary to the department from August 1865 to the end of April 1866, during which period upwards of 92 per cent. of the total number of fresh outbreaks of cattle plague occurred. I was again appointed the secretary on the 27th of November 1866; so that, with the exception of the six months, during which Colonel Harness held the office, I have been the secretary from the commencement of the department in August 1865.

10521. You were medical officer during the time, you were not secretary?—Yes, for six months.

10522. Will you tell me what the duties of your office were?—They were very light.

10523. You did not recommend any further appointment to that post?—I did not.

sumption in different countries seems to take away the supply, and the competition with other countries.

10533. Is that in consequence of the increased prosperity of those foreign countries?—Yes, almost entirely, I should think.

10534. What countries, for instance, consume much more meat than they did formerly?—Germany and Belgium, principally; and even Holland itself, although it is producing, is consuming a great deal more. The wages in all those countries have increased so largely, compared with what they used to be.

10535. Is that chiefly owing to manufacturing and mining?—To manufacturing and mining. I was, until lately, interested in mining in Germany, and the wages of miners have increased in two years fully 40 per cent.

10536. And you think that we shall not have any large increase of live meat from the Continent of Europe, except from Russia?—No.

10537. Do you consider Russia a safe country to import live cattle from?—Without precautions

Mr.
A. Williams.
—
26 June
1873.

Mr. A. G.
Robinson.

Mr. A. G.
Robinson.
—
26 June
1873.

it is not perfectly safe; there is generally more or less cattle plague in parts of it.

10538. The further we extend our cattle trade towards the East, the greater, perhaps, would be our liability to import cattle plague?—Yes, the more risk you run.

10539. Have you considered the effect of restrictions upon the import of foreign stock?—Yes, it has very little to do with it, I think. I do not think that direct restriction, that is to say, confining the slaughter to the water-side of ports, has such a material effect as the uncertainty of the trade. I believe, with regard to the import of foreign stock from every country, that we should have a steadier trade if we had fixed regulations.

10540. If all the foreign stock were killed at the water side, do you think that that would not materially decrease the foreign importations?—I do not.

10541. But the uncertainty and the fluctuation of the orders does interfere with the trade?—It does.

10542. What was the effect upon the import from Holland. I think there was entire freedom with regard to the imports from Holland in 1872, did the supply increase, or did it fall off?—The importation was very much less than in the previous year.

10543. Were there in the previous year any restrictions?—Yes, they were restricted, as far as London was concerned, on account of the *carras*; the animals were not allowed to be removed alive. Last year, I think, there has been the smallest amount of cattle coming from Holland that has come for years, except those when for a time they were prohibited.

10544. To what do you attribute the falling off?—To the extra demand for other places. Upon the cessation of the war, Germany and France took a good deal of store cattle from Holland, which put the prices up there.

10545. To make up for the ravages of the war?—Yes.

10546. What was the result of the restrictions which were in force in Schleswig-Holstein; do you remember them, because they varied a good deal?—Last year, I think, was the first year that there was any restriction from Schleswig-Holstein, and there were more cattle imported from Schleswig-Holstein than in previous years, when there were no restrictions.

10547. Last year was the first of the restrictions, and there were the largest importations then?—Yes.

10548. So it does not seem from that that restrictions materially interfere with supply?—No, I think not.

10549. We have had it in evidence that there has been a large extent of pleuro-pneumonia in Holland; do you happen to know anything about that?—Yes; the Government of Holland, the Chambers, voted last year some 35,000*l.* to compensate for the slaughter of animals suffering from pleuro-pneumonia. That was exhausted in the early part of the year, and they then voted a further sum this Session, I think, of 300,000 or 350,000 guilders (there are 12 guilders to the £), which has been supplemented by a further Vote, increasing the amount to 650,000 guilders.

10550. Consequently, that points to a very large amount of pleuro-pneumonia being prevalent in Holland even now?—I do not know that it is as prevalent in Holland as it was. The first

course they pursued when pleuro-pneumonia broke out there, when it was reported, was that the whole of the herd was valued by two independent parties, and they were slaughtered and the meat sold, and the party paid the compensation. Before the meeting of the Chambers this year, they got a second Vote, and they exhausted that fund, and then they only slaughtered the animals which were actually diseased; and I believe that that is the system now in vogue, that they only slaughter the animals which are actually diseased.

10551. I see, in the Paper which has been handed in to this Committee, that before they commenced slaughtering these cattle, in the first month there were 1,089 cases, and in the last month they appear to have decreased to 220 cases; that shows that the slaughtering had some good effect there?—Yes.

10552. (Chairman.) What year are you referring to, as regards compensation in Holland?—To 1812 and 1873.

10553. Mr. Barclay.] They commenced slaughtering-out in 1872 for the first time, did they not?—Yes.

10554. And they have continued the slaughtering until this time, have they not?—Yes, down to the 16th of June 1872. Upon the 30th September 1871 they raised 16,000 guilders; then upon the 17th January 1873 they raised 650,000 guilders; but that has not yet been ratified by both Chambers.

10555. Mr. Clare Read.] This all points to there being a good deal of pleuro-pneumonia at times, at least in Holland?—Yes; the Dutch cattle are very subject to pleuro-pneumonia, and have been all along; but their system is sure to generate it: the animals are kept in hot stables for six months; they are put in in November, and they are turned out in May. By the time May has come round, they have exhausted their hay crop, and food for them, and turn them out, and then sometimes the weather is very cold in May, and the animals are apt to get the disease.

10556. If we took any vigorous measures for stamping out pleuro-pneumonia, do you think it would be safe to allow cattle from Holland to continue to go all over the country?—No; I do not think that it would be quite safe.

10557. Do you think that there would be a risk?—No doubt there would be a risk in importing them.

10558. We now and then have an import of Dutch stores, do we not?—We only get stores, as a rule, in a large quantity from Holland, when their hay crop fails them, which is when a very hot summer comes, and the following year they are obliged to sell them for what they can bring, and they are sent over here and sold at very low prices. As a rule, when they have plenty of hay, they export very little. In 1871 they had a bad crop, and they sent a large quantity of stores over here, which were sold at very low prices. Some farmers did very well with them, and some did very badly, as so many died from pleuro-pneumonia and starvation. Last year we got only a few. Some milch cows and some cattle from Guelderland, which are like our English cattle, red and white, not black and white, which were no doubt sold in this country as English stores or Irish stores, but the import of store cattle from Holland into England is very small indeed.

10559. Do you think it will increase?—No.
10560. Is

10560. Is there any other quarter that we get store cattle from besides Holland?—No.

10561. Can you tell me the reason that they go at such very low prices?—There is nothing for them to eat, and therefore they must sell them for what they will fetch.

10562. But why do they obtain such low prices here in comparison to English stock; is it in consequence of their liability to disease, do you suppose?—They come over here, as a rule, very poor, and then the people are afraid of them, for they are liable to disease, and they are more delicate.

10563. They are more subject to pleuro-pneumonia?—They are more subject to pleuro-pneumonia, and the experience of farmers in my neighbourhood, in Essex, was that they lost a great deal of them. Some will not touch them at all now.

10564. In consequence of their dread of pleuro-pneumonia?—Yes; in consequence of their dread of pleuro-pneumonia.

10565. Are there many Dutch cows imported?—No, not many this year; very, very few.

10566. What is the falling-off due to?—To the less demand for them. English cows are not so dear as they were, and Dutch cows, I fancy, are dear in Holland; and there is the fear of pleuro-pneumonia.

10567. Mr. Dent.] When did the English milking cows fall in price?—I suppose they are 2*l*. or 3*l*. a head cheaper than they were some months ago.

10568. Mr. *Clare Read*.] Have you known any Dutch cows suffer from pleuro-pneumonia?—I have had no experience of them. I only know it from what I have heard.

10569. What have you been told?—One individual told me that he had lost three from pleuro-pneumonia.

10570. Lately?—Yes, this year; some weeks ago. There have been very few come over this year, not more than a hundred, I query, since the beginning of the year.

10571. What did that one individual give you as the result of his experience this year?—He said that he had bought five and had lost three of them.

10572. What from?—From pleuro-pneumonia.

10573. Do you consider that the supplies from the Weser are falling off?—I do not expect that we shall get any from Bremen and the district of the Weser; we used to get a good many, but the mining interest in Westphalia has increased so much, and the industries there, that they take them and give more money for them; they are large, coarse animals, and the beef is dearer than, or quite as dear as it is here, and they take them as being convenient for their purpose, they not having any other grazing district in the neighbourhood.

10574. I suppose some districts send out cattle grass-fed and others stall-fed?—Yes; we get our grass-fed cattle from Holland, Schleswig-Holstein, and from Oldenburg and the Weser, that, I think, is the principal district, and at times from Normandy when the French trade is open.

10575. Is that an increasing trade with us?—It varies very much; it depends upon the Paris market.

10576. Where do we get our stall-fed cattle from?—From Holland, from Denmark, from

Germany, and from France; and we have had them from Portugal and Spain. We get some grass-fed, or rather house-fed cattle, from Spain and Portugal; but still they are fed upon green food, such as green maize.

10577. Is it mostly from the distilleries that we have the stall-fed cattle?—Yes, we get stall-fed cattle from Sweden and Norway, but it is mainly from the distilleries; some are corn-fed, but they mainly come from Denmark. As a rule, the stall-fed cattle which we get from Germany are mostly from the distilleries and sugar refineries; some come from Sweden and Norway, from distilleries there. From Holland they are regularly fed as we feed them here, except that they have no roots in Holland to feed them upon; they feed them upon grain, cake, and hay.

10578. You do not think that stall-fed cattle are going to increase very much?—No. I think the foreign supply is not likely to increase unless, as I said before, we get into Russia. Our supply from Austria has quite fallen off. We used to get 8,000 to 10,000 head of cattle in the spring from Austria, and we do not get any now.

10579. Shall we not get any more from Spain and Portugal?—No, the price has got up so.

10580. The price has gone up in Spain and Portugal?—The price has gone up in Spain and Portugal. I took out a statement of it, which I have here: animals of average live weight of 12 cwt. 23 lbs., in February 1857, cost, at Oporto, an average of 17 *l*. 15 *s*. 8 *d*. apiece, whereas, in February 1873, animals of an average weight of 12 cwt. 23 lbs. cost 23 *l*. 1 *s*. 9 *d*.

10581. Mr. *Barelay*.] That is weighing the animal gross, alive?—Yes.

10582. Mr. *Clare Read*.] Do you always weigh the cattle when you put them on board?—Yes.

10583. And do you weigh them on landing?—We have never weighed them, except two cargoes which we sold to the French during the war.

10584. What do they shrink during the voyage?—In one case they lost, upon the average, 1 cwt. 3 qrs. 19 lbs., and in the other 1 cwt. 3 qrs. 14 lbs.

10585. Each bullock?—Yes, they weighed about 11½ cwt. apiece.

10586. Mr. *Barelay*.] Could you give the Committee any idea what these animals weighed dead?—The loss from live weight here is about a third; over a third.

10587. These 12-cwt. beasts would kill about a third less than the 12 cwt. dead?—But they would lose about 2 cwt., which would bring them down to 10 cwt., and you must take a third of 10 cwt.

10588. Mr. *Clare Read*.] That is a very large per-centage, is it not?—No; because we had these cargoes weighed on unshipping. We had them fed and watered before they left the vessel. We gave them as much as they would eat and drink, and then they were put on to the weighing machine and weighed.

10589. *Chairman*.] Did you sell them by weight?—Yes.

10590. Therefore you gave them all the food and water you could?—Yes.

10591. Before they went on shore?—Yes, as much as they would eat, and as much as they would drink. The other day we had two which weighed over a ton each upon shipment, and they weighed under 18 cwt. each on landing, and

Mr. A. G.
Robinson.
26 June
1873.

Mr. A. G. Robinson. one of them which weighed 18 cwt., when killed weighed 1,380 lbs.

10592. Mr. *Clare Read*.] You say that the live weight which a bullock would lose upon an average voyage from Oporto to London, would be about 2 cwt.?—Yes; 2 cwt. upon a 12-cwt. beast.

10593. Is that about the average weight per beast?—Yes, or a little over 12 cwt.?

10594. Referring to these figures of 1867 and 1873, could you give the Committee any idea of the value of these bullocks in the Islington Market, or in the Smithfield Market?—In February 1867 they averaged 20 l. 3 s. 8 d., and in February 1873, 24 l. — s. 9 d. and they cost 23 l. 15 s.

10595. So that there was a good deal more margin for profit in 1867 than there was in 1873?—Yes; then the next lot, which averaged 12 cwt. 12 lbs., fetched 24 l. 15 s. 9 d.

10596. If they sold for 24 l. 18 s. 9 d., and they were bought for 23 l. 15 s., they would not be worth bringing over?—No; we first fill up, if there is any spare room, with cattle.

10597. Mr. *Barclay*.] In point of fact, you had a freight for that load?—No; very little; about 1 l. per head.

10598. Mr. *Clare Read*.] What do you consider the extent of the depreciation in the value by the loss of that 2 cwt.; what is the value of 2 cwt.?—They cost about 40 s. a cwt.

10599. You lose about 4 l. each?—Yes.

10600. Did you feed and water them as you came along?—Yes.

10601. Do they, as a rule, take food and water?—They will not, as a rule, eat anything for the first 24 hours. We bring as much green food as will keep; and then we have hay.

10602. How many days are they upon the voyage?—It is about five days before they land, generally speaking.

10603. Have you had any experience of the importation of dead meat from the Continent?—Yes, when cattle plague was so rife in Holland, a great deal of dead meat came over then; we brought as much as 3,000 dead sheep in one vessel.

10604. Was there any difficulty in bringing it over?—None whatever.

10605. There were none lost?—None. There is a large amount of dead meat comes over here in the winter time from Hamburg and Holland, too.

10606. Do you think that the dead-meat trade is likely to increase rather than the live?—Yes; there is a tendency to send the finer parts of the animals here and retain the coarser parts at home; there does not seem to be the difference in value abroad between a hind quarter of beef and a fore quarter of beef, as compared to what there is here; and they send over from Hamburg the finer parts; and in the same way from Holland; they send over half a sheep; they send the hind quarters of the sheep and keep the fore quarter.

10607. Just the same as they do in the provinces here?—Yes.

10608. Have you had any offal from Holland?—Yes; when they killed the cattle and sheep there, they sent the offal with them, generally speaking.

10609. Does that spoil in the transit?—No, I think not.

10610. Did you ever see the way in which

they muddle the offal about in this country?—Yes; they muddle the meat too.

10611. Do they take any care in the transport of the offal now from the Deptford Market, or to places where it is consumed, in the East end of London?—I consider they take no care of anything; because they pile up the meat in such a way. I have seen a man sitting in a cart of meat, upon the top of a calf, with his arms upon the bricket of the calf, as if he were in an arm-chair; the offal is thrown into some tub, or something of that sort, or thrown into the cart loose, and taken in that way.

10612. So that when you hear of such great complaints of the transit of offal to feed the poor, if there was a little more care taken of it in transit, perhaps it would be brought in better condition?—Yes; but in the case of moving from Deptford to London, it is absurd to say that it depreciates in that distance if it is properly taken care of.

10613. *Chairman*.] You are largely engaged in the cattle carrying trade, are you not?—Yes.

10614. From what countries?—From Portugal and Holland, and from Germany; and we did bring some from Russia, when it was allowed.

10615. From what ports in Germany do you chiefly trade?—At present we are not running to Germany; the principal port that we have carried cattle from was Greestmünde.

10616. Do your ships bring cattle from the Schleswig-Holstein ports?—Yes, we have carried some.

10617. From where?—From Husum, and from Tønning, too.

10618. But you carry on a large Spanish and Portuguese trade, do you not?—Yes.

10619. As regards the Spanish and Portuguese trade, you are a merchant, are you not, as well as a cattle importer?—Yes; the risk is so great, that we import them upon our own risk. We could not carry them in any other way.

10620. I understood you to say, with respect to Schleswig-Holstein, that last year was the first year of the restrictions?—Yes, I did say so, as well as I can recollect.

10621. Are you not aware, that immediately after the passing of the Act of 1869, the whole of Germany was scheduled, and all the German cattle were put under restrictions?—That is so far back that I do not recollect it; we were all restricted then.

10622. Are you not aware, that some countries were scheduled and some countries were not scheduled?—Yes.

10623. Do you know that Germany was a country that was scheduled?—For a time it was.

10624. Are you not aware, that up to last year, there had been a restriction upon Schleswig-Holstein ever since the passing of the Act?—No; the Schleswig-Holstein cattle were permitted to come up to the London market always until last year.

10625. Up to what London market?—Up to the Metropolitan Market.

10626. They were in the same position as all other cattle were, were they not?—Yes.

10627. But are you not aware that Schleswig-Holstein cattle was scheduled in the same way as German cattle was scheduled?—Yes.

10628. Then last year was not the first year of the restrictions?—I am speaking more particularly

lary of slaughter at the waterside; there was one year, two years ago I think, in which they were slaughtered at the waterside.

10632. I understood you to say, that last year was the first year of the restrictions; my question is this: are you not aware, that instead of last year being the first year of the restrictions with regard to Schleswig-Holstein, it was the first year in which the restrictions were taken off?—What I meant by my statement was (I recollect I was wrong in that), that last year they were slaughtered at the waterside, but the previous year they were permitted to go to the Metropolitan Market, and they were slaughtered in the district; there were two years when they were slaughtered at the waterside.

10633. Before that time they were in the same position as all cattle from all scheduled countries?—Yes.

10634. That is to say, the cattle went to the Islington market until the cordon was removed?—Yes.

10635. But as regards the restriction of their going inland, the Schleswig-Holstein cattle were restricted until last year, were they not?—Yes, the same as all foreign cattle.

10636. Your answer gave the impression, that last year was the first year when the restriction was taken off?—What I meant by restriction, was the slaughter at the actual waterside, but I was wrong there, because there was a year previously, two years ago I think, when the animals were slaughtered at the waterside.

10637. Until the cordon was removed, that is to say until the market was completed, all cattle from scheduled or unscheduled countries came to the Islington market relying upon the cordon?—Yes, that was so.

10638. Then what are your suggestions now with regard to the trade?—I think that the restrictions should be a fixed one.

10639. You mean to say, that there should be a fixed restriction on cattle coming from abroad; that they should be slaughtered at the port of embarkation?—Yes, I think we would have a steadier trade taking it all through, even with our Spanish cattle, if they were slaughtered at the waterside.

10640. You would prefer that?—I would.

10641. Do you import anywhere except into London?—Only through Southampton sometimes, to London; not to any other port.

10642. You do not import for the large inland towns?—No; we import to Southampton, and sometimes sell some of the cattle there, and bring the rest of the cattle up to London.

10643. Is that the way with the importing trade generally?—No.

10644. You are by yourself in that matter?—Yes, I am.

10645. As a large importer of Spanish and Portuguese cattle, you think that they should be slaughtered at a waterside market?—I think if all foreign cattle were slaughtered at the waterside, including both Spanish and Portuguese, we should do quite as well as under the present system, because now the markets are held upon the same days; the market at Islington begins at four or five in the morning, and at nine the people leave because the Deptford market begins at ten, and it sometimes happens that a cargo of cattle arrives after nine, and there is nobody there; the principal buyers are not there. The principal buyers of foreign cattle are the large wholesale

carcass butchers; that is to say, of all foreign cattle, Portuguese as well as others, therefore it is immaterial to us.

10646. I understand you to say that you do not expect much increase of import from the Continent, except from Russia?—No.

10647. I suppose there is a high price of meat upon the Continent, as well as here, now?—There is.

10648. With regard to the Russian import, do you think it would be at all safe to allow Russian animals to be imported, even if slaughtered at the port of landing?—Take Deptford, for instance; I think it would be safe to bring them to Deptford and slaughter them immediately, having them under certain restrictions. I would not allow the public to go indiscriminately amongst them, but only a certain class.

10649. Are you aware that the cattle plague is always more or less prevalent in Russia?—It varies; Russia is a large place; one district may have it and one district may not.

10650. But notwithstanding its largeness, it is very difficult for us to be sure that cattle will not come up from infected districts, is it not?—Yes.

10651. Notwithstanding that, you still think it would be safe to import them?—As an importer, I should not import cattle from a place where there was a risk of the plague, because if they got the cattle plague on the way, I should have to throw them overboard, and I should lose them; no cattle importer would knowingly bring cattle from a place where they had been in contact with the cattle plague, or in the immediate neighbourhood of it.

10652. Did you ever import cattle from Russia?—I did a few, but a very few.

10653. Did they answer?—Yes, they left a freight. Until the cattle plague broke out there was a prospect of a considerable supply from Russia; we could organise a large supply from Russia.

10654. Supposing we were to allow Russian cattle to come in to be slaughtered at Deptford, have you any idea what amount of fresh supply we could get into the port of London?—I could not form any idea of that; but when you come to consider that we import 40,000 or 50,000 casks of tallow from Russia, and that their export, I think, is 60,000 or 70,000, it must take a great many boats to make that, and the principal district is getting within reach of us now by railway.

10655. Do you think it would be an extravagant estimate to suppose we could get in 1,000 a week?—It would.

10656. Do you think it would be an extravagant estimate to suppose that we could get in 500 a week?—It would be a long time before we could get that.

10657. What would be the time when we should be most likely to receive Russian cattle?—The autumn would be the principal time for the grass-fed, and the spring for stall-fed cattle; but we should principally get them in the autumn.

10658. If they came by sea what port would they come from?—They could come from St. Petersburg or from Riga.

10659. What is the length of the voyage?—The length of the voyage from St. Petersburg is from six or seven days, and from Riga it is from five to six.

10660. Where did those animals that you imported

Mr. A. G. Robinson.

25 June 1879.

Mr. A. G.
Robinson.
—
26 June
1873.

ported come from?—A few come from Riga, and the rest from Cronstadt.

10658. Would it be likely that any would come from Odessa?—No, it is too long a voyage.

10659. You have stated that you have tried the dead-meat trade; did you try it on your own account, or as a carrier?—Merely as a carrier.

10660. Was that in the summer?—No, it was not until after July.

10661. Do you know anything about the cargo of 3,000 carcasses of mutton which was landed at the Dublin Steam Company's wharf in 1867?—No, I do not.

10662. Where did you import dead meat from?—We carried it from Holland; principally from Rotterdam.

10663. Mr. Barclay.] What was the length of the voyage?—Twenty-four hours.

10664. Chairman.] Do your ships all run up to Deptford now?—Our cattle which we bring now, are landed at Thames Haven, and they come up to the Metropolitan Market.

10665. From where?—From Holland and from Opoto; there are so few coming from Germany now, that we are not running there.

10666. Do you think that if, instead of being allowed to land your Opoto cattle and your Dutch cattle at Thames Haven, you were obliged to bring them up to Deptford Market, that would in the slightest degree diminish the number you brought over?—If no other imported cattle were taken to Deptford, it would; but if all foreign cattle indiscriminately were sent to Deptford, I think it would not.

10667. Did those imported cattle that came in include Dutch cattle, Spanish, Portuguese, Schleswig-Holstein, Swedish, and Danish?—Yes.

10668. I suppose there is not much import from Sweden and Denmark at present?—There is about an average of 400 or 500 a week, or perhaps not quite so much now.

10669. Are you engaged in that trade now?—No; there are about 800 to 300 coming from Gothenburg; and there is a cargo every fortnight coming from Alborg, and a few from Copenhagen.

10670. You think it would not decrease the foreign import if all cattle were slaughtered at the water-side?—I do not think it would; the Dutch cattle are now permitted to come free, but if there is one found affected in a cargo, they are all slaughtered, and that is a very serious matter.

10671. This opinion you have given is not the opinion of your brother importers, but it is an opinion which you have formed after a long experience in the trade?—Yes, it is my opinion.

10672. What number do you bring of Spanish and Portuguese cattle per year to London?—It is not very large; we do not bring any from Spain; the whole export from Opoto in 1868 was 8,571; in 1869 it was 10,761; in 1870, 16,880; in 1871, 20,397; in 1872, 15,622; and in 1873, up to the end of April, 5,171.

10673. Is the import from Spain larger than from Portugal?—No; I think it has been less lately.

10674. What proportion of the Portuguese cattle, in very rough figures, do you import?—I should think a third or a fourth of it.

10675. As regards the Dutch trade, you are only carriers there?—Yes, only carriers.

10676. What quantity do you bring of that trade?—We bring a large proportion.

10677. How many ships have you in the trade?—We run four a week.

10678. Do you find the arrangements at the Deptford Market to be what you would consider good now?—I have had no experience of Deptford Market; there is a complaint of the want of ventilation there.

10679. You bring up no cattle to the Deptford Market because you do not deal with the scheduled countries at all?—No; but they complain of the want of room there.

10680. Therefore, if there is an advantage in the non-scheduled cattle over the scheduled, you get it at this moment?—We get it at this moment.

10681. Mr. Dodson.] I understand you to state that, with regard to the trade from foreign countries, the cattle which are admitted without being slaughtered at the port of landing have an advantage over those which must be slaughtered at the ports?—At present they have, to a certain extent.

10682. But if the cattle from all foreign countries were to be slaughtered at the ports there would be no disadvantage to the foreign trade?—I think not.

10683. It would put the different foreign countries from which we import cattle, of course, upon the same footing, would it not?—Yes.

10684. But would it not be a disadvantage to the foreign trade in competition with the home trade?—I think not, because the bulk of the supply of cattle from abroad come to London, and are consumed in London, and I believe, myself, that if you were to bring up two hundred animals in a ship, and land a hundred of them at Thames Haven, which we do now, and quarantine them, and rail them down to the market, and take them out of the market and drive them to the slaughterhouses and slaughter them, and bring the other hundred up to Deptford, and land them there, and take them into the slaughterhouses, there would be a considerable advantage in the weight of meat in favour of Deptford over the other plan.

10685. I suppose it is a great advantage in the trade to have certainty?—Yes, it is the uncertainty of the trade which does the harm; there is no knowing from day to day whether a country will be scheduled or unscheduled. If disease breaks out in Holland, for instance, the Privy Council would schedule it to-morrow.

10686. Chairman.] That is to say, if the cattle plague broke out?—Yes; they have the power to do it; the Act of Parliament gives them the power.

10687. No country has been scheduled for anything but cattle plague, has it?—No, it has not, except for sheep-pox.

10688. Mr. Dodson.] Do you import sheep at all?—No, we do not.

10689. Is the supply of animals from the Peninsula likely to decrease?—I do not think it will decrease, nor do I think it will increase much; the system of feeding them there is so peculiar; they are all fed by the small peasants in pairs; they do not keep more than two pairs of oxen at the outside; they work them and then they fatten them; they live in the houses with them, and under the same roof.

10690. Your importations are principally from Portugal, are they not?—Yes, they are.

10691. Do

politan Market, or perhaps he has to come to Deptford for them?—Yes.

10743. And you believe that it would be more advantageous if the carcass butcher had always to come down to Deptford for the animals?—Yes; the carcass butcher would know his trade better, and could make his arrangements better than he does now.

10750. In the meantime, it is a matter of calculation and judgment with him whether he shall do better by going to the Metropolitan Market or to Deptford?—He may be up at the Metropolitan Market, and as he has thought the prices too dear, he may have gone to the Deptford Market, and have had to pay more for them, or vice versa, in the Metropolitan Market, particularly when there are country people up to buy; the prices are better there, because a butcher believes that the countryman gives a better price when he comes up.

10751. When the carcass butcher thinks he can buy better at the Metropolitan Market than he can do at Deptford, which he can do except when there are country buyers, and he fills his head with metropolitan cattle, he does not go to Deptford?—That is so.

10752. Then there are fewer buyers at Deptford in consequence, and the importers are disappointed?—Yes.

10753. Upon the other hand, when a lot of foreign cattle comes into the country, a large number of carcass butchers go to Deptford?—Yes.

10754. That is to say, the consequence is that the trade is much more uneasily than it ought to be?—Yes, I think so.

10755. You think that, under those circumstances, if all foreign cattle were ordered to the Deptford Market, and the butchers knew that they could get all the foreign cattle there at one place, that would be, upon the whole, more satisfactory to the importer and consumer?—I think so. The principal buyers of our Portuguese cattle, which have never been scheduled, and have always been allowed to go free, are carcass butchers.

10756. The same carcass butcher might buy so many of your cattle in the Metropolitan Market early in the morning, and afterwards go to Deptford and complete the supply?—Yes, they do that constantly.

10757. Whereas, if all the foreign cattle were sent to Deptford, he would be saved the trouble of going to two markets?—Yes.

10758. Are there complete arrangements for slaughter at Thames Haven?—There are arrangements for slaughter at Thames Haven, but not for a large number; the arrangements are very defective, and we have to send men down from here, and there are very defective arrangements in getting the meat off; the slaughter of animals at Thames Haven is a heavy loss.

10759. Does it sometimes happen that you have to slaughter a whole cargo at Thames Haven?—Yes, but not often.

10760. It occasionally happens, does it not?—Yes, but not in a large cargo; we would not slaughter there, in any case, because the Privy Council would allow us to send the animals which were not diseased up to Deptford, and that has been the practice lately since the Deptford Market was opened. Instead of slaughtering them at Thames Haven, they only slaughter the

diseased ones, and send the sound ones up to Deptford.

10761. How are they sent up?—By sending the vessel back with them. I send a vessel the other day for them.

10762. That must involve considerable expense?—Yes, it does.

10763. The slaughter at Thames Haven being only occasional, you have to make special arrangements for it, have you not?—Yes, we should have to send men down specially, and the arrangements are very bad, naturally, because they do not expect to have to do it, and we find it better to remove them alive to Deptford.

10764. What do you count the loss per head upon animals which have to be slaughtered at Thames Haven?—I should think 2*l.* per head.

10765. You would be satisfied if you got off with a loss of 2*l.* per head?—Yes.

10766. That is a very great stimulus to you to be very vigilant in getting only healthy animals on board your ships, is it not?—We endeavour to avoid getting unhealthy ones, but with regard to sheep, it is impossible to detect them upon the other side; in fact, anywhere.

10767. Mr. Dent.] With regard to the Portuguese trade according to your account, the trade was a steadily increasing one until 1871?—Yes, it was.

10768. Then it fell off suddenly in 1872, did it not?—Yes.

10769. Was there any particular reason for that?—The high prices there, and not a corresponding price here.

10770. Was there any particular reason to cause the increased price there, because it appears from your account to have steadily increased for some years?—No, I cannot well account for it; it is difficult to account for it. When you get the price up there, the price would be down here.

10771. The price of meat did not go down?—The price of meat has not increased a great deal. It is a curious fact that in May 1869, the proceeds here in London per hundred weight, I am now taking the shipping weight, was 35*s.* 2*d.* In November 1870 there was exactly the same price, and in November 1871, it was 38*s.* 7*d.*; in October 1872, it was 35*s.* 8*d.*, and now it is rapidly increasing; it had gone up in February 1873 to 38*s.* 6*d.*, 39*s.* 4*d.*, 41*s.* 4*d.*, 43*s.* 4*d.*, and 43*s.* 11*d.*; but previously to that the rise was not much. In February 1861 the price was 34*s.* 8*d.*, and in February 1867, it was 35*s.* 7*d.*

10772. You have not found your butcher reduce his price, have you?—The price varies very much if I buy in Leadenhall Market or if I buy in the West End.

10773. But if you have bought from a retail butcher you have found no diminution, but a steady increase?—The price of meat has increased. When we commenced the trade with Holland, I recollect I went over to Friesland, the market day that I was there the value of good Dutch cows was equal to 3*d.* per pound dead, and a gentleman who made up a large quantity of meat for the Dutch East India Company, came into the hotel where I was dining, and said, "I have just bought a lot of cattle which will stand us in 3*d.* a pound."

10774. Chairman.] When was that?—About 1847 or 1848.

10775. What is the worth now?—The same animal

Mr. A. G. Robinson.
—
25 June
1873.

Mr. A. G.
Robinson.

25 June
1873.

animal would be worth 8 d. a pound now in Holland.

10776. Mr. Dent.] But the price of beef in England has almost increased in an equal amount, has it not?—Yes; but the value of land in Holland has gone up in proportion to what it has in this country; that is to say, the rents.

10777. You cannot account for that sudden drop of about 5,000 in the Portuguese trade in 1873, after it had been a steadily increasing trade for the last five years?—I would account for it in this way, to a certain extent: There are a large number of steamers calling at Lisbon now for passengers. All the Brazil and South American steamers, which carry a large number of passengers, get their meat there, and there is a considerable trade since the railway opened between

Oporto and Lisbon, and there is a large quantity of cattle taken from Oporto to Lisbon; the price gets up, and it does not go down rapidly enough to induce parties to buy, and they remain on hand; and particularly with those small farmers, when they are tempted with high prices, having sold one pair, they hold on to the others.

10778. Chairman.] You spoke of the heavy loss from the slaughter of a cargo in which there is any animal diseased at Thames Haven. Why does not the fear of that loss induce you to make it a habit to send the animals to Deptford?—While the Metropolitan Market is open we prefer sending them there, because there is not a sufficient number of buyers to be depended upon at Deptford.

Mr. GEORGE ANDREW LEPPER, called in; and Examined.

Mr.
G. A. Lepper.

10779. Mr. Clare Read.] You are a Veterinary Surgeon at Aylesbury, I believe?—Yes, I am.

10780. Have you had considerable experience in cattle diseases?—I have.

10781. Can you give the Committee any particulars of the outbreak of foot and mouth disease in the district of Aylesbury in the year 1869?—Yes, I can.

10782. Had your county been previously free for some months?—Yes, for some considerable time before then.

10783. The foot and mouth disease broke out in 1869; will you tell the Committee when and how it broke out?—I saw some foreign sheep and oxen in the neighbourhood, which came from the London market. I saw that they had the foot and mouth disease; but the sheep I noticed more particularly, and in a very few days afterwards we had it spread very much in the district where the animals were lying.

10784. You consider that these foreign sheep and cattle conveyed the foot and mouth disease into the country?—I have no doubt whatever that they did.

10785. Did the disease spread rapidly in the district?—Yes, it spread very rapidly indeed after that.

10786. Was it of a very virulent type?—Yes; more so than I ever knew it before, and it has continued so up to the present time.

10787. Are you now free from it?—Yes, we are.

10788. Have you had great losses amongst the dairy cows?—In most of the dairies we have had very great losses.

10789. Do you consider this last outbreak of an especially virulent type?—Yes, very much so.

10790. Have you had much pleuro-pneumonia in Aylesbury?—Not a very great deal, lately.

10791. Have you formed any opinion with reference to how we ought to treat pleuro-pneumonia?—I think you cannot kill the diseased animals too soon, and I isolate the remainder.

10792. Would you advise compulsory slaughter of animals, and compensation given to the owner, to get rid of pleuro-pneumonia?—No; it can be done without that. I would not slaughter healthy animals; but I would slaughter the diseased animals immediately they showed symptoms of the disease, and I would isolate the others.

10793. Have you any opinion to offer with reference to inoculation?—I have not; I have

never seen it tried. But you cannot produce the disease as you do small-pox, &c. &c.

10794. You would slaughter the unhealthy animals, and isolate the rest of the herd?—Yes; we have a Mutual Association in our district, to which I am the veterinary surgeon, and that is the treatment which we pursue; and we find it answer exceedingly well.

10795. You do not think there is any necessity to kill all the herd?—No, I am sure there is not, if there is strict isolation.

10796. For how long a time?—I would make them use disinfectants in a cowhouse, and clear it out well; and I would not put an animal in the cowhouse again for two months.

10797. Have you seen anything of foot and mouth disease in foreign sheep in the Islingham Market?—Yes, I have.

10798. When was that?—That was some little time ago now. I have seen them there several times, but I was sent down professionally to examine some sheep which a gentleman bought there; he was going to remove them into the country, and I found that they had foot and mouth disease upon them at the time. He bought 27, and 25 of them had the disease upon them.

10799. Could you tell the Committee when that was?—Twenty-fifth October 1869.

10800. Was it before or after the outbreak which you had at Aylesbury?—It was after then.

10801. Those sheep had passed the examination of the inspector, had they not?—Yes; and the man had his orders to take them anywhere he chose.

10802. And you were telegraphed for to come and see those cattle, were you not?—I was specially telegraphed for.

10803. Why was that; were they of opinion that they were sending diseased animals into the country?—They were constantly being sent, and the man thought he would have some opinion before they left the market; they were kept there for me to see.

10804. And after those animals were passed by the inspector, you found that 25 out of 27 had foot and mouth disease?—Yes, I did. They were passed the same day I saw them.

10805. Chairman.] You cannot give the Committee the date of that?—October 26th, after we had that outbreak of foot and mouth disease in Aylesbury.

10806. Was

Mr. A. G.
Robinson.
—
26 June
1873.

10691. Do you import from Spain at all?—No, we have not done so lately.

10692. You do not get Spanish cattle through Portugal?—No, we do not.

10693. Now, if Russian cattle were allowed to be imported and slaughtered at Deptford, or at any other ports, what precautions would you consider would be necessary for the prevention of the introduction of the cattle plague into the country?—I would have the place quite isolated, and disinfect the people who frequent it.

10694. When you say that you would have the Russian cattle quite isolated, do you mean isolated from other foreign cattle?—Yes.

10695. In fact, there must be two markets, one for the Russian and the other for other foreign cattle?—Yes; at Deptford the thing is done, and could be done to-morrow. There would be little or no disadvantage in slaughtering an animal at the water-side immediately upon its landing, because, as a rule, all fat cattle that come to the market upon the Monday are slaughtered within the week; they are not kept over; there is a great waste in holding animals over; and in London they get foot and mouth disease directly.

10696. Then the persons who slaughtered and had to do with the Russian cattle would have to be disinfected as they come out?—Yes.

10697. Would not that be an expensive or troublesome process?—No; the number of people connected with them might be very small.

10698. The restrictions which would have to be put upon Russian cattle would not be such, in your opinion, as materially to add to the price of them, would they?—No.

10699. Could Russian cattle be imported now upon terms as favourable as cattle from the Peninsula?—They could be imported more cheaply, a good deal, I think. I have not inquired the price lately, but I fancy they could be imported considerably cheaper.

10700. The distance they would have to come would be about the same, would it not?—The Russian cattle would have farther to come, but the journey would not be so bad; there is more shelter for them, and, in bad weather, they would not be suffering so much; for instance, if a gale of wind sprang up, they would get into port, or get into shelter; it is from bad weather that we lose the cattle, and the losses from Spain and Portugal at times are very heavy indeed.

10701. Do your importations from Portugal go on all the year through?—Yes; all the year through, but more particularly in the spring. As soon as the grass-fed cattle come into market here, then the Portuguese and Spanish import falls off.

10702. I think you have stated that you have imported dead meat from Holland?—We have carried it; we do now in the winter season.

10703. Could dead meat be brought with advantage from any great distance?—The dead meat could be brought from Hamburg, I think, that is the farthest.

10704. How far is that?—It is about a 36 hours' journey.

10705. That is the extreme distance at which you think the dead trade could be carried on with advantage?—Yes, it would not do where the voyage was longer than 36 hours.

10706. Mr. Pell. Do you know what internal restrictions there are in Russia with regard to

the movement of cattle?—I fancy that there are none; I am not aware of any.

10707. The effect of our opening a cattle trade with Russia would be to drive cattle towards the port they were going to be exported from, would it not?—Yes, it would.

10708. The railroad communication in Russia covers, does it not, a great deal of country?—Yes, from north to south, and they are making branch lines which will intersect the country in a few years to all the centres of production.

10709. I understand you to state that the price of cattle in Russia is low, compared to that in other parts of Europe?—It is so.

10710. Then it would rise, probably, if England became a buying country?—Naturally it would.

10711. And there would be, with this railroad communication, a flow towards the ports from distant parts of the country?—Yes.

10712. Would there not be a great probability, if the restrictions in the interior of Russia are imperfect, or do not exist at all, of animals coming out of some rinderpest district towards the port?—Yes, there would be that risk.

10713. I think you stated that arrangements could be made in England avowedly for receiving those rinderpest animals, and killing them here?—Yes.

10714. And selling the meat even of rinderpest animals?—If they were actually suffering from rinderpest, I do not think I would sell the meat, because I do not think it would be fit for consumption.

10715. But in the earlier stages of the disease I think I remember reading that, in 1860, when the disease was here, it was stated that rinderpest meat could not be distinguished from other meat?—Perhaps in the very early stages that might be so, but I should think that the disease would develop itself previously to the arrival of the animals here, as a rule.

10716. But there would be some of the meat which you would say would be dangerous, and might convey the disease into the country, which was slaughtered at and sold from Deptford?—I should doubt that any meat which would be allowed to be sold would convey cattle plague.

10717. You contemplate a selection being made of the meat, do you not?—Yes, certainly.

10718. Now, you stated that the uncertainty with respect to the regulations in England checked the importation of foreign cattle generally?—Yes; we do not know where we shall have to take the cattle to, in fact, because if they show any symptoms of disease, we have to take them to one place, and if they do not they are allowed to go free.

10719. That is to say, a vessel may put out from a port with an idea that she has got a sound cargo, and that they will be treated in one particular way when they arrive in England; but in consequence of some outbreak of disease on board, even the destination of the vessel may be altered, and the treatment of the vessel certainly so?—Certainly.

10720. Can you tell me at all, as the result of your own experience, what per-centage of vessels there have been with diseased stock on board which has caused the slaughter of the animals, the vessel having apparently started with a sound cargo?—I cannot tell you the per-centage; it is very small.

10721. It does not frequently happen that they

Mr. A. G.
Robinson.
—
25 June
1873.

have an outbreak of disease, then, which necessitates that slaughter?—No.

10722. Then, if it does not frequently happen, do you think that the cattle imported are affected by the slight chance which there is of the animals being affected with disease?—When they do get caught they suffer severely. If a cargo of animals is stopped at Harwich, the loss upon them is something serious, and the profit upon the import of foreign stock is very small indeed; it is a very bare trade.

10723. Your impression as a trader is, that you would rather trade under the certainty of having the animals killed, than under the uncertainty of not knowing what to do with them?—I think so.

10724. With regard to the Spanish cattle trade, you stated that you did not think there would be much decline in the importation into England?—No.

10725. Owing partly to the habits of the people and the way in which they treat their cattle?—Yes.

10726. Is it not also owing to the fact that the population of Germany does not increase at all?—I am not aware of that.

10727. Mr. Coffin.] You recommend that all foreign cattle should be slaughtered at the port of debarkation?—I think it would be a better system than the present one of scheduling one country and not scheduling another.

10728. If that recommendation is not carried out, would you not recommend that countries should be scheduled for pleuro-pneumonia as well as for cattle plague?—I think there is quite as much risk of pleuro-pneumonia to home stock as there is from cattle plague. Pleuro-pneumonia is a disease which you cannot discover for some considerable time.

10729. Then you would add your recommendation to Mr. Verdon, that countries should be scheduled for pleuro-pneumonia?—I think I would. The foreign supply of cattle is so small as compared with the home supply, that the difference, if any, between what the trade would suffer from having a country scheduled or not scheduled is very small. Last year, Holland was unscheduled, and in all my experience of Holland we never had less cattle, and we had more from Schleswig-Holstein when they were slaughtered at the waterside, than we had when they came free; we had less from Holland, and more from Schleswig-Holstein.

10730. Mr. Berkeley.] Do you know what success has attended the efforts of the Dutch Government to stamp out pleuro-pneumonia?—They have not succeeded.

10731. They may not have succeeded, but have they made any considerable impression upon it in the way of reducing it?—It is since the cattle have been turned out of the stalls into the fields that the disease has increased materially; the Dutch cattle are stalled from November to May, and they are then turned out into the fields from May to November, and since the month of May, I think it has produced a material increase in the disease, but I cannot speak definitely upon that subject; the Privy Council know better about that, because they have the official returns; the Dutch Government are very particular in publishing the returns, and I think they may be relied upon.

10732. Do you know the cattle trade of Russia from your own knowledge?—I do not know much about it.

10733. It is only by hearsay?—We know from inquiries which we have made, that they could send us a good many cattle.

10734. You spoke about stall-feeding in Russia; are you aware whether there is anything of what is called stall-feeding in Russia?—Yes, there is some; they fatten the cattle in the Baltic provinces; but the main cattle from Russia are grazed.

10735. Would you expect to get the cattle from the Baltic provinces, or from the southern provinces, coming up to Riga by rail?—In the spring they would come from the Baltic provinces; in the autumn they would come from the south.

10736. Would they be fit cattle which you would get in the spring?—Yes.

10737. The navigation is only open to St. Petersburg from the 1st of June to the end of October, I believe?—The navigation is open from the middle of May to the end of October; but Revel, which is a Baltic port, and Riga are open all the year round.

10738. Is there a considerable risk in bringing cattle to London during the winter?—Yes, there is.

10739. The weather is quite as hazardous during the month of October as the Spanish voyage, is it not?—Yes, it is.

10740. Of course, if you were to import cattle from Russia, you would be exceedingly particular that you should not get animals affected with cattle plague, I suppose?—If I was an importer I should, because I should otherwise lose them before I got here.

10741. The cattle plague would almost invariably break out before they arrived in this country, would it not?—I think it would.

10742. You would suppose that the Privy Council would deal very severely with these cattle?—We would have to deal with them ourselves, by throwing them overboard; they die very quickly when cattle plague develops itself.

10743. Are you aware how the Privy Council dealt with a cargo of foreign cattle imported into Leith, whereof some of the animals were affected with cattle plague?—No.

10744. You are not aware that the whole cargo, whether affected or not, were taken out to sea?—No, I am not aware of that.

10745. And that the importers got nothing at all for them?—No, I am not aware of that.

10746. You are of opinion that there should be a regular market for foreign cattle at Deptford?—There is one at present; but I think myself that the import of foreign cattle would not suffer, and that the trade would be steadier, if all were sent to Deptford.

10747. I infer from that that you consider the market at Deptford would assume greater importance if all the foreign cattle were sent to it, and that it would induce the buyers to go there regularly, and so establish as good prices at the Deptford Market as they get at the Metropolitan Market?—Yes; the tendency of the trade is towards a dead-meat trade, and the small butchers are resorting to the dead-meat market more for their supplies than they formerly did, and the tendency of the London trade is, as I say, towards the dead-meat trade, in preference to the live-meat trade.

10748. At present, a carcass butcher wishing to buy foreign cattle, gets them in the Metropolitan

Mr.
G.A. Lyster,
28 June
1873.

10806. Was it before the outbreak in 1869.—
It was in 1849.

10807. Mr. *Clare Read*.] You have reason to believe that foot and mouth disease was introduced into the country by foreign animals?—It was in our district.

10808. Did you take any particular precautions in Buckinghamshire for the extinction of foot and mouth disease?—No, nothing particular.

10809. You did not succeed in getting rid of it very quickly?—No, we did not, indeed; but we have got nearly rid of it. I have not seen a case of it for some time.

10810. Are you an inspector?—No; the police are the inspectors, but they call in our assistance.

10811. Are you ever called in by them?—Yes; but they are pretty well up to foot and mouth disease. Most of our farmers are insured in this Mutual Association; the police wait for my report, and then they report upon that; they wait until I have sent in the account, and then they copy from that.

10812. That saves the county a little expense, I suppose?—Yes, I suppose it does.

10813. Have you any inspection of the market at Aylesbury?—The police have.

10814. Do you consider that the police being employed as inspectors under the Act is a satisfactory thing?—I think it is a farce; it is a farce in our district; they are very good men in their places. They are very willing to do what you tell them, and such like; but still it is an expense which leads to nothing.

10815. Do you think that the compensation which was given under the Cattle Plague Act was sufficient for the purpose of making the farmers divulge the presence of the disease?—No; the farmers were anxious to keep the presence of the disease as close as they could; the compensation of three-fourths of the value which they get is not sufficient for that purpose.

10816. That is to say, for animals in contact with the diseased ones?—Yes.

10817. For animals affected, it is only half, I believe?—It was only half.

10818. You think that in cases of pleuro-pneumonia you ought to have a more ample compensation?—I think the owners ought to be paid in full, inasmuch as it generally occurs amongst cows which are giving large quantities of milk, and as soon as they are dead, a man's income stops directly. Sometimes you have to kill cows which are producing from 15 s. to 25 s. a week in milk, and as soon as you kill them the man's income stops immediately, and therefore I think you ought to pay the owner in full.

10819. It is your opinion that we shall never get rid of pleuro-pneumonia unless we slaughter it out?—No; you must kill the diseased animals according as they are attacked.

10820. Do you suppose that we import pleuro-pneumonia-diseased animals from abroad?—I have no doubt we do; we find that the Dutch animals are subject to it; there are some brought occasionally in our district.

10821. There are a few brought, even now?—Yes.

10822. Are they more subject to pleuro-pneumonia than our own stock?—Yes, they are; and our local association will not insure them at any price.

0.38.

10823. If we took stringent measures for stamping out pleuro-pneumonia, do you think that it would be safe to continue the importation of foreign animals from parts of the Continent where pleuro-pneumonia exists?—We are running a great risk in doing so.

10824. Do you think that they should be killed at the water-side?—Undoubtedly; so long as you let foreign animals traverse England, so long you will have the disease break out at times.

10825. Are you of opinion that pleuro-pneumonia and foot and mouth disease are both foreign diseases?—I am quite sure of it, inasmuch as we had accounts of them from the Continent many years before we had the diseases in England.

10826. Do you think that if we had no more direct importation of foot and mouth disease and pleuro-pneumonia from the Continent, we should be able to get rid of those diseases in this country?—Yes; if you have stringent measures adopted at the same time; but eventually you will get these diseases naturalised here, just as we have small-pox. At one time small-pox was not known in England, and now it has become naturalised, and so it will be with those diseases, if you allow animals to traverse the country as they do now.

10827. During the cattle plague regulations, did foot and mouth disease and pleuro-pneumonia entirely cease in your district, or nearly so?—Yes, very nearly; we might say that they quite ceased.

10828. You think that those diseases have been here long enough already to become naturalised?—I think they are beginning to claim a home here now.

10829. But you are of opinion that we can get rid of those diseases if we take stringent measures now?—Yes, I think so.

10830. And not let any more disease be directly imported?—I should not let any more animals traverse the country. Those that come from abroad should be killed as soon as they arrived.

10831. *Chairman*.] As regards stringent measures for foot and mouth disease, what would you recommend?—In the first place, I would put all cattle dealers upon the same footing as I would the horse dealers; I would make them all pay duty, and let that go towards paying the inspectors; and I would make them give returns of all the animals bought and sold, and where they went to, and where they came from, and then you would have no difficulty in tracing it out. I know that personally the dealers go into a field where disease is in existence, and select the healthy animals, that is to say, those animals which do not show the disease; they take them into the market, and distribute them over the country.

10832. That is one stringent measure; you would not think that alone sufficient, I suppose?—I have not thought enough about the matter to say anything further.

10833. What would you think should be done with those animals which have foot and mouth disease?—I would keep them by themselves, and all animals which had been in contact with them; I would not allow one of them to be moved.

10834. Do you think it would be sufficient to apply the regulations merely to those which had the disease, or do you think it would be necessary

Mr.
G. A. Lepper.
10 June
1873.

nary to do as some witnesses have said, namely, stop the movement of all animals for a certain time?—It would be necessary to stop the movement of all animals within a given distance of the disease; they should be isolated; I would keep them at a certain distance.

10832. How would you be sure that you heard of all the animals that were really ill?—I would fine the owners severely, if they did not report at once.

10834. You mentioned an outbreak which occurred in the summer of 1869?—Yes.

10837. You have been working under the Act as an inspector, have you not?—Yes, for the cattle plague.

10838. But under this Contagious Diseases Act, which deals with human diseases, you have been concerned in that, have you not?—Not as an inspector.

10839. Are you not called in as an inspector?—No.

10840. I suppose you are aware that the Act was passed on 6th August 1869?—I forget the date.

10841. With regard to this outbreak before the passing of the Act, you state that you are quite sure it came from animals which had come from Spain?—There were Spanish bullocks and German sheep lying together in this field, and as I went past I observed that these animals were diseased; that is to say, in my own mind I felt sure they were, and I cautioned my neighbours around me. I have a farm which joins very close there, and in less than a week, in the land which is adjoining, foot and mouth disease broke out.

10842. Do you know what date the Spanish cattle were landed there?—No, I do not.

10843. I am told that they were landed in July 1869?—I do not know that.

10844. Has not this statement been made, that 28 were bought by a man of the name of Fisher, that they were all killed a week after they were brought to Aylesbury, and that no disease appeared at Aylesbury within six weeks afterwards?—I do not believe that that is true.

10845. Are you aware that that is the statement?—Yes.

10846. Are you aware that it is the fact that foot and mouth disease was prevalent in the Metropolitan Market at the time?—I cannot call it to mind.

10847. Supposing it was so, I suppose that sometimes sheep come from the Metropolitan Market into your district?—Yes, frequently.

10848. If there was foot and mouth disease rife in the Metropolitan Market at that time, it might have come from sheep from the Metropolitan Market, might it not?—Yes, it might, and often does.

10849. Mr. Pell.] You stated that in 1869, foreign sheep and oxen were brought into the market, which were diseased; what market was that?—No; I stated that they were brought from the London market by the butchers to be killed, but they were constantly driving up and down the road to the slaughter-house.

10850. They were not permitted to go again to Aylesbury after being brought from London?—The dealer sends them down to different butchers; he supplies them at so much a stone; and when they get them at Aylesbury they are distributed over the country.

10851. Chairman.] If they were foreign sheep

which came diseased from the Metropolitan Market, was not it possible that they might have caught the disease from English animals in the Metropolitan Market?—I would not speak to that; I can only speak to those animals as I saw them.

10853. Mr. Pell.] In 1868 and 1869 you saw foreign sheep and oxen in Buckinghamshire which had been marketed in the Metropolitan Market?—Yes.

10853. Chairman.] Are you clear that the foreign cattle came from the Metropolitan Market at that time, because at that time the cattle was existing?—They were Spanish oxen.

10854. Then they did not come from the Metropolitan Market?—But the sheep did.

10855. Mr. Pell.] The sheep were diseased?—Yes.

10856. Were those fat sheep?—Yes.

10857. They had been bought on commission in London to supply people in the country?—Yes, they were brought to kill down there, only that the dealer supplies different people in the district with them.

10858. Did you see them in the slaughter-houses?—No, I saw them in the fields and upon the roads.

10859. Lying there before they were killed?—Yes.

10860. Now, previously to your seeing these animals, was there any foot and mouth disease about in the district?—No, there was not.

10861. And after that the disease broke out?—Yes.

10862. And was very prevalent?—Yes.

10863. You suggested, I think, by way of getting rid of the disease, a duty being imposed upon dealers?—Yes, that would bring them under control.

10864. Who would you call a dealer?—A man who was constantly buying and selling cattle or sheep.

10865. He must buy and he must sell?—Yes.

10866. But I buy and sell too?—But you buy to graze very likely; you would not sell the next week.

10867. I do not know about that, if I could get a good profit?—Then you ought to pay the duty.

10868. Would you impose a duty so as to register the dealer?—Yes, so as to register the dealer and make him keep an account of all the animals, where they were brought from and where they go to, so that in case of an outbreak you would have no difficulty in tracing where it came from.

10869. That is to say, you would be able to trace where the animals came from, but would you be able to trace where the disease came from?—Yes, you would, because now they go to the fields, and they take them out and spread the disease everywhere.

10870. Suppose you knew that a dealer had some sheep which proved to be diseased, and that he sold them to a purchaser at Leicester market, what do you get beyond the fact that the disease is in the Leicester market?—You would be able to trace where those animals came from, and if this man had disease upon his farm I would punish him very severely for selling those animals.

10871. But if after tracing those animals, you are able to prove that those animals came into Leicester

Leicester sound, and that after being marketed there they had become diseased, what would you do after you found they had left the market?—You would be sure to find that there were some diseased animals as well as those which were in the market, and you would be able to trace it more readily.

10872. But how would having one man registered enable you to trace the proceedings of another dealer who had brought cattle into the market?—I should make the dealers all keep an account of their stock as they bought them, and where they came from, and where they were sold, and have their books open to inspection by some person appointed in the district. If A sold to B any animals which broke out with the disease, you would look at his register and see that those animals were bought at such a place, and then you would go back to know where they came from, and you could judge whether or not they had come from a diseased herd.

10873. But I am supposing a case in which the animals came perfectly safe into Leicester market, and you have got your register of the dealers, and you know who the man is, and you get him before you, or before the magistrates, and he proves that they were sound when they came into Leicester market; now, I want to know of what use that register of the dealers would be?—You might in some few cases have a failure, but in the generality of cases you would find that those animals were diseased before they left home, or that a man had disease upon his farm.

10874. Having ascertained the fact that the animals became diseased in the Leicester market, is it your plan that an inquiry should be made into all the cattle which had been marketed at Leicester on the same day?—No, you would not go into all the lot of them.

10875. Then surely the proof that the cattle took the disease at Leicester would be of very little service in checking the disease?—It would be a very great check upon them, inasmuch as they would know that they were being looked after, whereas now they are not.

10876. Do you find that the fact of a horse dealer being licensed affects his character in any way, or renders him more moral or honest?—No, not at all.

10877. You stated that you would have every farmer report where foot and mouth disease broke out?—Yes.

10878. And if he did not do that, you would have him fined severely?—Yes.

10879. The severity of the fine would depend upon the view the magistrates took, would it not?—Yes.

10880. Do you find that the magistrates fine severely now?—They take very different views about it; in some districts they take notice about it, and in some they do not. We want more uniformity of action.

10881. You know that it is a violation of the Act to drive an animal suffering from foot and mouth disease over a highway?—Yes.

10882. Have you ever known in all your experience a severe fine imposed by the magistrates for that offence?—No.

10883. Do you know what the amount of the fine is?—Yes.

10884. Did you ever know it imposed?—Never.

538.

10885. Did you ever know half the fine imposed?—Never.

10886. Do you think, with your knowledge of proceedings before magistrates, that you would get that security which you imagine might be arrived at by imposing upon farmers reporting to the local authority?—I think you want more uniformity of action.

10887. You really think that if you had a duty imposed upon dealers so that you might ascertain their proceedings in the sale of cattle, and if you could induce magistrates to fine severely where disease was not reported by owner, we could get rid of the disease?—Yes; but you must stop the distribution from the London market as well.

10888. Now, with regard to animals in contact, you stated that you would stop their movement; how far would you extend that?—To the adjoining field.

10889. Would you extend it to the adjoining farm?—Not to the adjoining farm so much as to the adjoining field, because sometimes one farm runs into another; you may stop the movement upon one man's farm, and the next man's stock may be a great deal nearer to where the outbreak takes place.

10890. Supposing cattle have been driven 14 miles along a road, would you prevent the movement of all cattle which had been in fields adjacent to this road?—No.

10891. But would you stop the movement of all animals which had been in fields adjoining the farm where diseased stock had been?—I should think that a farmer would not move his stock across a road where he knew that diseased animals had been recently.

10892. But in a farm immediately adjoining a farm where there had been diseased cattle, would you stop the movement of those cattle?—Yes, in the adjoining fields I would.

10893. Do you think that people would submit to that?—Yes, I am sure they would.

10894. That people who perhaps had got 1,000 £ worth of fat meat, just ripe, in the autumn, with the grass going off, would submit to an order which would prevent them from marketing those animals and sending them to London, because in a neighbouring field, upon another farm, foot and mouth disease had occurred?—They would kill those fat animals if they were anxious to get rid of them, or remove them for immediate slaughter under license.

10895. You have seen animals killed in a grazing field, I suppose?—Yes, very many.

10896. Do you find it a very clean transaction, or that the meat goes off very readily?—We always send it to London.

10897. What price do you get for it?—If it is a good one, you would get the market price for it.

10898. But not so good a price as if the animal went up alive?—You cannot expect, where you have to kill a large quantity, to keep it quite so clean.

10899. But you think there would be so little difference between the animals treated in this way, that a grazer would consent to his animals not being moved?—You cannot impose any restrictions without their inconveniencing some people.

10900. But would not this be something more than inconvenient; would it not be productive of very heavy loss?—It would not be, eventually, inasmuch

Mr.
G.A. Lyster.
—
26 June
1873.

Mr.
G.A. Lepper.
26 June
1873.

inasmuch that as the disease advances now, it increases the price of meat.

10901. Mr. Clay.] Do I understand that you would stop the importation of all foreign cattle and sheep?—No, I would have them killed at the point where they land.

10902. That is next door to it; but you have no objection to dead meat being imported?—No, not at all.

10903. What effect do you suppose it would have upon the price of meat, if you had all sheep and cattle slaughtered on landing?—It would eventually lower the price of meat; I have seen many scores of beasts in our district where disease has broken out, sold, which, had they been kept the proper or usual time, would have fed 10 stone more each. If we get rid of disease, meat will come down in price.

10904. Can you give me any instance where the prohibition or restriction of the entry of any article into this country has lowered its price?—No, I do not know of any case of that kind.

10905. Would you stop the importation of horses?—If they brought the disease, I would. When the American disease broke out, I would not have had them imported here.

Mr. HENRY WEBB, called in; and Examined.

Mr.
H. Webb.

10911. Mr. Clare Read.] ARE you a veterinary surgeon, practising in Essex?—Yes, I am.

10912. In your district, in the year 1871, was there any outbreak of foot and mouth disease until July and August?—Not that I am aware of.

10913. Was there then an importation of Dutch cattle?—Yes, there was an extra importation, I think, in that year.

10914. Were there any stores imported at that time?—Yes.

10915. Do you know any farmer in your district who purchased those cattle?—Yes, I do.

10916. Did those cattle have the foot and mouth disease?—Yes.

10917. Did they give it to other animals?—Yes, they did.

10918. Do you believe that foot and mouth disease was introduced into your neighbourhood by means of these Dutch cattle?—Most decidedly.

10919. You do not know of any case of foot and mouth disease in your locality now, do you?—There was not last night; for I saw the police inspector, and I asked him, and I do not believe there is.

10920. When do farmers generally begin to buy these Dutch stores?—They begin to buy them generally about the autumn; in July and August or September; it depends entirely upon the supply.

10921. Have you seen any of these Dutch stores lately?—No, they do not come, they are scarce now. There was a large importation in 1871, but they have been rather short in the supply since.

10922. When the farmers buy these large importations of Dutch cattle, do they expect them to be subject to foot and mouth disease?—Yes, they do.

10923. Do they expect them ever to have pleuro-pneumonia?—Yes; but they don't think so much about that as they do of foot and mouth

10906. I do not quite understand what you mean; you say, if they brought disease; they may bring a very fatal and contagious disease, the glanders, may they not?—Yes.

10907. Would you protect yourself against that in the same way that you would protect yourself against other contagious diseases?—Yes, if there was a district in which animals were known to be affected with glanders, I would not have them in this country.

10908. Would you for that reason prescribe the same restrictions that you do for cattle and sheep?—They might be, certainly, put under restrictions.

10909. That is to say, you would not allow them to be landed alive?—If they came from an affected district, I would not allow them to be.

10910. But you did not put in that "if" with regard to cattle and sheep; as regards those, you would not allow any of them to come into the country alive?—You cannot detect the disease so readily with the vast numbers which come in as you can with horses, there are so many passed over now.

disease; they think more about the Irish cattle having pleuro-pneumonia.

10924. You are positive that in 1871 there was no foot and mouth disease in your district until it was introduced by those Dutch stores?—I am certain of that.

10925. Have you turned your attention at all to pleuro-pneumonia, whether it would be a good thing to stamp that disease out by slaughter?—I think it would.

10926. Giving good compensation to the owners?—Yes; it is a very serious affair when it breaks out amongst a lot of cows; it is more fatal to dairy stock than it is to other beasts.

10927. Do you think that we might get rid of the disease if we did not re-import it, by simply killing the diseased animals?—I think so.

10928. You would not think it necessary to kill those that were herded with them?—Certainly not.

10929. What division of Essex do you live in?—Freshwell.

10930. Chairman.] Have you had foot and mouth disease ever there before this attack in 1871?—Yes.

10931. When had you it there before?—I cannot tell you. I have been there 22 years, and I have seen hundreds of cases; thousands, I might say.

10932. What time do you say the disease broke out in 1871?—I think it was about the second week in July; but I am not certain.

10933. How long before that had you had so disease?—There was not a case to my knowledge the whole year.

10934. For how large a district were you free from it?—I could not say. I can only speak so far as my own practice is concerned, and that extends about 12 miles, and we were infected from those Dutch cattle going from one to the other.

10935. How do you know that the disease came from the Dutch cattle?—I presume so, simply.

simply for the reason that we were quite exempt from it till those beasts came; they were the first that fell down with it, and the others followed; if it is not so, it is a very strong suspicion, at all events.

10936. Where did they come from?—I could not tell you exactly where they came from; but I think that two lots came from the Braintree market.

10937. Was there any disease in the Braintree market?—Not that I am aware of.

10938. How long had they been imported?—I should say, according to the appearance of them, a very little time; because they were in such a debilitated and low state.

10939. You are aware that foot and mouth disease was in certain parts of the kingdom at the time?—It was not in my own immediate neighbourhood.

10940. But you are aware that that disease was about in England a good deal?—I cannot say that I took much notice of it, as it did not come under my immediate observation.

10941. Are you, or are you not, aware that there was foot and mouth disease in this part of England at that time?—I could not call it to my mind now; there might or might not; I could not say.

10942. Your belief that it was brought from Holland was that those animals were Dutch animals, and had the disease?—I firmly believe it; it struck me so forcibly.

10943. But you do not know how long those animals had been in England?—I could not say positively.

10944. Mr. Dodson.] Is it the general opinion amongst the farmers in your district that foot and mouth disease was introduced into England by those Dutch cattle?—Yes, most decidedly.

10945. Do the farmers in your county look upon foot and mouth disease as a very serious matter?—They did not, but they do now. It seems to be a disease which stock acclimatised get in a very mild form, but those foreign animals get it in the most severe form. In 1871 it astonished many who had looked upon it as a very mild disease up to that time.

10946. Since 1871 they have looked upon it as a more serious complaint, have they not?—Yes.

10947. Have they ceased buying Dutch store cattle?—No; but there has been very little importation into our neighbourhood since 1871.

10948. If they can get them they continue to buy, do they not?—Yes, and at a low price. The fact of the case is this, they come over here half starved; and if they can get part of them to live that is cheaper than weaning.

10949. The farmers are not so frightened as to resist the temptation of buying those animals, if they could get them?—They would buy them, but they would use precautions; they would keep them by themselves, but they do not often study their neighbour's stock which may in the adjoining field.

10950. And did they use the same precautions generally in buying cattle when the foot and mouth disease was about?—I cannot say that they used that precaution until after 1871, as far as this district was concerned, because it quite astonished them their having it in such a virulent form.

10951. Chairman.] Where is your large market for buying?—The cattle are landed at Harwich, and they go to Colchester, and then to Braintree.

10952. But your market is at Braintree?—Yes, Braintree and Colchester, the latter being the largest.

10953. Until quite lately were the Braintree and Colchester markets quite free from foot and mouth disease?—Yes, to the best of my knowledge.

10954. Mr. Dodson.] Are your markets inspected?—Not to my knowledge.

10955. Chairman.] Are you aware that Norwich Market is said to have a great deal of disease in it?—I could not speak to that.

10956. Are you not aware that a great many markets are said to have foot and mouth disease in them?—Not in my own immediate district.

10957. It appeared to me that in spite of your Dutch import, your market was more free than many other markets?—I cannot hear of anything at the present time, but can say little as to the state of this market, as I seldom attend any.

10958. Mr. Dodson.] Have your local authorities made any regulations?—I am not aware that they have.

10959. If they had made any, you would be aware of them, would you not?—I am not an inspector now; the police are inspectors now.

10960. But have you not been called in in consequence of any restrictions which they have made?—No, the farmers generally send for me if they get into trouble, and I tell them to send for the police inspectors, if it is a contagious disease included in this Act.

10961. But I take it, that if there had been any stringent regulations forbidding the removal of animals from a farm upon which they had been attacked by this disease, you would as a veterinary surgeon be aware of it?—I take it that I should. The police inspector takes the number of head of cattle, tells the owner not to remove them, but does not visit them again, which I do not call stringent regulations.

10962. Mr. Kossingh.] Have you had much experience in pleuro-pneumonia as a veterinary surgeon?—A very great deal.

10963. Have you ever tried inoculation?—I have never tried that.

10964. You can give the Committee no information with reference to inoculation?—I cannot give the Committee any information with reference to that.

10965. Mr. Pail.] When you are called in to an animal suffering from pleuro-pneumonia, what do you do?—I remove the diseased animals from the healthy ones at once.

10966. By your medicines, or by the pole-axe?—If an animal is not too far diseased and fit for the butcher I have him killed.

10967. You would not advocate slaughter in all cases for pleuro-pneumonia, I believe?—If an animal is diseased, and you are certain that it is pleuro-pneumonia, the best thing is to kill him. I am certain that that is the best thing to do.

10968. Mr. Clare Read.] Have you ever seen any diseased animals in the Metropolitan market?—No, I was never there in my life.

Mr.
H. Webb.
—
26 June
1873.

Mr. JOHN DENCHFIELD, called in; and Examined.

Mr.
J. Denchfield.
25 June
1873.

10968. Mr. *Clare Read*.] You live at Burston House, Aston Abbot, near Aylesbury, do you not?—Yes, I do.

10970. What are you?—A Grazier when I am at home, and a Salesman in London.

10971. Have you anything to do with dairy stock as well as grazing?—Yes, I dairy largely.

10972. How many cows do you keep?—About 100.

10973. Have you ever had any experience of foot and mouth disease?—Yes, I have had a great deal.

10974. When had you the last outbreak upon your farm?—About 12 months ago.

10975. Did you suffer very severely from that outbreak?—Very severely indeed.

10976. What was the origin of that outbreak, do you suspect; where did you get it from?—Somewhere in the neighbourhood; we had it all round us at that time.

10977. Is there any difference in the disease at different times?—A very great difference indeed.

10978. Was this last a very virulent outbreak?—Very.

10979. The worst you have had?—Yes.

10980. Have you had any animals affected with that disease more than once?—I have had an animal attacked twice. I have not had any at home, but I have had one which I sent away from home, a bull which I let, which has had the disease twice.

10981. Is treatment of any use?—It is of vast importance.

10982. What do you do when you have an animal diseased?—I generally have a veterinary surgeon, and I do a little treatment myself. If you do not treat the animal, the disease goes on to blood poisoning. If you do not destroy the germs of the disease, you lose a much larger quantity of the animals.

10983. I suppose nursing is more important than physicking the animals?—It is quite as necessary as physicking them, but they require a little medicine and disinfectants to stop the virus of the disease, such as painting their mouths and feet with glycerine and carbolic acid.

10984. Do you think that is necessary for preventing the spread of the disease?—Yes; you can get rid of it off your place much sooner, for I find that some healthy beasts have been infected with others, but they did not happen to take it. I have known beasts which have happened to get over it where fresh ones have been put in a fortnight afterwards and they have taken it; that is to say, in cases where they had not been treated and disinfected.

10985. Mr. *Deal*.] Do you treat the healthy or affected animals with the glycerine and carbolic acid?—The affected animals, as soon as you find them affected.

10986. Mr. *Clare Read*.] What do you give the animals?—I have adopted the potash and camphor treatment with great success.

10987. But I suppose it will run its course; how many days does it take to develop itself after the animals have contracted the disease?—That depends upon the quantity of poison they have received into the system. If you put them into such a place as the Metropolitan lairs, I have

known them take the disease in 48 hours; and when beasts have picked it up casually in transit from a fair to a farm, they will go a week.

10988. Do you think that foot and mouth disease can be exterminated in this country?—I am certain it can.

10989. How?—By adopting sufficient regulations for stopping the movement of diseased animals; I have been without the disease in the animals I had for 15 years down to the outbreak last year.

10990. How many head of stock have you upon your farm altogether?—About 250 beasts; mine is a breeding herd.

10991. Do you consider that foot and mouth disease is of minor importance as a disease?—Not at all; quite the reverse.

10992. What do you estimate the loss at per head through that disease?—I estimate the loss at about 4*l.* per head upon the carcass; and I find that my beasts will lose about 500*l.* in milk. I was astonished when I copied it off the books the other day to find that the beasts, now that they have calved, again show a loss upon the last week of 19*l.* 16*s.*, compared to what they made in the corresponding week last year before they had the disease.

10993. Do you really attribute this loss of 19*l.* 16*s.* a week to those animals having been attacked with foot and mouth disease last year?—Wholly and solely; that is the amount of loss for the 26 weeks; it would be less in winter when a large portion of the cows were dry.

10994. What time had the cows the disease?—They began about this time last year.

10995. You say you lost 500*l.* worth of milk last year?—They will lose 500*l.* in the 12 months, from the time they took it up till now; they lost about 20*l.* a week to begin with at the time they took the disease last year.

10996. Do you sell the milk in London?—Yes, we sell the milk.

10997. Do you think it is a preventative of other diseases, as some people say it is?—My late relative, Mr. Biggs, who used to live in the Edgware-road, said it was the forerunner of lung disease; it predisposes them to disease, and weakens their constitutions.

10998. What improvement do you think we could effect in our legislation for the treatment of foot and mouth disease?—I think, if the cattle plague regulations were adopted, except the slaughter, it would be very well; I do not say that it is necessary to shut up all the country, but if you were to stop the traffic when the disease existed, it would soon be got rid of.

10999. Would you isolate the stock for a certain time?—Yes, I would.

11000. Have you any knowledge of this disease being brought into the district at all by home cattle?—I know that the disease was reported to have been brought in by some German sheep when it first came into the Vale of Aylesbury; we had been free for about two years and then.

11001. Are you now speaking of the year 1869?—Yes.

11002. Have you been free from that period until now?—Yes, we have.

11003. But you had the disease in 1869, had you not?—No, I had not.

11004. Mr.

11004. Mr. Dent.] Between 1869 and now, the Vale of Aylesbury has been free from foot and mouth disease, has it not?—Very nearly so; we have not had much at times; it has visited occasionally.

11005. Mr. Clare Read.] Do you of your own knowledge say, that previously to that outbreak in 1869, you had been free from the disease for two years?—Yes, I am certain of it.

11006. That is to say, the whole district round about you?—Yes, the whole district round about.

11007. Have you had any experience of pleuro-pneumonia?—Yes, I have had that disease upon my farm. I have never suffered very much myself, but I have seen a great deal from other people. We have an insurance agency at Aylesbury, and I am called in to value the stock.

11008. Is that disease on the decrease or on the increase, do you think?—It is upon the decrease; I have got what our claims are since 1869.

11009. Are you one of the insurers?—Yes, I am. We had not a case at the last meeting, and about 12 months or a year and a half ago, I complained about the animals being kept too long before they were slaughtered, and we passed a resolution that they should be slaughtered at once; and we find that by doing that we have nearly got rid of the disease.

11010. Do you think that it would be a good thing to try and stamp out pleuro-pneumonia by slaughtering the animals affected?—Yes, I think that is the best way of doing it.

11011. By Act of Parliament, making it compulsory to kill those affected with the disease?—Yes.

11012. Would you slaughter the animals which were associated with the diseased ones?—Certainly not.

11013. You would isolate them, would you not?—Yes.

11014. Since you have adopted the precaution of slaughtering the cattle in the first stages of the disease your losses have been less, have they not?—At our last meeting we had not a single case.

11015. Where do you suppose this pleuro-pneumonia came into your district from; could you trace it exactly?—Not now.

11016. The disease has become pretty general over the country in isolated patches, has it not?—I should think, perhaps, it had; but I do not know; we had not much of the disease with us.

11017. How long do you think the disease is incubating?—I have known it incubating for two months. I saw two cows purchased by a friend of mine from a farm where pleuro-pneumonia existed, keeping them isolated from other cattle for two months, till with the disease.

11018. You think that the period enjoined by Act of Parliament, being 28 days, is not sufficient?—Certainly not.

11019. If you slaughtered the animals which were diseased, you would isolate the other stock for more than a month; for how long would you isolate them?—I would isolate them for three months.

11020. Do you think we should get rid of the disease by that means?—Yes, I think we should, if we knew more about the disease.

11021. Do you think that it is imported into this country?—Yes; I have reason to know that so.

that is so; the only time I have ever had pleuro-pneumonia was from such Dutch cattle that I bought.

11022. How long was that ago?—It is some years ago now.

11023. Did you ever buy any more?—No.

11024. Do you think that if we took stringent measures to get rid of pleuro-pneumonia, we ought to admit cattle into the interior of the country from foreign districts where the disease prevailed?—Certainly not.

11025. And you would schedule Holland, and make all cattle coming from there be killed at the water-side?—Yes; if they had pleuro-pneumonia in Holland.

11026. Did you suffer from cattle plague at all?—Yes.

11027. Does the compensation which is given to farmers in case of cattle plague make them careless?—Certainly not; I did not hear of any compensation being given.

11028. Did you get any compensation yourself?—I can tell you what compensation I got; I had about 40 down with it; I killed 10 of them myself, and the other 30 the local authorities killed, and the compensation that I got more than the beasts made was just over 100*l.* from the local authority, and I paid about 60*l.* to the Insurance Company, and 40*l.* to the local authority, so that actually, if I had not insured, or had not had anything to do with the local authority, I should have made the money myself, and out of those 30 beasts that the local authorities killed there were 24 of them that were making 25*s.* a-week a piece, and they were in calf to the son of a 500 guinea bull, so I will leave anyone to guess what the loss upon them was.

11029. Do you think it necessary to give full compensation in the case of pleuro-pneumonia in order to get notice of the first outbreaks of the disease?—I do not.

11030. What compensation would you give?—I do not think that the local authority should be compelled to give full compensation, because, if anything was done, I think it would be done better completely with an insurance society.

11031. What compensation does your society give?—It is three-fourths.

11032. How do you estimate the loss; do you mean three-fourths of the value before they are attacked?—Yes, three-fourths of the value before they are attacked.

11033. What do you do with the carcasses of the animals; does the insurance society take the salvage?—Yes, they do.

11034. Suppose a man were compensated for half his loss, and took the salvage himself, do you think that that would be an unfair way of compensating the owner?—I think that would do very well.

11035. Chairman.] You stated that you had pleuro-pneumonia once upon your farm?—Yes, I had.

11036. Was that in Dutch cattle?—Yes.

11037. Where did you buy those cattle from?—I bought them close at home; but I believe they were bought in London.

11038. At the Metropolitan Market?—I am not quite certain about that.

11039. You do not know whether those animals caught the disease in Holland, or at the market in London?—They were newly imported.

11040. How long had they been imported?—Not

Mr.
J. Denchfield.
26 June
1873.

Mr.
J. Denchfield.
26 June
1873.

Not many days; they were met somewhere in the neighbourhood of London.

11041. How do you know that?—I deputed a person to buy them for me.

11042. How long after you bought these animals did you find them with the disease?—I should think four or five weeks, perhaps; I do not know exactly.

11043. Mr. Pell.] Do you buy any calves yourself, or do you breed all your stock?—I do breed principally.

11044. Therefore you are particularly anxious not to have diseased cattle introduced into your neighbourhood?—Certainly I am.

11045. Mr. Barclay.] Do I understand you to say that the compensation which this insurance society which you speak of gives is three-fourths the value of the animals?—Yes; we make it up to three-fourths by the salvage.

11046. So that the owner loses only one-fourth the value of the animal?—Yes, that is so.

11047. That is his direct loss?—Yes.

11048. But the owner would also have a very considerable indirect loss in the case of dairy cows and breeding cows?—Yes, he would.

11049. Do you consider that ample compensation?—Perhaps if the compensation was greater it would make people more anxious to get rid of the disease quickly, and in the long run I think it is likely it will be less cost to the country.

11050. These people who are members of this insurance society, I presume, are all the leading men and intelligent farmers and stockholders in the district?—We have men of all grades, from two cattle up to 200.

11051. Would there be a fair average or above an average of intelligent farmers of the country?—In all probability there would be above the average, but it is dairy stock principally that is insured.

11052. The loss is very much heavier upon dairy stock than it is upon fattening stock, is it not?—Yes, much heavier.

11053. A plan has been recommended to this Committee of compensating the owner to a certain proportion of his loss, that is to say, if the salvage of the animal fetched three-fourths, the remaining fourth of the loss should be divided between the owner and the local authority, or whoever was to be responsible for compensation; would you approve of such an arrangement?—I think it would do very well.

11054. The owner would then have a joint interest in making the most of the carcasses with the local authority?—Yes, undoubtedly he would.

11055. And if the disease were very summarily treated and quickly dealt with, the loss is much more likely to be smaller than where the farmers hesitate about it, and allow the disease to make progress?—Much more likely; that is where we get so much mischief done.

11056. Mr. Dent.] Upon what do you base your losses of last year; what is your comparison based upon with regard to foot and mouth disease, is it upon the previous year or the present year?—I laid the loss upon 250 beasts affected with the foot and mouth disease, at 4*l.* each.

11057. But here you have given the figures at so much a week; it is that your production of milk was so much less than the previous year?—Yes.

11058. Upon that ground you base your calculation?—Yes.

11059. Taking the price that milk was worth last year, the quantity which your cows gave was so much less, and the figures which you gave us now represent the loss?—Yes, that is the loss for the last 28 weeks previous to the 14th June 1873.

11060. But I thought it was last year that you had the disease?—Yes, but they are never so good in their lives after they have had the disease, not even after they have calved again.

11061. Then those cows are giving less during the first 28 weeks of this year than they did last year?—Yes.

11062. That is to say, the corresponding weeks?—Yes.

11063. They calve in the spring, do they not?—Yes, they would calve in the spring.

11064. Or do you arrange for them to calve at all times of the year?—No, they are very scarcely done now; I shall not have any more calves until after Michaelmas.

11065. Is this loss upon some of your cows that they are nearly dry before they calve, during the first 28 weeks of the year?—They would be getting towards that way.

11066. When did those cattle have the disease?—They began about this time last year; they did not all have the disease at once, or else we should have had no milk at all; they were making 38*l.* a week, and they dropped to 34*l.* per week directly.

11067. Did it go rapidly through them?—Rather so.

11068. How are they milking now that they have calved again?—Some of them do not give half so much as they did before.

11069. Did you have many cases of abortion amongst your cows?—We did not, this time.

11070. Did any of the cows miss the bull?—I have some which did not breed, but not a very large proportion; I may have 30, perhaps.

11071. Out of how many?—Perhaps I had from 120 to 130 out last year.

11072. Was that a much larger proportion than usual?—Yes, a very much larger proportion; it is very rarely that I do not get a cow to breed.

11073. Do you attribute that to the prevalence of foot and mouth disease, or to anything in the season?—To the foot and mouth disease; they went all right up to the time when they had the foot and mouth disease.

11074. Holding to the bull?—Yes.

11075. Have you ever heard of failure in that way attributed at all to its being a wet or a dry season, as well as to the disease?—No, it was a very good season with us for that. I do not believe much in seasons for that sort of thing.

11076. Mr. Clure Read.] Are your calves later than usual?—Rather so, a few of them.

11077. Last year was a particularly good season for grass, was it not?—Yes; I think it was the best I ever knew, turned to the west account.

11078. That is to say, where a grazier or keeper of any sort of cattle have foot or mouth disease, the greatest amount of grass produced the least profit?—Yes; I am sure it destroyed more produce with me last year than was made off the land in 1868 or 1870.

11079. How do you mean destroyed the produce?—The foot and mouth disease destroyed the produce in meat and milk.

11080. You mean that it actually destroyed more

more meat and milk than the dry seasons of 1868 and 1870 produced?—Yes.

11081. As a cattle salesman, do you attend the Metropolitan Market regularly?—Yes, I do.

11082. Have you seen any cases of foot and mouth disease in the market at any time?—Yes, a great many sometimes.

11083. Lately?—No; the market has been very free for some time.

11084. Did you see it in the case of any cattle or sheep that went out of the market into the country?—Not recently, I think.

11085. When you say you have seen several cases of foot and mouth disease in the market, had they been passed by the inspectors as sound, or were they just taken out and killed?—They are all taken out and slaughtered now when they are seen.

11086. Then how do they get into the market in the first instance; have they not to pass the inspection before they get there?—I suppose all foreign stock is inspected.

11087. Have you seen cases in which foreign stock have developed the disease in the market?—Yes.

11088. What has happened to them, have they been taken out?—They are sent to be slaughtered.

11089. They have come in to the Metropolitan Market diseased, although they had been passed by the inspectors as sound at ports?—Yes.

11090. Are you quite sure that they had been the subjects of disease?—Yes, I am quite certain about it.

11091. Foreign sheep have for some time gone about the country, have they not?—Yes, they have.

11092. Have you seen any of them diseased?—Yes, but not lately.

11093. Have you, within the last two or three years?—I should say I have.

11094. But in the cases in which foreign stock have been the subjects of foot and mouth disease in the market, they have evidently escaped detection at the waterside?—Yes.

11095. And the disease developed itself afterwards, did it not?—The disease developed itself after the animals had left the waterside.

11096. Therefore, the same thing might happen, that cattle and sheep which were passed out of the Metropolitan Market as perfectly sound, and went into the country, would be the means of communicating foot and mouth disease to the country?—Yes.

11097. Mr. Dent.] Have you ever tracked cattle out of English markets which may have contracted the disease in the markets, and taken it out with them into the country?—Yes.

11098. The country markets in England, where there are no foreign stock, are very often very full of foot and mouth disease, are they not?—There is no doubt that the large markets are centres of disease, and centres of foot and mouth disease.

11099. But in almost every large market the germs of foot and mouth disease are existing, whether there are foreign cattle there or English cattle there?—At some certain periods; but I do not think that is so now, without it is a very large market.

11100. Are you free from foot and mouth disease altogether in the Vale of Aylesbury now?—I believe we are.

11101. I think I understood you to state that

you had been free since 1869, before the last outbreak?—I believe we have been free; we have been very nearly so; we have not much of it.

11102. Have you noticed, from your experience as a grazer, that the disease comes and goes, and is very virulent for a year or two, and then dies away, and then breaks out again?—I have no doubt that mine was a newly imported species of the disease. I believe that after the disease has been through the animals in this country, it gradually gets much lighter, and that they do not have it so severely.

11103. You think that each fresh importation makes a more virulent outbreak?—Undoubtedly.

11104. Did you trace the last outbreak of the disease in your animals to foreign importation?—I did not; but I know they had the disease in Germany very badly just before we had it.

11105. When had they the disease very badly in Germany?—In May 1872.

11106. But we had the disease in England in 1871?—Yes, but not of the virulent type that we had in 1872.

11107. You think not?—No.

11108. Then your idea is, that a more virulent type was introduced by the foreign importation in the spring of 1872 or the autumn of 1871?—I have no doubt of it; you will always find that foot and mouth disease which is imported from Germany, is worse than any other. I have noticed that years ago.

11109. But how have you traced back the importation from Germany?—I have seen German beasts with the disease in the Metropolitan Market years ago.

11110. You say that the disease is brought from Germany; but have you been able to trace it in England to cattle which have been brought from Germany at any time?—Not directly. I know that there was some German sheep that took it, and some others of the same type.

11111. When was that?—That was last summer.

11112. Were the sheep sold in the Metropolitan Market?—Yes, I believe they were.

11113. Could you be satisfied that they would catch the disease in the Metropolitan Market?—They might, possibly, catch the disease in the Metropolitan Market.

11114. Your own business is in dairying, is it not?—Yes.

11115. Do you feed stock also?—I feed them all off.

11116. As a salesman, you have, I suppose, fat stock consigned to you from other people?—Yes.

11117. Is disease getting now very faint throughout the country generally?—There is very little loss in the country now.

11118. I am presuming that you have communication with different counties if you have beasts consigned to you; do you find that there has been any difference between counties where they have stringent regulations and where they have not with reference to the subsidence of the disease?—Yes, it got better with us directly we put the regulations in force, but they did not do anything until it was got very bad, and then we had one county which had stringent regulations, and another which did not do anything at all.

11119. What county had the stringent regulation where they limited the disease?—We had Bedfordshire and Hertfordshire; one had stringent

Mr.
J. Dentfield,
28 June
1873.

Mr.
J. Denchfield,
28 June
1873.

gent regulations, and the other had none at all, but I could not tell which was which at this time.

11120. Was there any difference in the amount of the disease in those counties?—I could not say anything about that.

11121. I want to know from your experience as a salesman, whether you found that there were fewer diseased stock in the counties where the regulations were very stringent, or not?—I found that we could trace the disease very often to where there were no regulations, or where the regulations were not carried out.

11122. In what counties could you trace the disease to the regulations not being carried out?—I do not know which of those two counties it was; there was nothing done in our own county at one time; when the disease gets a little slack, then you relax the regulations, and they are not carried out. Even in our own county, I saw the roads depastured last spring by sheep with foot and mouth disease.

11123. Mr. Dodson.] Was no information given with reference to that?—I suppose not.

11124. You saw those sheep yourself?—Yes.

11125. You did not inform against them?—No, not unless they came too near me.

11126. How far were they from you?—They were three or four miles off.

11127. I suppose it is the case generally that people do not like giving information?—It is.

11128. Do people who have disease upon their farms conceal it frequently?—Yes, I think some few do; but I do not think they do it much now; they did not when the regulations were carried out.

11129. What regulations are there in force in your county with regard to foot and mouth disease?—We give notice to the police to stop the movement of them.

11130. To stop the movement of all animals off a farm, or only the diseased ones?—All animals which have been in contact.

11131. Therefore, of course, a man who declares that he has foot and mouth disease upon his farm, has his farm, in a great measure, shut up?—Yes.

11132. But notwithstanding that inconvenience, you think there is not much concealment?—I do not think there is.

11133. You think that the owners of animals would readily give information to the public?—Yes, I do.

11134. But you think that owners of animals, seeing other diseased animals along the road, are unwilling to give information about it?—Yes, I think they are.

11135. You told the Committee that the milk in your dairy had fallen off in the period of the 28 weeks of this year, compared with the first 28 weeks of last year; there must be some mistake in that date, must there not; 28 weeks of this year have not yet elapsed, I think?—No, hardly; it would be the last 28 weeks from the time I took the paper. I got my brother to copy it for me. He took the 28 weeks preceding a fortnight ago.

11136. Then some of the weeks must have fallen in last year?—Yes, I suppose so.

11137. Are you comparing the 28 weeks preceding, and the 28 weeks which immediately followed them, or are you comparing 28 weeks and a corresponding period in a different year?—Yes, that is it.

11138. The same season of the year, is a different year?—Yes.

11139. Now, you say that the German foot and mouth disease is of a very virulent kind?—Yes, I do so.

11140. Are there distinct symptoms by which you can tell it from our own foot and mouth disease?—The symptoms are very much the same, only more severe.

11141. Could you distinguish a light case of German foot and mouth disease from a severe case of English foot and mouth disease?—Perhaps it would be difficult to distinguish the two; but where you get severe cases, it runs on to blood poisoning, and produces abscesses, and the beast ultimately dies with it.

11142. But there is no distinction, as far as you know, between German and English foot and mouth disease, excepting in degree?—Only in the severity of the case.

11143. Mr. Clare Read.] Your idea is that after disease has been prevalent in England for some time, it becomes less intense?—Yes, it does.

11144. And when you have a fresh importation, it is of a more virulent type, is it not?—Yes, undoubtedly it is.

11145. You have a letter from a gentleman near Harnage, dated May 1873, in which he says, "I have already lost 12 cattle, eight oxen and four cows;" have you any idea whether he was a very large proprietor of cattle?—I do not know the quantity he keeps.

11146. But evidently there it was fatal?—Yes, certainly.

11147. Mr. Dodson.] Have you lost any animals yourself from foot and mouth disease?—Yes, I lost three.

11148. In what year was that?—It was this last time; but I have no hesitation in saying that we should have lost ten times the number if they had not been treated.

11149. At what time of the year was that?—It was in the months of June and July 1872.

11150. You say that there was a virulent outbreak in Germany in May 1872?—Yes.

11151. And that since then the worst form of the disease has appeared in this country?—Yes.

11152. Could you trace the connection between the worst form of the disease in this country and the German disease?—I could not trace how it came to me.

11153. You only know the fact, that it was prevailing in Germany in May 1872?—Yes.

11154. And that the worst form of the disease which you consider to be identical with that in this country appeared in this country in June 1872?—I know it was taken in those sheep that I am speaking of; it was somewhere in the neighbourhood of Slough or Windsor. Mr. Forbes told me of it.

11155. Where did those German sheep come from?—They were bought in the Metropolitan market, I believe.

11156. When did they reach the neighbourhood of Slough?—I do not know the exact date; it was sometime last summer.

11157. Mr. Clare Read.] How long was it before that that they were attacked?—It was somewhere near the same time.

11158. Mr. Dent.] That could not have brought the disease to you?—No, not to me.

11159. Mr. Dodson.] Those animals were in the Metropolitan market; you could not tell that

these animals did not get the disease there?—No, you have no certainty where they did get it.

11160. Mr. Dent.] You do not believe in the veterinary recipe when the cattle have got this disease, to take care of them, and leave them alone and let them cure themselves?—Certainly not; they require treating in order to destroy the germinant matter, because, if you let it go, it forms abscesses. I have known many beasts who have had abscesses upon the kidneys, and sometimes upon the joints.

11161. Do you think that the veterinary surgeons know anything at all about the disease?—I think that ours do; we have two or three, or four in our neighbourhood who are well up, and who do a deal of good.

11162. Mr. Barclay.] The treatment you speak of is simply in the way of an alleviation of the disease, but not in the way of stopping its course?—It is only an alleviation of the disease.

11163. There is more in the way of good nursing, than there is in medical treatment?—They want nursing and medical treatment as well; they are very fond of hay. I believe our

beasts eat 30 tons of hay last year; when grass was rotting upon the ground, they would not eat it when it was mown.

11164. Mr. Clave Road.] That is soft hay, I suppose?—They do not care whether it is soft or hard; there is a peculiarity about foot and mouth disease which is not common to other diseases; the animals do not cease to ruminate in foot and mouth disease; whether hay cleanses their mouths and keeps up the rumination or not, I do not know.

11165. You think that by giving medicine you prevent any secondary symptoms arising?—Certainly.

11166. Mr. Dent.] Do you give them glycerine and carbolic acid internally, or do you only apply it externally?—I only paint their mouths and their feet with it.

11167. Is that in the early stages of the disease?—Yes, as soon as you see it.

11168. Mr. Clave Road.] And you give them some medicine internally as well, do you not?—Yes, I give them a little nitrate of potash, or chloride of potash, or camphor.

Mr.
J. Deschamps.
25 June
1873.

Monday, 30th June 1873.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mr. W. E. Forster.
Mr. James Barclay.
Mr. Jacob Bright.
Mr. Callan.
Mr. Cawley.
Mr. Clay.

Mr. Dent.
Mr. McNeill.
Mr. O'Connor.
Mr. Clare Read.
Mr. Ridley.
Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson.

THE RIGHT HONOURABLE WILLIAM EDWARD FORSTER, IN THE CHAIR.

Mr. JAMES THOMSON, called in; and Examined.

Mr. J. Thomson. 11169. Mr. Barclay.] YOU are a member of the Veterinary Profession, I believe?—Yes, I am.

30 June 1873. 11170. And inspector for the local authority of Aberdeen and Aberdeenshire, and also inspector of dead meat in Aberdeen?—Yes, I am.

11171. And also inspector of the Aberdeenshire Rinderpest Association?—Yes.

11172. Can you give the Committee some statistics of that association?—Rinderpest was introduced into the county twelve times.

11173. Upon how many farms did it exist?—It existed upon 46 farms.

11174. How many animals died?—Eighty-four.

11175. How many were slaughtered and buried?—One hundred and ninety-six.

11176. And slaughtered and sold?—Three hundred.

11177. What was the total loss to the county?—£. 4,652 15 s. 6 d.

11178. What was the amount of compensation paid?—£. 3,393 8 s. 6 d.

11179. Will you hand in a statement of statistics of cattle plague in Aberdeenshire?—I will (The same was hand d in, vide Appendix).

11180. In Aberdeenshire was it found necessary to slaughter out all the animals upon a farm where the cattle plague existed?—No.

11181. You have had great experience, particularly in the last case; will you state that briefly to the Committee?—The disease appeared at Mill Hill, parish of Old Deer.

11182. How many cattle were there upon the farm?—Eighty.

11183. The disease had considerable hold upon the stock before it was finally determined to be rinderpest?—Yes, it had.

11184. You slaughtered down about how many?—About 40 altogether.

11185. So that there were 40 left?—There were 40 left, which remained healthy.

11186. A part of these were animals which were fat?—Sixteen of these were animals which were fat, and would have been slaughtered in any case.

11187. You adopted a special system of disinfecting upon that farm?—Yes.

11188. What was that special system which you adopted?—We covered up all the manure in the courtyard with earth, and then with quick

lime, and then we disinfected the cattle with a solution of Condy's fluid, two or three times a day, and washed the walls and woodwork of the byres inside.

11189. Without removing the cattle from the infected sheds, you disinfected the sheds by means of a solution of chloride of lime, watering the walls by a force-pump?—Yes.

11190. The result was, that although the cattle plague had made some progress over the herd, you were able to save about 40 animals by vigilance, and by adopting that system?—Yes, that was so.

11191. Foot and mouth disease has been very prevalent in Aberdeenshire during the last four years?—Yes; it has been very prevalent.

11192. Can you give the Committee any estimate of the loss in the county during those four years?—In 1869 I estimated the loss at 6,817 l. 10 s.

11193. How many animals were there attacked?—Four thousand five hundred and fifty-five.

11194. Then, in 1870, what was the number?—Three thousand three hundred and seventy-five.

11195. And the loss was how much?—£. 5,062 l. 10 s.

11196. In 1871 what was the number?—Nineteen thousand eight hundred and sixty-five.

11197. And the loss was how much?—£. 29,227 10 s.

11198. And in 1872 what was the number?—Ten thousand three hundred and ninety-five.

11199. And the loss?—£. 15,592 10 s.

11200. What is the total?—£. 56,700 during the last four years.

11201. What did you estimate the loss at per head?—Thirty shillings.

11202. Do you consider that a very moderate estimate?—I do.

11203. Has foot and mouth disease attacked sheep in Aberdeenshire to any extent?—Yes, it has, but not to any great extent.

11204. The disease has not spread generally amongst sheep in Aberdeenshire, I believe?—No.

11205. The stock of sheep in Aberdeenshire

is not very large in proportion to the number of cattle?—No, it is not.

11206. Have you had an opportunity of knowing the views of the butchers in Aberdeen as regards the loss and damage to fat cattle from foot and mouth disease?—Yes, I have.

11207. Assuming that a butcher is going to buy an animal, and he estimates the weight of it to be 7 cwt., without knowing that the animal has had foot and mouth disease previously, how much does he reduce his estimate of its weight, if he knows that the animal has had foot and mouth disease and recovered from it even four months previously?—From a quarter to half a hundred-weight.

11208. The experience of the butcher tells him that even four months afterwards foot and mouth disease will have effect upon an animal, so as to make it from a quarter to half a hundred-weight less than its apparent weight?—Yes.

11209. That is from 1 l. to 2 l. per head?—Yes, according to the price of meat at the time.

11210. Have you got clear of foot and mouth disease in Aberdeenshire now?—Yes, we have.

11211. You have not had any cases for how long?—Since the 11th of April.

11212. Do you think that foot and mouth disease is a disease of foreign origin?—Decidedly.

11213. You are perfectly satisfied that it is a disease of an origin foreign to Aberdeenshire, at least?—Yes.

11214. You are certain that it does not originate in Aberdeenshire?—It does not.

11215. How was the disease brought into the county?—By the introduction of cattle.

11216. Was it by store cattle brought into the county to be grazed and fed?—Yes, to be grazed and fed.

11217. Do you attribute the disappearance of the disease to the restrictions to any great extent?—Partly to the restrictions.

11218. Are you in favour of retaining the existing restrictions?—Decidedly.

11219. You have carried out the Orders in Council completely in Aberdeenshire?—Yes.

11220. You adapted for a time in Aberdeenshire the pleuro-pneumonia rules to foot and mouth disease?—Yes.

11221. Has that continued to be the case until now?—No.

11222. You abandoned the pleuro-pneumonia rules in the case of foot and mouth disease after some experience?—Yes, we did.

11223. What was the objection to them?—They did not diminish the disease at all.

11224. The carrying out of the pleuro-pneumonia regulations in the case of foot and mouth disease, had not a result proportionate to the trouble and loss which it involved?—It had not.

11225. What are the regulations in existence now as regards foot and mouth disease?—After a place has been declared to be infected with foot and mouth disease, no cattle are allowed to be taken away until the place is declared clean again.

11226. Does the inspector visit the place?—No; the farmer gives information to the police, the police report it to the local authority, and the owner reports when his cattle are recovered, and the inspector then visits and examines them.

11227. You are chief inspector for the county, and have cognisance of cattle disease throughout the whole county, but there are sub-inspectors

under you, who have authority for examining into the cases of foot and mouth disease and pleuro-pneumonia?—Yes.

11228. In the case of pleuro-pneumonia, if it is supposed to be in existence upon a farm, what is done?—The owner sends for the local inspector, and he examines, and if he finds that the suspicion is well grounded, he communicates to the clerk of the local authority.

11229. Which is practically to you?—Yes.

11230. The clerk of the local authority communicates with you?—The clerk of the local authority communicates with me, and I go and examine, and I either find that it is pleuro-pneumonia or not.

11231. You determine whether it is the disease or not?—Yes.

11232. Have you seen any other animals affected with foot and mouth disease besides cattle and sheep?—Yes, I have seen pigs affected with it.

11233. In Aberdeenshire?—Yes.

11234. Did that disease prevail amongst pigs to any great extent?—Not to any great extent.

11235. You have made certain experiments with rabbits?—I have.

11236. What was the result of them?—It was negative, so far as their taking foot and mouth disease.

11237. What experiments did you try?—I took the rabbits alive to a farm where foot and mouth disease existed, and introduced the saliva dribbling from the mouths of the cattle by smearing the mouths, lips, &c., of the rabbits, and brought them home and fed them for a week upon the turnips which the cattle had been feeding upon, all smothered with their saliva.

11238. Had that any effect upon the rabbits?—None whatever.

11239. Did you try any other experiments?—I tried to inoculate them with the saliva; I took the saliva fresh and introduced it into the ears, and failed to discover any symptoms of disease other than slight inflammatory action around the seat of puncture.

11240. Neither locally nor upon the system of the animal had the inoculation any effect, so far as you could observe?—So far as I could observe, there was none.

11241. Have you had any opportunity of trying inoculation upon any other animals?—No.

11242. Have you had any opportunity of proving by any indirect evidence whether hares are or are not attacked by foot and mouth disease?—I have seen hares which were shot in a field amongst cattle affected with foot and mouth disease, and which were killed with a view of determining whether they were affected by the disease or not, and I could see no symptom whatever of their having the disease.

11243. There is one estate which you know of in Aberdeenshire where there is a very large stock of hares, and upon the same estate foot and mouth disease prevailed to a very great extent; have you heard whether the hares which were killed upon that estate had any appearance of being affected with foot and mouth disease, or any such disease?—The country people reported that the hares were the means of spreading the disease, and it was with the view of determining whether such was the case or not, that those hares were killed upon the estate.

11244. You made inquiries upon this estate whether they had got any hares affected with

Mr.
J. Thomson.
30 June
1873.

Mr.
J. Thomson.
—
30 June
1873.

any disease whatever, or any disease approaching foot and mouth disease where hares were very numerous, and you found that none of the hares appeared to be in any way affected?—None of them.

11245. Do you think that foot and mouth disease attacks any animals beyond cattle, sheep, and pigs?—It has not been my experience to find out that other animals took the disease.

11246. As regards foot and mouth disease, what alterations would you recommend to be made in the existing regulations?—I would not leave it optional for the local authorities to adopt the regulations for foot and mouth disease. I would make it imperative for all local authorities to adopt the present regulations, and to adopt the powers which the Privy Council have already empowered them to do, and I would have a more efficient inspection at the port of embarkation and of debarkation of all Irish cattle.

11247. Do you think that foot and mouth disease is brought into Aberdeenshire to a large extent by Irish cattle?—I do.

11248. Would you wish the local authorities to have clear and distinct powers to seize any animal affected with foot and mouth disease in a fair or market, or moving upon a public highway?—Certainly.

11249. Would you give them power to deal with the cattle, and to hold the cattle until they should be paid for their expenses?—Most decidedly.

11250. Pleuro-pneumonia has prevailed extensively in Aberdeenshire during the last two years?—It has.

11251. Have you there a statement as regards pleuro-pneumonia in Aberdeenshire during the last two years?—I have.

11252. Will you hand that statement in?—Yes, I will. (*The same was handed in, vide Appendix.*)

11253. The result of that shows, that for the year ending 31st December 1871, the disease appeared upon 80 places?—Thirty places.

11254. And 237 animals were slaughtered with a view to stop the course of the disease?—Yes.

11255. The loss upon those animals amounted to 1,699 £ 7 s. 4 d.?—Yes.

11256. In Aberdeenshire you applied for power to slaughter out pleuro-pneumonia as soon as the Privy Council intimated that they would consider application for those powers from the local authorities?—We did.

11257. And you have vigorously carried out the slaughter of animals affected with pleuro-pneumonia ever since?—Yes, we have.

11258. Then for the year ending 1872, upon how many farms did the disease appear?—Upon 34.

11259. What was the number of cattle upon those places?—One thousand one hundred and twenty-six.

11260. Of these, how many were slaughtered?—Three hundred and thirteen.

11261. And the loss was how much?—£ 2,431. 7 s. 4 d.

11262. The general abstract of the experience of Aberdeenshire in pleuro-pneumonia for the year and nine months, ending 31st December 1872 was, that the disease existed in 64 places, was it not?—Yes, it was.

11263. The number of cattle upon those farms was 1,998?—Yes.

11264. And the number of cattle slaughtered was 550?—Yes.

11265. And the value of those cattle was 8,469 £ 6 s. 6 d.?—Yes.

11266. And there was realised by the sale of carcasses, hides, and offal, 4,418 £ 11 s. 9 d., showing a loss of 4,230 £ 14 s. 8 d.?—Yes.

11267. And the amount paid in compensation was 2,939 £ 5 s. 9 d.?—Yes.

11268. Can you tell the Committee what was the rate levied upon the county during the last two years to meet the expenses?—One penny per pound of the agricultural rental.

11269. In calling in the agricultural rental, you exclude the boroughs only, do you not?—It was a penny per £ upon the whole rental of the county, excluding the boroughs.

11270. But excluding no other part of the county rental except the boroughs?—No.

11271. The assessment in 1872-73 to meet the total expenses, was how much?—A penny farthing.

11272. What has been the state of the county as regards pleuro-pneumonia?—During the last six months we have had five outbreaks of pleuro-pneumonia.

11273. You have been able to root out that disease almost entirely in Aberdeenshire, have you not?—Yes.

11274. The expense for the current year unless some change in the present prospect occurs will be materially less, will it not, than it has been during the last two years?—It will.

11275. Will you state the details of the proceedings your county have taken in connection with pleuro-pneumonia; what are the leading regulations which the local authorities issued to the local inspectors?—Immediately upon pleuro-pneumonia being suspected at a place, the local inspector visits the place and examines the animals, and if he thinks it is pleuro-pneumonia, he communicates the fact to the county inspector.

11276. How is he paid for that?—He gets a guinea, if it turns out to be pleuro-pneumonia, for the information. The sub-inspector gets 5 s. for every visit, and 1 s. for the report.

11277. The local inspector reports to the clerk of the local authority, who directs you to proceed to the place and examine the cattle?—Yes, that is so.

11278. Should it be determined to be pleuro-pneumonia, what is the next proceeding?—All the cattle are valued.

11279. There is a special schedule issued to the district committees, for the purpose of filling up with the values of these vernal cattle?—Yes.

11280. Then if it is determined to be pleuro-pneumonia, the animal is slaughtered forthwith?—It is.

11281. And the carcass realised if it is of value?—Yes.

11282. How is the owner compensated?—To the extent of three-fourths of the loss, provided it does not more than equal half the value of the animal.

11283. That is to say, in the case of an animal worth 16 £, if the salvage amounts to 8 £, the owner is paid three-fourths of the loss of 8 £, which is 6 £?—Yes.

11284. The local authority in that case loses 6 £, and the owner 2 £?—Yes, that is so.

11285. Are you in favour of a high rate of compensation?—Yes, I am.

11286. With

Mr.
J. Thomson.
30 June
1873.

11286. With what object?—To get rid of the disease.

11287. But how does that get rid of the disease?—I think that the farmers would be more willing to communicate the fact of the disease being upon their places at an earlier stage, at least.

11288. Then you advocate a high rate of compensation for the purpose of inducing the early discovery of the disease?—Yes.

11289. I presume that you find it of very great importance to have the disease discovered at an early period, and before it has taken any great hold upon a herd?—Yes, decidedly.

11290. Do you consider that to be one of the most important points in connection with the stamping out of contagious disease?—I do.

11291. Can you give the Committee the results of your proceedings upon a few of the farms, with reference to how many animals it has been necessary to kill in order to stop the progress of the disease; you have a statement relating to 10 farms, have you not?—I have.

11292. How many cattle were there upon those farms altogether?—There are 10 places specified in this Return, and the number of cattle upon those 10 farms was 610.

11293. How many animals did you find it necessary to slaughter?—Forty-seven.

11294. What was the total value of those animals upon those 10 places?—£ 10,000.

11295. What was the loss by the slaughter of the 47 animals?—£ 315. 5 s. 6 d.

11296. There were 610 animals upon those 10 farms, and it was found necessary to slaughter only 47 to stop the disease?—That is so.

11297. Has the disease quite gone from those 10 places?—With one exception.

11298. With that one exception, how long is it since there was any disease upon the other nine farms?—We have had no complaint of any disease upon the nine farms since this statement was made up.

11299. You have not had any cases upon nine of the farms for two or three months?—For 10 months we have been perfectly clear.

11300. Upon one of the farms has the disease appeared again?—Yes, after the lapse of five months.

11301. After having been declared free, there was no more disease for five months?—There was no more disease reported; but the owner of that one farm had been in the way of disposing of cattle during the winter season, and it is more than probable that in the disposal of fat stock the disease had been latent, and that the disease had actually never ceased upon that farm, thus accounting for the second outbreak of it.

11302. What kind of animal was this in which the disease has recently appeared?—A two-year old half-fat bullock on grass.

11303. Chairman.] You say that the owner had been disposing of cattle, but had he been getting fresh cattle in?—The owner had been getting no fresh cattle in.

11304. Mr. Barclay.] He had added none to his stock since the previous outbreak?—He had not added any to his stock since the previous outbreak, except two milk cows, which were kept in a different place from where the disease broke out, and those two cows have remained healthy.

11305. But you think that the disease had been smouldering in the fat cattle which were

sold during the winter, and had reappeared in this store animal, having been communicated by the fat animals during the winter?—Yes.

11306. Chairman.] I suppose that means that in consequence of the owner's constantly disposing of fat animals, the disease which you think was lurking among them was not so apparent as it might have been otherwise?—Yes; that after being put to the grass, the change from the byres to the grass made it so that the disease could no longer remain latent, and it broke out, so that it became apparent.

11307. Mr. Barclay.] The disease in the earlier stages is not easily visible in fat cattle?—No, it is not.

11308. They do not show it very readily?—No, they do not show it very readily.

11309. But you have no particular reason, except an inference from the general state of the case, to suppose that any of the fat animals had been attacked which were sent away?—I have no particular reason to suppose that.

11310. You believe, I dare say, that pleuro-pneumonia is a foreign disease?—Yes, I do.

11311. You have no doubt about its being imported into Aberdeenshire in any case?—None.

11312. Do you know how long it is since pleuro-pneumonia appeared first in Aberdeenshire?—I do not.

11313. It was before you were connected with the profession, I suppose?—It was.

11314. Chairman.] How long have you been connected with the profession?—Ten years.

11315. Mr. Barclay.] It is one of your instructions from the local authority that when disease breaks out at a place, you have to trace, as far as you possibly can, whence the disease came?—It is.

11316. You have done that in a good many cases, have you not?—I have.

11317. Can you give the Committee any statement respecting any of the cases you have traced out?—Yes. For the last two years there have been 64 outbreaks of the disease, 26 of which are due to animals imported into the county. From these 26 centres disease has spread to 21 places. So far as I can ascertain, 15 of the 26 outbreaks referred to are due to Irish cattle; 4 to Dutch; 4 to English; and 3 to Scotch from different counties. During the years 1871 and 1872, one or more animals died previous to the discovery of the disease at 25 places. The total number of cattle which died was 40, and their probable value 480 l.

11317*. In those cases where you attribute the disease to Irish cattle, you have found that the disease has first appeared upon a farm in an Irish animal, have you not?—Yes.

11318. Recently bought?—Recently bought.

11319. And imported from Ireland?—And brought from Ireland.

11320. In any case, have you had any special opportunities of knowing how long a time had elapsed since the animal came from Ireland previously to its showing disease?—I am not at present in possession of the facts, but within a month.

11321. You have known of Irish cattle showing pleuro-pneumonia within a month after you have been certain that they had left Ireland?—Yes.

11322. And you infer from that that the animals had been affected with pleuro-pneumonia before they left Ireland?—Yes, I do.

11323. Can

Mr. J. Tasson. 11323. Can you give the Committee any idea of the number of cattle imported into Aberdeenshire?—In 1871 there were upwards of 10,000 store cattle imported, composed of English, Irish, Dutch, and a small proportion from the south of Scotland, but not including those from Orkney and Shetland.

30 June
1873.

11324. Can you tell the Committee what proportion of the cattle were Irish?—I have somewhere, but I really cannot tell the proportion now; the number of Irish cattle and the number of English cattle was stated in the report to the local authority, but I cannot distinguish it just now.

11325. Mr. *Clare Read*.] You do not know how many Dutch cattle were imported into Aberdeenshire?—I do not know how many Dutch cattle were imported.

11326. Mr. *Borczyk*.] There were comparatively few Dutch cattle introduced, I believe?—Very few, comparatively.

11327. Would the Irish cattle be three-fourths of the whole import?—They would be the largest proportion; they would be more than a half.

11328. Are you satisfied with the existing restrictions and regulations as regards pleuro-pneumonia, or in what respect would you wish them modified?—I would wish the time for restricting the moving of cattle upon a farm where pleuro-pneumonia existed, to be extended.

11329. You have seen the proposal to prohibit all movement of cattle for one month, and for two months thereafter only under the certificate of the local authority, do you approve of that?—I do.

11330. Would you allow fat cattle to be removed from an infected place for immediate slaughter, provided they were unaffected with the disease?—I would.

11331. You think that would be a very considerable advantage without causing any material risk of communicating the disease?—I do.

11332. How many local authorities are there in Aberdeenshire?—There are five; there are the city of Aberdeen, the borough of Inverary, the borough of Peterhead, the borough of Kintore, and the county.

11333. Would you approve of one local authority for the whole county?—Yes, I would.

11334. The local authorities throughout Aberdeenshire act altogether in concert, do they not?—They have hitherto done so.

11335. That is by a voluntary arrangement amongst themselves?—Yes.

11336. The Aberdeenshire local authority has taken its members from the borough authorities throughout the country, has it not?—Yes, it has.

11337. Do the borough local authorities follow the course adopted by the county local authority?—Yes, they do.

11338. Has it ever been shown that their interest at all conflicted together upon any of the questions which arise?—No.

11339. No difficulty has arisen between the local authorities of the boroughs and the local authority for the county?—None whatever.

11340. There is a weekly market in Aberdeen, is there not?—Yes, there are two.

11341. *Chairman*.] Are those two markets which are held in Aberdeen the principal markets that are held in the county?—No.

11342. Mr. *Borczyk*.] Taking into account that they are weekly markets, they are important

markets, are they not?—They are important markets.

11343. *Chairman*.] Do the farmers send any store cattle there?—Many of them do.

11344. Mr. *Borczyk*.] The store cattle imported, or a very considerable proportion of the store cattle imported into the county, are sold at those markets?—They are.

11345. Now, as regards the transit of cattle from Aberdeen to London, are the butchers and dealers in Aberdeen satisfied with the present mode of transit from Aberdeen to London, with regard to live cattle?—There are no great complaints.

11346. Do the butchers and dealers complain with reference to the existing mode of transit?—They do not.

11347. Would they pay anything additional for any improvement in the mode of transit of live cattle?—They will not.

11348. Have you asked a good many of them?—Yes, I have.

11349. Is that the uniform answer of the whole?—They would take a quicker transit, but they will not pay anything more for it.

11350. The improvement they would desire especially, is as regards a quicker period of transit, rather than any improvement in the tracks or mode of transit?—Yes.

11351. Any improvement that they would look for would be, as regards increasing the speed and shortening the time of the journey between Aberdeen and London?—Yes.

11352. You have a statement, I believe, with reference to when live cattle leave Aberdeen and when they arrive in London?—I have.

11353. Will you read that statement?—I will.

"The live cattle trade is decreasing, and is likely to do so. In 1858 there were about 3,520 tons sent from Aberdeen to London, while in 1870 it is calculated that about 9,000 tons were sent, exclusive of about 5,000 tons sent by highland railway from country stations and the north of Scotland. Butchers keep cattle from 12 to 24 hours before being killed; cattle intended for Monday's market are usually killed on Friday, and leave Aberdeen at 12 noon on Saturday, and arrive in London about 3 a.m. on the Monday morning. Live cattle leave on Friday at 12 noon, arriving early on Sunday morning."

11354. A very considerable portion of the cattle leave on the Thursday, do they not?—Yes, they do.

11355. The cattle would arrive in London on Saturday morning?—Yes.

11356. Leaving at that time, they would have two days' rest before appearing in the market on Monday?—Yes, they would.

11357. According to the statement which you have just read, the live cattle trade is falling off very much, and the trade is all going in the way of dead meat?—Yes, it is.

11358. What sort of animals are still sent up alive?—The best cattle; the top quality of cattle.

11359. They are principally the black-poll cattle, are they not?—Yes; they are three-year-old cattle.

11360. All the lower quality are killed and sent on?—Yes.

11361. Is there any difficulty in disposing of offal in Aberdeen?—None.

11362. How is the offal disposed of; I am not speaking of the hides and the tallow particularly, because

Mr.
J. Thomsen.
30 June
1873.

because they are manufactured there, or sent to London or other places, but as regards what is called small offal, how is that disposed of?—We have manufactories for making meals out of them.

11363. The Germans have an establishment at Aberdeen for making sausages, have they not?—Yes, they clean these small intestines and prepare them for sausages.

11364. *Chairman.* Where are those sausages mainly sent?—Some of them are sold in Aberdeen.

11365. There is an export trade, I suppose?—I do not think that they manufacture sausages to any great extent in Aberdeen; they prepare the skins and export them to other places, merely for holding the minced meat.

11366. Mr. Barclay. They do not make the sausages complete in Aberdeen?—No; one firm & Messrs. Nott & Sons.

11367. The butchers have no difficulty, at least, in disposing of the small intestines and the small offal of the animals which are killed in Aberdeen?—They have no difficulty whatever.

11368. Is there a great demand for them for preparing and using up, both locally and for sending away?—Yes, there is.

11369. *Chairman.* You are the principal inspector in Aberdeenshire, I suppose?—I am.

11370. How many other inspectors are there connected with the veterinary profession; are there any?—There would be about 30, I should say.

11371. Are all of them veterinary surgeons?—All of them.

11372. Do the police work under you?—Yes.

11373. Is it the business of the police to report cases of disease to you?—Yes.

11374. Do they often do so?—They often do so through the chief constable.

11375. Will you just tell me, in the hill parts of Aberdeenshire, how large a district will one inspector have to deal with; take, for instance, the district of Ballater and Braemar; would one inspector take the whole of Braemar and Ballater?—Yes.

11376. Would he take anything else?—I, at present, am inspector for that district, owing to the want of a veterinary surgeon.

11377. But what is the size of the district which you have under you owing to the absence of this veterinary inspector?—It includes the parishes of Glengairn, Tulloch, Glensunick, Ouchie, and Braemar.

11378. Are you, as chief inspector, paid by salary or by fee?—By salary and by fee.

11379. What is the salary?—£. 100 a year.

11380. With the fees, what does it amount to in round figures?—I get 10s. 6d. for each visit to each place, and travelling expenses.

11381. What would that altogether come to for last year?—Travelling expenses and all would come to about 286l., from May 1872 to May 1873.

11382. I presume a considerable proportion of that would be travelling expenses?—Yes.

11383. Then the inspectors for the districts who work under you do not get so much, I suppose; are they paid by salary?—They are not paid by salary.

11384. Simply by fee?—They have 6s. for every visit they make to a place, and 1s. for a report.
9.58.

11385. Are there any live cattle which come up from Aberdeen by water now to the ports of London?—Yes, there are.

11386. Do they come every week?—They come weekly in the season.

11387. What do you call "the season"?—It is in the winter season, principally.

11388. They do not come during the summer?—No; there are very few which come during the summer.

11389. What proportion do you think the live cattle coming by sea bear to the live cattle coming by land, from the port of Aberdeen?—Perhaps they would be one-fourth of the whole live cattle.

11390. Do the cattle by land also come up mainly in winter?—Yes, live cattle principally.

11391. Then if it is stated that the dead meat trade can hardly be expected to replace the live meat trade, because the dead meat cannot with advantage come up in the summer, that would hardly be a fair statement, inasmuch as not much meat, either alive or dead, comes up from Aberdeen in summer?—We have not so much coming in summer as in winter.

11392. Do you know whether the exporters in Aberdeen consider that, so far as the railway charges are concerned, the dead meat trade is or is not more expensive than the live meat trade?—I am not aware; the dead meat costs 5s. a hundred weight, including carriage and commission for the selling.

11393. And the porters in London?—Yes; that is to say, 5l. per ton.

11394. Do you know what the carriage of a live beast is?—It costs about 35s., the nearest way that you can go, including everything.

11395. Is that by railroad?—Yes.

11396. What would the average of those beasts weigh?—Six or seven hundred weight.

11397. By six or seven hundred weight you mean six or seven hundred weight altogether, including the legs, and so on; you do not mean six or seven hundred weight of salable meat?—Yes, I do.

11398. Does that 35s. include fees and everything?—Yes.

11399. Do you think that those animals which start, we will say on Friday afternoon, and do not get to London till Sunday morning, are seriously the worse for their journey when they arrive?—I should think they are.

11400. I have here the evidence which was given before an administrative committee upon the transit of animals by Mr. Hicks, who is a salesman in the Metropolitan Cattle Market, who says he is principally connected with the Aberdeen trade, and he speaks of animals which leave Aberdeen on Thursday, about 4 o'clock, and arrive in London about 5 or 6 on Saturday morning; that I understand to be about the length of journey you think it to be?—Yes.

11401. Mr. Hicks says that from one end to the other they get neither a bite nor drink, and, of course, they were completely exhausted, particularly during very hot and cold weather; on their arrival they will drink till they are fit to burst, if they can get it. Then he speaks of this as a proof of the depreciation in the value of the beast; would you agree with that?—I have no doubt that there is a great depreciation.

11402. That being the case, how do you account
3 M 4

Mr.
J. Thomson.
30 June
1873.

count for the best cattle being sent up alive?—They can stand the journey best.

11403. They are stronger?—Yes; they are stronger, to begin with.

11404. Mr. Ridley.] And they are older?—Yes, they are three-year-olds.

11405. *Chairman.*] I should have thought that the deperdition in a very good animal would have been more felt than with a very poor animal?—They stand the journey better.

11406. Now, with regard to pleuro-pneumonia, since when have you put into force those regulations which appear to have been successful with regard to stopping the disease?—Since the 16th of April 1871.

11407. So that now you have had two years' experience?—Yes, two years' experience.

11408. And, practically, you think that if you have not anticipated the disease, at all events you have very much checked it?—I decidedly think so.

11409. Your principle is to slaughter all the animals which have the disease?—Yes.

11410. But you do not slaughter all that have been in contact?—No.

11411. When do you consider an animal, which has been in contact with another animal which has had the disease, to be safe?—I should not allow an animal which has been in contact with a diseased animal to mix with other animals for at least three months.

11412. That is the principle upon which you have gone?—Yes.

11413. With your experience of pleuro-pneumonia, I am not asking for extreme cases, but upon the average, how long does the disease remain latent before it shows itself?—That depends very much upon the observant character of the owner of the stock, because I believe he could give us information a great deal sooner than we get it; but I may say this, that in 44 outbreaks the average period has been 13 weeks.

11414. Supposing that you were to buy a herd of cattle, and that one of those animals became affected with pleuro-pneumonia, with your knowledge of the disease, how soon after that animal had first got the disease would you expect to find out that the disease had ceased to be latent, and see the traces of it?—If I understand the question aright, if I took a diseased animal, and placed it amongst a lot of healthy cattle, I should not expect to see those healthy cattle become affected in a less period than one month.

11415. But you would expect it in one month or six weeks, I suppose?—I would.

11416. One or two veterinary surgeons have given evidence before this Committee, to the effect that they think that the disease is only conveyed by the breath; is that your opinion?—That is my opinion.

11417. You stated that you traced several of the outbreaks to animals which were imported into Aberdeenshire; in 15 cases you said that you considered the disease was imported from Ireland; will you just tell me upon what you ground your conviction that those cattle had come from Ireland; how did you arrive at that conclusion?—The purchaser of the cattle went direct to Ireland, and purchased them in Ireland, and brought them with him.

11418. What length of time would there have been from the cattle leaving Ireland to their getting on to his farm?—He carries on an auction sale in Aberdeen; but he goes monthly to Ire-

land and purchases cattle, and it was through these cattle that the disease spread in Aberdeenshire.

11419. But I want to know how long these animals which had the disease, and, as you say, brought it from Ireland, had left Ireland before the disease was discovered?—I could not instance precisely the time; but I should say the disease was discovered within a month or two from their leaving Ireland.

11420. My reason for asking you is this: that pleuro-pneumonia exists in England as well as in Ireland, and when you say that the animals brought the disease from Ireland, I want to know why you think they brought the disease from Ireland, rather than that they caught it upon their way through Great Britain from Ireland to Aberdeen?—We have a very large fair, called Falkirk, to which a great number of Irish cattle are brought. Our dealers go south to Falkirk, and purchase Irish cattle largely there, and bring them to Aberdeenshire direct. The time since they left Ireland to come to Falkirk would be just the time requisite for the transit.

11421. But Falkirk you would not consider a very safe place in respect to pleuro-pneumonia?—There are a very great number of animals congregated there.

11422. Now, with regard to those four Dutch cattle; what makes you think that they brought the disease in four cases from Holland?—Because the disease broke out amongst them.

11423. How long had it been since they left Holland?—I could not tell.

11424. Mr. Barclay.] The facts as regards Irish and Dutch cases which you have referred to are simply these, that in those cases referred to, the disease first appeared in animals which had come from Ireland, and in other cases in animals which came from Holland; but you are not prepared to give evidence as to whether the animals had the disease when they left their native place, or whether they caught it upon the road?—That is so; but my impression is decidedly that they brought it with them.

11425. You have a strong suspicion, taking all the facts into consideration, that the animals, particularly the Irish animals, was diseased before they left Ireland?—I hold that opinion.

11426. *Chairman.*] Have you got with you the expenses of working the Act in Aberdeenshire for the last year?—The total sum laid was 4,000*l*.

11427. What amount of money was expended?—

11428. Mr. Barclay.] You have a return containing the balance sheet of your expenses for last year and this year?—Yes; from Whit Sunday to Whit Sunday; from the 15th May 1872 to the 15th May 1873.

11429. Will you hand that in?—I will. (The same was handed in, vide Appendix.)

11430. *Chairman.*] You state that the county authority works well with the different borough authorities?—They do.

11431. You have no difficulty in working together?—No.

11432. But, still you would recommend that it should be one authority?—I would.

11433. Wishing to make that recommendation, have you considered in what way you would make it one authority. I suppose you would give

give the city of Aberdeen some voice in the united authority?—Yes, I would.

11434. Have you considered in what way you would do that?—By making part of the town council members of the local authority.

11435. Who is the local authority at present for the county of Aberdeen?—They are the Commissioners of Supply and the tenant trustees.

11436. That is what it is by the Act; but do they appoint a managing committee?—The whole of the members are the executive committee.

11437. Where do they meet?—They meet in the County Hall in the borough of Aberdeen.

11438. Do they not meet in any other part of the county?—No.

11439. Do not they appoint local committees?—Yes.

11440. For each parish?—Yes; and a veterinary surgeon may be an inspector for two or three parishes.

11441. What is the size of those local committees, generally?—They consist of two or three members.

11442. There would, of course, be no practical difficulty upon the part of the local committee of the city of Aberdeen joining in this general committee?—There would be no practical difficulty.

11443. There would be no practical difficulty in the town council of Aberdeen electing members to join in this general committee?—I do not think there would.

11444. These small boroughs of Kintore, Peterhead, and so on, do send members to the county committee, do they not?—They do.

11445. Mr. Barends.] The local authority form themselves into a committee, in order to be able under the Act to take in representatives from the burghs of Peterhead and Kintore?—They do.

11446. Chairman.] The Commissioners of Supply in your county are persons who pay 100*l.* rent, are they not?—Yes, they are.

11447. I suppose you would hold this view, that the Commissioners of Supply of Aberdeenshire meet and nominate a certain number of their body; the Act says, "not fewer than four, nor more than fifteen of their number to act upon the county board"?—Yes.

11448. You have the full 15?—Yes, we have the full 15.

11449. Now, out of those 15, how many would be tenant farmers?—They have a separate representation.

11450. By the Act, there are also the same number nominated by the owners and occupiers of agricultural subjects in each county of the value of 100*l.* sterling?—Yes.

11451. That would be 30 in all?—Yes.

11452. Of those 30, I suppose a very large proportion are tenant farmers?—Fifteen are tenant farmers.

11453. Who is the chairman of your local authority?—The sheriff substitutes.

11454. Mr. Clave Read.] You have stated that the largest and the best of the cattle of Aberdeenshire still come up alive to London?—It is only the best cattle that are sent alive to London.

11455. I suppose the large cattle are carried and sold alive at exactly the same terms as the small ones are?—Yes, I should suppose so.

11456. You think the time of incubation of

pleuro-pneumonia differs frequently on account of the treatment the cattle receive; that when they are tied up in a warm shed, and the temperature is not varied, the period of incubation would be much longer than when they are turned out to graze early in the spring, and when they experience a considerable variation of temperature?—I do.

11457. You would recommend that there should be an isolation for three months of those animals which have been herded with others which had been killed, suffering from pleuro-pneumonia?—I would.

11458. You would recommend ample compensation being given to the owner of stock in order to get at the disease earlier?—I would.

11459. It has been said before this Committee, that giving ample compensation might be the means of making the farmers careless; do you not think, that the certain loss which the farmer would have to undergo from the three months restriction, would make him wish not to have the disease upon his farm?—I am satisfied that no farmer would wish to have the disease, however high the compensation was.

11460. You think that the farmer would be only too glad to get rid of the disease when it came?—Yes, he would be only too glad to get rid of the disease.

11461. Where did those Dutch cattle which had the disease come from; what port were they landed at?—At Hull.

11462. Did they come direct from Hull to Aberdeenshire?—They passed through one or two markets. Those cattle are perhaps consigned to a Liverpool salesman who sends some, possibly, on spec to an Aberdeen salesman, and he disposes of them in that way.

11463. Were those store cattle?—Yes.

11464. Are there many of them in Aberdeenshire?—Yes, there were more of them last year than I have ever seen before.

11465. Have you seen many this year?—No, but I am not inspecting the cattle upon their arrival at Aberdeen now, so that point is not immediately under my knowledge.

11466. Do you happen to know that there is a decrease in the importation of those Dutch stores?—Yes, decidedly.

11467. Do the farmers prefer buying those Dutch stores?—No, I do not think they do.

11468. I suppose the four cases in which pleuro-pneumonia prevailed among the Dutch cattle would be a considerable percentage of the whole of the Dutch cattle that you have had in Aberdeen?—Calling them lots, that would be a large proportion; you know they come in lots, not as isolated animals.

11469. It is a larger proportion than that of the Irish cattle; can you give the Committee any idea how many Dutch store cattle go to Aberdeenshire?—Yes, if I had a little time I could.

11470. Chairman.] You say that those Dutch cattle came from Liverpool?—That is my impression; I believe they do.

11471. Mr. O'Connor.] You are not able, I presume, to state what is the proportion of the import of store cattle from Ireland into Aberdeenshire, as compared with the import from England and other countries?—No, but they form the larger proportion.

11472. Therefore, if there is a quantity of disease going about in other countries, and also

Mr.
J. Thomson.
30 June
1872.

Mr.
J. Thomson.
30 June
1873.

in Ireland, as the greater portion of the cattle come from Ireland, it is not wonderful that you should have a greater number of diseased Irish cattle than any others?—We have greater chances of getting the disease.

11473. You get a greater number of cattle, and therefore you get a greater amount of diseased cattle. It does not follow that because you have a greater number of diseased Irish cattle in Aberdeenshire, therefore there is a greater amount of disease amongst Irish cattle, as a whole, than amongst the cattle of any other country?—My impression is that we get more disease by Irish cattle than by any other cattle.

11474. Because you get more Irish cattle?—We do get more.

11475. *Chairman.* Are you large importers of Irish cattle?—Yes.

11476. Mr. O'Connor. You stated that there was an outbreak of foot and mouth disease in Aberdeenshire commencing in 1869; had you any before that period?—No.

11477. *Chairman.* Did you never have foot and mouth disease before that time?—Yes, but we had no general outbreak of it until 1869, for a few years previously.

11478. Mr. O'Connor. But there had been a general outbreak in some previous year?—Not in my experience; not since 1866.

11479. But if there were a general outbreak previously, it disappeared; in 1868 you had scarcely any?—Scarcely any.

11480. Before 1869 you never had any restrictions at all with respect to foot and mouth disease?—No.

11481. If there had been an outbreak of the disease before, which died away without restrictions, that would seem to prove, would it not, that the disease which broke out in 1869 might also have died away without restrictions?—I do not think it would.

11482. Mr. *Clare Read.* Had you not the cattle plague regulations in 1847 in Aberdeenshire, the same as we had in England?—Yes, we had.

11483. Was it then that you got rid of foot and mouth disease?—It was then that we got rid of it.

11484. Mr. O'Connor. But you had foot and mouth disease in 1869 again?—And in 1867 we had the cattle plague restrictions ceasing.

11485. And you had foot and mouth disease from 1869 to 1872?—We had foot and mouth disease from 1869 down to 1872.

11486. And in 1872 it disappeared, did it not?—The county has not been clear since 1869; we have the disease still.

11487. But I understood you to say at the commencement of your evidence, that you had no foot and mouth disease now to any extent?—Not to any extent; we have only 14 cases now.

11488. You attributed your freedom from disease to your restrictions, did you not?—That was the material cause, and another thing operated as well. We had a very great failure in turnips, and did not require to import cattle last year.

11489. Then with regard to your remedy for foot and mouth disease, you state that it does not exist in Aberdeenshire as a home, and that it is introduced by store cattle from other places?—Yes.

11490. And as a remedy you propose that

there should be a better system of inspection?—I do think so.

11491. Supposing foot and mouth disease to be very prevalent in England, and also to be prevalent in Ireland; do you think that it would be possible by any restriction, short of stopping the importation of store cattle into your country, to prevent the disease coming in?—You would materially lessen the number of cases by so doing.

11492. Do you think that it is possible, at the port of debarkation, to have such a system of inspection as would prevent the admission of a considerable quantity of foot and mouth disease when it is very prevalent in the countries whence the boats come?—Yes, by inspection at the ports of embarkation and debarkation.

11493. You think that that would be effective in preventing its introduction?—It would be effective in preventing the spread of infected animals throughout the country.

11494. Sir *H. Selous-Bissham.* Can you give the Committee any idea what is the proportion of diseased animals in the Irish importation compared to those imported from elsewhere; you stated that the Irish importation was more than half of your general importation; are the cases of disease larger in proportion in that number than in the other half?—Fifteen out of 26 outbreaks are due to Irish cattle.

11495. So that it is rather a larger proportion; but then the Irish cattle imported are the larger number?—The Irish cattle are the larger proportion.

11496. Mr. O'Connor. But with regard to these Irish cattle, you really do not know how long they have been in England before they go to your country; when you attribute the outbreaks to Irish cattle, all you can say is, that you know these cattle originally came from Ireland; you have no means of proving how long they had been in England before they went to Scotland?—They are consigned by the Irish to a salesman possibly, or they come direct from Ireland to some of our large fairs, and then there would be just such a length of time as would be necessary for the journey from Ireland to the Scotch markets.

11497. *Chairman.* Those animals very often do not go through England?—Many of them would go to England.

11498. But a good many of them would not go to England at all, would they?—That is so.

11499. Mr. O'Connor. Do you believe that any system of inspection would be any preventive against pleuro-pneumonia?—Not so far as its detection is concerned.

11500. Unless the animals were very far gone it would be impossible to detect the disease in the animals as they came off the ship, would it not?—I do not think you could detect it unless the animals were very far gone.

11501. Mr. *Callow.* What restrictions would you propose to place upon Irish cattle arriving in Scotland?—I propose that they should be all thoroughly inspected before they are allowed to go on board ship, and then again immediately after they arrive. I think the best of such rigid inspection being carried out would materially deter the Irish dealers from sending diseased animals. Especially if they were subjected to one or two severe detentions of a number of cattle; they would be more careful in the selection of their stock afterwards.

11502. What

11502. What effect would inspection according to your evidence have in detecting pleuro-pneumonia?—None whatever.

11503. Therefore, as regards pleuro-pneumonia, your proposed restrictions would be wholly useless?—Yes, so far as the inspection for its detection in the cattle imported went.

11504. I ask you whether your proposed restriction with regard to the inspection of cattle would not be wholly useless as far as regards pleuro-pneumonia?—Until once the disease was ascertained to exist it would.

11505. Would it not be entirely inoperative as regards pleuro-pneumonia, according to your own evidence?—I do not think that any inspection whatever is likely to discover a case of pleuro-pneumonia.

11506. [Chairman.] Do you mean to say, that any man with veterinary knowledge, who was inspecting cattle, could not discover a good many cases of pleuro-pneumonia, which without such inspection would pass?—I do not think they would be shipped in a single in which the inspector could detect the disease, and unless he were to kill the animals. I should not be satisfied with his opinion from external appearances, as to whether it was a simple cold or contagious pleuro-pneumonia.

11507. We had the fact that the inspectors, who are employed in inspecting animals arriving from the Continent do detect the disease in many cases; do not you think there would be an advantage in having the same cases discovered coming from Ireland?—It would be an advantage no doubt.

11508. Mr. Cullen.] As regards foot and mouth disease, what time do you consider it takes from the contact to the development in a diseased animal?—From 12 to 24 hours.

11509. Therefore, as regards foot and mouth disease, examination at the port of embarkation might be of service?—Yes, it might be of service.

11510. With regard to the Irish cattle you import into Scotland, by what course do they come?—They come from Londonderry and Dublin to Glasgow.

11511. Are there cattle exported from Dublin to Glasgow?—I think so.

11512. You would not be surprised if you were mistaken?—I am not distinct upon the point.

11513. But there are cattle imported from Belfast and Londonderry to Glasgow and Ardrossan, are there not?—There are from Belfast and Londonderry to Glasgow; I do not know about Ardrossan.

11514. What time would it take to come from Glasgow or Ardrossan to Aberdeen?—I do not know.

11515. Could you give me an idea?—I could not.

11516. Do they go through an infected district?—I am not aware.

11517. Do you not know the infected districts; is Falkirk an infected district?—No.

11518. I am speaking of districts where pleuro-pneumonia and foot and mouth distemper are rife?—I can only speak as to disease in our

own county. I do not know about the districts of other counties with regard to the extent of disease in those counties.

11519. Then, although you can speak confidently as to the importation of disease from Ireland, you have no knowledge of the neighbouring county?—I am inspector for three parishes in the neighbouring county.

11520. With regard to those 15 cases which you attributed to animals imported from Ireland, are you aware whether they were long in your own county before the disease showed itself?—Some of them were for a considerable time in the man's own stock.

11521. Would you not fancy that cattle which had been six weeks in Scotland without showing the disease, would be more likely to have contracted the disease after coming to Scotland than before they had left Ireland?—No.

11522. Are you aware that the districts of Ireland which principally send cattle to Scotland are remarkably free from pleuro-pneumonia?—I am not aware of that.

11523. Should you be surprised to learn that they are?—I would.

11524. If they are, would you not consider that the disease was more likely to be contracted in Scotland than in Ireland?—I would be surprised to learn that a dealer could say from what districts he picks up his cattle.

11525. Did you trace the diseased animal in any one of those 15 cases which you spoke of?—Not to its direct source, but to a cattle dealer.

11526. A dealer in Aberdeen. I think you referred to some salesman or auctioneer in Aberdeen?—Yes.

11527. Does not that man have other cattle besides Irish?—Yes.

11528. Then they might have contracted the disease in his byre, might they not, while waiting for the auction?—It is possible.

11529. Is it not more than probable?—No.

11530. It is a mere case of suspicion upon your part?—I have traced it.

11531. Can you give me the length of time in any one of the 15 cases which the animals had been from Ireland?—I could not.

11532. Mr. Barclay.] Have you any doubt about the success of the treatment of pleuro-pneumonia in Aberdeenshire, or that within six months or nine months you would be able to rid the county of it, if it were not re-imported?—I would not limit the time, but I have no doubt about being able to rid the county of it.

11533. With regard to the best bullocks coming up to London alive, you do not talk of best bullocks in point of size, but in point of quality?—Yes.

11534. Two animals may be of the same size, but very different in point of quality?—Yes; very different in point of quality.

11535. The best animals which are sent are prime fat animals, well matured, and which do not show the symptoms of fatigue so much when they come up to the market as half-bred sort of animals?—There is an endeavour upon the part of the exporter to select those animals as he thinks will stand the journey best.

Mr.
J. Thomson.
30 June
1873.

Mr. WILLIAM GOODLET, called in; and Examined.

Mr. W. Goodlet. 11536. Mr. Barclay.] You are a Farmer in
30 June 1875. Forfarshire?—Yes, I am.

11537. How many acres do you farm?—About 700.

11538. Are you a member of the local authority for Forfarshire?—Yes, I am.

11539. Forfarshire imports cattle very largely, does it not?—Yes.

11540. Principally from Ireland?—Yes.

11541. You have had a great deal of foot and mouth disease in Forfarshire during the last few years?—Yes, a good deal.

11542. Were you clear of the disease about 1866?—Shortly after the cattle plague was stamped out, we were pretty well clear of it for a time, and we were then pretty clear of pleuro-pneumonia too.

11543. Had you much foot and mouth disease before the cattle plague came in 1865?—I do not think we had so much of foot and mouth disease; it followed the cattle plague rather.

11544. After the cattle plague restrictions were withdrawn, foot and mouth disease and pleuro-pneumonia began to prevail largely in the county, did they not?—They did shortly afterwards.

11545. Did you adopt in Forfarshire the pleuro-pneumonia rules for foot and mouth disease?—No, we did not, unless for a short time, I think, in the autumn of 1871.

11546. You did not think it necessary to take those extreme measures?—No; there were rules laid down for foot and mouth disease, which were followed.

11547. Have you carried these rules practically into effect?—As far as we were able, we did.

11548. As far as you found it practically possible, have you carried out the rules of the Privy Council?—Yes, we tried to carry them out.

11549. What is the state of Forfarshire now, as regards foot and mouth disease?—We have it still, but not to so great an extent as I have seen it; still it is always with us, more or less.

11550. There are few cases which remain, I suppose, still?—At present, I think, we have very few cases; we have also a few cases of pleuro-pneumonia, but not nearly so many as I have seen at other times.

11551. Do you attribute the decrease of foot and mouth disease to the rules and regulations which you have been able to put in force to a very great extent?—I do not think that we can attribute very much to the Privy Council rules for putting out foot and mouth disease.

11552. You do not think that the decrease of foot and mouth disease has been due, to a material extent, to the regulations enforced?—No, I do not think it has. I may mention that foot and mouth disease generally comes to us after the large Falkirk Markets, where there are a large number of Irish cattle, and we generally have a pretty good dose of foot and mouth disease after that; but when there are no large markets, we have not so much of the disease.

11553. Have you found the foot and mouth disease to be a very serious disease?—Yes, I have sometimes found it so.

11554. Have you lost any of your cattle by it last year?—Yes, I lost one or two.

11555. What kind of cattle were they?—They

were home-bred cows, and also the year before one out of a lot of Dutch heifers.

11556. Where did you buy them?—They were sent from Newcastle.

11557. Had they been imported at Newcastle?—Yes, they had been imported at Newcastle.

11558. Were they suffering from foot and mouth disease when they arrived?—No; they were apparently healthy when they arrived, but they also afterwards took the disease, and I put them into a field by themselves, so as not to affect the other animals upon the farm.

11559. You put them upon a field by themselves at a distance from other animals?—I did.

11560. Did the disease go among the other beasts?—No; it ran its course among those cattle; one of them was very ill; I had to kill and bury it; but the others all recovered, after the first attack, in about a month, although they were very badly affected, some of them.

11561. How many beasts were there?—About 14, I think.

11562. The disease ran its course in the 14 beasts in about a month?—Yes; the one which died was the one first seized; they did not all take it at once; it went through them by degrees.

11563. Was that the one you slaughtered and buried?—Yes; I got a veterinary surgeon to put the heifer under treatment; it was in the summer months that it happened, and I put up a little shed in a field for her, and did the best I could to recover her; but she gradually dwindled away, till I saw it was no use paining the animal any longer, so I slaughtered her.

11564. Did you treat the other thirteen?—No, we treated two of them; but when I found such poor effects from treating the first one, I thought it was not worth while to treat them, so I let them take their chance in the field.

11565. The one that was treated died, and all the rest got better?—That was so.

11566. You do not think that much can be done for foot and mouth disease by treatment?—I do not think so; I think the best way, in general, is to let them alone; give them soft food and water, and they will generally recover.

11567. You would recommend good nursing, then, in preference to treatment?—Yes; comfortable up-putting and good nursing.

11568. Have you any recommendation to make for different regulations for foot and mouth disease than those which prevail at present?—I think it would be certainly diminished if the places in which the disease broke out were declared infected, and farmers prohibited from removing affected cattle, and those in contact with them; nor should other cattle be allowed to be removed from an infected place, unless under license of the local authority. I would not have a mile round about the place declared infected, but I would have the place itself declared infected. I would have it under surveillance until the animals get better. And in the case of any animals travelling about a road with foot and mouth disease, I would apply the penalties more severely than they have been applied, and extended to Ireland, where I believe they have not been applied at all.

11569. You think there should be uniformity of action throughout?—Decidedly so. I think, without

aid out that, there is little or no hope for amendment.

11570. How many local authorities have you in the county of Forfarshire?—We have six. I think we have five Parliamentary burghs and the county.

11571. Have each of those burghs and the county a local authority?—Yes.

11572. Do the burgh local authorities and the county local authority work in concert together?—We do not work together well at all.

11573. Is there any special reason why you cannot work well together?—The burghs are anxious to supply the fat market; we again are anxious to keep out infectious diseases if we can manage it from the county, and the consequence is that they do not agree to our rules which we lay down for the purpose.

11574. The only point of conflict between the burgh local authorities and the county local authority is as to whether cattle should be admitted into the county or not?—Yes, that was the question between us some months ago.

11575. Has no other point of difference arisen between the authorities?—No, we cannot be said to have had conflict; but our rules do not harmonise, and when we made rules in regard to the movement of cattle, which we did in September last, we found that the burghs would not enter into these rules.

11576. Was it because they had any antipathy to the rules, or because they would not take trouble about it?—They did not like our rules, which were thought rather stringent; the cattle plague had raged in Yorkshire, and the northern counties declined to receive any cattle into their counties, except under a license; we joined in that arrangement, but we could not get Forfarshire to join in it, and we could not get our burgh local authorities to join in it, so that we had to repeal those rules as unworkable a month after they had been enacted.

11577. There was one case in Forfarshire, was there not, of the county local authority prohibiting cattle from being brought into the county from any place outside its jurisdiction, which had awkward results?—Yes.

11578. There was a large cattle fair in Forfar, was there not?—Yes.

11579. The farmers had to take out their cattle, had they not?—Yes; the market being within the limits of the burgh, cattle got in, but could not be removed into the county again without infringing the rules, and farmers were liable to be fined for taking them out of the burgh. The burgh authorities permitted the Irish cattle to come in, but they could not get them out again without incurring penalties. I myself bought a number of cattle in the market, and brought them out. I was not one of those who were summoned, but some of my neighbours were summoned, and one of them had to pay 1*s.* a head, I think.

11580. Were your neighbours members of the local authority?—The one fined was not; I do not think there was any case brought into court except those mentioned. After they found it would involve so many, the prosecution was stopped, and withdrawn against the others.

11581. I suppose only a nominal fine was imposed upon this farmer?—It was just a nominal fine.

11582. If the means for putting down cattle diseases were carried out uniformly and with efficiency throughout the county generally, do

you think it would be necessary at all to give power to a local authority to prohibit cattle from being brought into their county?—I do not think so, if carried out generally throughout the country. If each local authority were to do its duty, and follow out the rules properly, I do not think that there would be any necessity for interference with the movement of cattle.

11583. That is to say, if the local authorities carried out with efficiency the general provisions of the Act, you think that there would be no necessity for interfering with the movement of cattle throughout the country?—No, I do not think so.

11584. That is to say, cattle not affected with the disease?—Yes, of course.

11585. The local authority for the county at present consists of the Commissioners of Supply, and so many farmers?—Yes.

11586. In one case elected by the Commissioners of Supply, and in the other case by the tenant farmers of the county?—Yes.

11587. I suppose you would provide that the burghs in the county should have some representation at the general central board?—Yes, I think they should.

11588. The town councils might elect representatives to the general board from each of the burghs?—Yes.

11589. Have you had much pleuro-pneumonia in Forfarshire?—It is constantly cropping out, and it is only within the last two months that we applied for and got authority from the Privy Council to slaughter animals suffering under pleuro-pneumonia. We have just got the rules set going for slaughter, but up till now compensation for slaughtered animals has not been allowed, and we did not learn very easily where pleuro-pneumonia existed; we expect now to find out the cases more easily.

11590. I suppose it requires some little time to familiarise the local authority with the proper measures to adopt for slaughtering those animals and carrying out the provisions of the Act with efficiency?—Yes, in due.

11591. Have you many inspectors for Forfarshire?—No; we have now only the chief constable as our inspector.

11592. But you have not a veterinary surgeon?—The chief constable employed as inspector has authority to appoint a veterinary surgeon, or to get the aid of veterinary surgeons whenever he may require them.

11593. Is the chief constable going to deal with the slaughtering out of pleuro-pneumonia?—Yes.

11594. He has power to call in the assistance of a veterinary surgeon?—Yes, and a valuator; he orders the animals to be valued; in fact, we follow very much the Aberdeen rules as to slaughtering and compensation.

11595. Do you think it advisable to have one inspector for the county specially employed to control and look after the disease within the county?—Yes, I think so.

11596. Generally, to carry out the provisions of the Act, and see that it is duly attended to under the superintendence of the local authority?—Yes.

11597. The public feeling is growing strongly in favour of slaughtering out animals affected with pleuro-pneumonia, is it not?—Yes; among the farmers, certainly, if compensation be given.

11598. Do you recommend a liberal compensation

Mr.
IV. Goslett.
30 June
1873.

Mr.
W. Goodlet,
—
30 June
1878.

nation to the owners?—Certainly, if you give any compensation at all, do it liberally.

11699. Do you think if you were giving a liberal compensation there would be any risk of farmers being more reckless in consequence?—I do not think there would.

11600. Would any compensation which is likely to be granted, even if it were up to the value of the animal, compensate the farmer for his loss in having disease upon his farm?—Certainly not.

11601. I suppose farmers buy in the store cattle because they have no choice in the matter; they must buy what is offered to them in the market?—Yes, in Forfarshire we do not breed many animals, but we bring in a considerable number. I believe half the animals shown in our markets are Irish cattle, and a good many English calves used to come, and cattle from England also; there are not so many English calves coming now; it was found that a good many of them died from the effect of the long journey, and the farmers do not care so much now for buying calves which come a long journey by railway.

11602. They want them to be a year old before they buy them?—Yes; there are a good many of what are called calves brought in the autumn about six or eight months old, from Ireland, besides older cattle.

11603. Would the farmers take any precautions against disease which were practical to them?—I have no doubt of it.

11604. Speaking to you as a practical farmer, and having experience of the purchase of those cattle in the markets, is there any precaution which occurs to you which you could take to keep yourself clear of disease, as regards the purchase of cattle in the market?—It is very difficult as the regulations stand at present. If you want cattle, you must take your chance; but I think if the rules were carried out properly, you would not run such a risk as you do at present; in buying cattle when I want to fill up my byres in the autumn from August to October, when I have to purchase a very considerable number of cattle, I just endeavour to get them as healthy looking as possible, but I always run a risk when I go to market of buying cattle that have been in contact with foot and mouth disease and pleuro-pneumonia.

11605. You have commodious buildings, have you not?—Yes, I have very good farm offices.

11606. Is it possible for you buying cattle in the autumn to isolate the different lots?—Yes, I always do; when I bring home cattle from the market, I always put them into a field to be quarantined for a short time, and even when I put them into the offices I keep the different lots as much as possible by themselves. When I have any suspicion, I always put them by themselves.

11607. Is that the only thing the farmers can do?—Yes, but very few farmers have their farm offices in such a state as will enable them to make that separation.

11608. Very few farmers have offices which enable them to practise isolation to the extent that you can do?—Very few.

11609. Have you any new measure to recommend as regards the treatment of pleuro-pneumonia?—I think if the system which has been followed out in Aberdeenshire were followed out all over the country, we should very soon get

rid of pleuro-pneumonia; but it will, I fear, do little good in Forfarshire, for as to carry out our new system, unless the regulations in Ireland are to be carried out properly. When we import and bring into the county cattle from the south or from Ireland, we are sure to have foot and mouth disease and pleuro-pneumonia existing, unless the regulations were to be carried out in the same stringent manner as we would now do in Forfarshire.

11610. It discourages you in taking vigorous measures in Forfarshire, to find that if the disease should be put down at one time, it would be re-imported at another, by the cattle brought in?—There is no doubt of it. I am very doubtful, whether adopting the Aberdeenshire rules would have the good effect with us that they have in Aberdeen; because in Aberdeen the importation of animals is upon a very small scale compared to what it is in the county of Forfar, inasmuch as we very much depend on those animals for feeding in the winter.

11611. You have a very large number of imported animals compared with Aberdeenshire, so you apprehend you would import disease in proportion, and thereby you would have a very much larger proportion of disease brought in than is the case in Aberdeenshire?—Yes, I think so.

11612. Notwithstanding that, the county of Forfar is prepared to give the killing-out system a trial?—We have gone into that. The question went to a division, and was carried by a majority, and in that majority farmers mostly prevailed.

11613. Have you any suggestions to make with reference to the transit of cattle?—I think there is very great carelessness in the transit of cattle; they are often kept too long in the trucks, and they are often shunted to a siding and allowed to remain longer in the trucks than they might be. It would be a great improvement if the railway companies would forward cattle more expeditiously than they do very often.

11614. I suppose that remark would apply particularly to store cattle?—Yes, it would apply particularly to store cattle; the fat cattle are carried more expeditiously, and even those cattle which come from Ireland are brought pretty smartly by the railway companies.

11615. Is that because there is a considerable number of them; usually sufficient to make up a train?—Yes, mostly; it is a good deal owing to that.

11616. And a train of them is sent on to the market from Glasgow, which is the port of importation?—Yes; and from the Falkirk markets a good many cattle are sent on immediately by train; a large number of trucks are sent over immediately into Forfarshire, and also from Glasgow, where the Irish cattle are chiefly imported.

11617. Do you think that the trucks might be somewhat better cleaned than they are?—Yes, I think they might be.

11618. Can you suggest any practical provision for having them better cleaned?—There is such an immense trade, that it is very difficult to clean the trucks every time.

11619. In the case of such markets as Falkirk, where there is a very large amount of cattle brought up upon trucks, do you think there are great practical difficulties in cleaning them thoroughly?—Yes, in Falkirk market and our own large local cattle markets, it is not possible to have the trucks cleaned, after they bring in the

the cattle, before they are trucked away again; still I think there might be an improvement in the present state of things.

11620. I suppose a large number of cattle are brought up, and a large number of trucks are again employed to take away the cattle after a fair in the course of a few hours?—Yes, I think so.

11621. I infer that you think the railway companies might do a great deal more than they do in the way of cleaning the trucks; but you do not see your way to making a stringent provision to carry that into effect?—I think it would interfere a good deal with the trade to be so stringent; it would be possible, if they would clean the trucks as soon as the cattle got out of them, and disinfect them, and then they would be ready for the next lot to come forward; but there is so much shifting about of the trucks from one station to another, that I do not think it is possible to carry out the provision very well. I think the main point of dealing with these diseases is to get hold of them at the fountain head. Whenever a man's cattle are affected with any of these diseases, I would shut them up for a time, but I would never attempt to stop cattle markets, unless in very serious cases indeed; or to stop the transit of cattle from one part of the country to another; but I would be very strict in this way, that if a man had disease upon his place, that place should be shut up, and the cattle should not be sent away, except with a license from the local authority.

11622. You think that the disease is there confined to the smallest space, and could be dealt with more effectively there?—Yes, I think so.

11623. Mr. Bidgely.] What do you put the loss per head at from foot and mouth disease?—I think if you had foot and mouth disease in a lot of cattle, I should put the loss at a couple of pounds a head; but if one or two died, it would be a pound or two more.

11624. When you say a couple of pounds a head, do you include store cattle and milch cows, and everything?—Milch cows would be the worst case, because if milch cows take foot and mouth disease, the milch ceases, and you lose the milk, which would be a very serious loss in the case of cows taking the disease; with regard to fat cattle, if they are fit for the market, you do not lose so much; but I do not think you could calculate the loss upon store cattle at less than an average of a couple of pounds.

11625. The loss upon store cattle then is less than upon others?—Calves and others would not be worth so much money, but I speak now of two and three-year old cattle.

11626. What is your regulation in Forfarshire, supposing foot and mouth disease is detected in a lot of animals shown in the Forfarshire market, are those animals allowed to be moved?—They are taken possession of by the local authority. I have here a copy of the existing regulations of the local authority, which are in fact just the regulations in the Act.

11627. And those regulations are carried out?—Yes. This is the notice given by the chief inspector for the county. He gives notice in this form: "Take notice, that foot and mouth disease exists amongst stock at _____ in your possession, or under charge at _____, and that you are required to observe the foregoing regulations, made by the local authority, for the county of Forfar, for preventing the spread of said disease."

Then follow the regulations, which are just extracts from the Act; it is simply the Orders in Council put into an order. Practically, I believe, very little good arises from the inspection of a diseased animal in a market; it is very rare that, in any of our markets, animals are found fault with.

11628. You do not attach much weight to inspection?—Not much.

11629. Have you found that farmers report the existence of disease, in accordance with this regulation, to the police-constable?—Of course, they are not very willing to report the disease; but they are liable to be pulled up in penalties, and penalties have in some cases been enforced, though I believe they will be willing enough to report cases of disease now that compensation is to be given for slaughter in the case of pleuro-pneumonia, and that is one inducement for our adopting the compensation rules, that we may have no difficulty in ascertaining the actual amount of disease in the county.

11630. Are they equally ready to report the existence of foot and mouth disease?—In Forfarshire, a great many of us do not think that foot and mouth disease is so dangerous and so serious an affair, and I do not think they are so particular in dealing with foot and mouth disease, although the constables have orders, whenever they see it, to report it to the inspector, and when he gets a report from any source, he goes to the place where the disease is said to exist, and, if he finds the disease there, he puts the cattle under the rules of the local authority.

11631. Has the inspector or police constable any power of entry when he hears a rumour of disease existing?—Yes, I think he has.

11632. As a rule, in Forfarshire, when the chief constable suspects the existence of disease upon a farm, would he be entitled to go and see for himself if that disease existed?—I believe so; I never heard of any difficulty being raised.

11633. Practically, in Forfarshire, that is done?—Practically, in Forfarshire, that is done for foot and mouth disease, but they are not so particular in foot and mouth disease as in pleuro-pneumonia.

11634. It is sufficiently serious if a man has to lose 2*l.* a head upon each of his herds?—I do not mean that he loses that sum a head over the whole stock of his farm; I mean over those which are affected; it is sufficiently serious for the owner of the stock, but it is not so serious for the country, generally speaking. When the disease breaks out in that way, they generally allow the disease to run its course.

11635. I suppose you think that foot and mouth disease is much more contagious than any of the other diseases, except cattle plague?—Cattle plague is the most contagious of all, and I think foot and mouth disease is also highly contagious or infectious, because, if it breaks out in a lot of cattle, it generally goes over the whole of them.

11636. Mr. O'Connor.] I suppose, if there is an outbreak of foot and mouth disease upon any farm in your county, you very soon get to hear of it; is it easily found out?—Yes, I think so, upon the whole.

11637. According to the very nature of the disease, if a person sees an animal in an advanced stage of it, he can detect it at once?—I think he would.

11638. But when you have to go and buy in a fair

Mr.
H. Goodlet,
—
30 June
1873.

Mr.
H. Goodlet.
30 June
1873

a fair, you have no protection at all; you must take the beast upon chance, except it is a very advanced stage of disease?—I believe, if there were a beast suffering from foot and mouth disease, the inspector would take charge of it and see that the animal was removed; but it is very rarely that you will see that they are actually suffering from that disease in a cattle market. If a diseased animal is in the lot it is generally left behind, lingering upon the road, or somewhere, and only the healthy ones brought into the market.

11639. But these healthy ones, having been in contact with the diseased one, would probably convey the disease subsequently?—Yes; that is the way in which it is conveyed.

11640. You stated that you got your disease from the Falkirk fair?—Yes; and from the Irish cattle; a good many of our cattle come into the country direct from Ireland.

11641. Where are they landed?—At Glasgow.

11642. They go direct from Glasgow to your country by rail?—Yes.

11643. Without stopping anywhere on the way?—I think so; they are put upon the trucks at Glasgow, and brought direct to the county.

11644. But to return to the Falkirk fair; I presume that animals go to that fair from all parts of the country?—No doubt of it; from England, and also from Ireland, and from neighbouring counties.

11645. So that if there were any disease going about in any part of the three kingdoms, it would be very likely to find its way to that fair?—I have no doubt of it.

11646. Mr. Maxwell.] Did I correctly understand you, that the greater number of your store cattle come to you from Ireland?—Yes.

11647. They generally come by Glasgow, do they not?—They always come by Glasgow.

11648. Do you ever go to Glasgow yourself to buy cattle?—No.

11649. So that you do not know what the arrangements are at Glasgow?—No, I do not know particularly what they are.

11650. Neither do you know whether there is a great deal of disease, as I am informed there is always in Glasgow, amongst the dairy cows, and so on, which are kept in the town of Glasgow?—I do not know that the disease is always in the town of Glasgow amongst the dairy cows; but I think it not improbable that the disease will exist, and pretty frequently, among them; and if the disease is in the county at all, it is very likely to be picked up at Glasgow; there are so many cattle in the Glasgow market, which are spread all over the country.

11651. But I suppose it is possible that an Irish beast which was not diseased at all might get the disease at Glasgow?—I have no doubts of that; but I believe that the great bulk of them bring the disease with them.

11652. Why do you believe that?—Because in reading the report in an Irish newspaper of a meeting the other day of the Kildare Agricultural Society and Farmers' Club, at Athy, I observe it stated and generally complained of that in that district the regulations were not carried out at all; that they only fined the offenders a nominal fine; that the magistrates sympathised with them if they only fined them 1*d.* a head; and that after the Ballynascloa fair the country is in a blaze.

11653. Your information really comes from Ireland; it is not from your own observation

that you mention this fact with regard to the Irish cattle; it is not from anything which you have seen yourself?—It is not from my own observation.

11654. I have just had a return put into my hands of the number of outbreaks of disease in Ireland reported during the last few weeks, and I find that in the week ending the 31st of May there were only 14 outbreaks, in the previous week only four, the previous week eleven, the previous week four, and so on; therefore, I should like to know whether you can say that any foot and mouth disease has been lately imported into Perthshire from Ireland?—I have no doubt of it.

11655. That is to say, within the last few weeks?—I have no doubt of it.

11656. What is your reason for thinking that?—Because, after our fairs, the disease always breaks out more strongly, and our fairs are chiefly supplied by cattle that come from Ireland.

11657. At the Falkirk Fair do the majority of the animals come from Ireland?—I would not say so with regard to the Falkirk Fair, as that is a very large fair, and a good many of the cattle come from England, but at the small county fairs you only find very few lots of best animals, and as regards the Irish cattle, you will get them in all directions, and if they do not sell them at the fair, then they wander then from town to town, and you can purchase them any market day lying in the street.

11658. Does it not appear to you to be probable that, at all events, at the present time, when foot and mouth disease has almost entirely died out in Ireland, the Irish cattle coming from a place where there is very little disease at the present moment, must catch the disease in transit to, or through Perthshire, and not bring it with them?—If that is the case, but I should doubt whether that is the case.

11659. I have been quoting from official returns. I do not think you can contradict the inference that I have drawn from these returns?

—The only inference I draw is, that here is a meeting of farmers saying that the rules are not obeyed, and that if they were obeyed there would be far less disease. I would at once accept the returns but for that, and after that I have very great doubts of them.

11660. These farmers may be speaking about last year, which, as we all know, was a very disastrous year for the kingdom?—No; this meeting occurred about a fortnight or three weeks ago.

11661. But they may be referring to what passed some time ago; have you any disease now on your own farm?—None.

11662. Have you bought any Irish cattle lately?—No, I do not buy them till the end of the year. I generally buy in my store cattle at the end of the year; at present I have nothing upon the farm but a few cows and cattle of my own rearing, and a few young calves.

11663. Is there any foot and mouth disease in your county now?—Only here and there, occasionally.

11664. Do the other farmers there follow the same system as you do; that is to say, not to purchase at this time of the year, but to purchase later on?—Yes; a good many farmers do. As regards the time when the Government returns are taken, namely, the month of June, you could

not take a return at a time of the year when fewer cattle are imported into the county. If the statistics were taken about the month of October or November, you would find a very much larger number of cattle in the county when they are brought in and put on to feed upon the turnips.

11665. But I gather from you that foot and mouth disease is now prevailing in the county, and that this is not the time of year when farmers usually purchase Irish cattle?—That is quite true, but we have a great many dealers and jobbers in our county who are constantly buying and selling, and it is in consequence of the continual traffic among cattle that this disease will break out occasionally.

11666. I think you stated that railway trucks are not well disinfected?—They are not well disinfected.

11667. That might be where they catch the disease?—No doubt it would be.

11668. What would you suggest with reference to having more stringent regulations with regard to disinfecting railway trucks?—I think you begin too far down, when you begin to disinfect railways; if you will begin at the very fountain-head, and stop the disease wherever it exists, then it would not matter whether the trucks were very much cleaned or not, because, if this disease were not carried about, they would not get it in trucks. The great point is to see that the thing is checked, just as they did in Aberdeenshire with pleuro-pneumonia and cattle plague; they got more cheaply through the cattle plague than any other county that I know of. I lost myself about 1,000 £ by cattle plague, and buried between 40 and 50 cattle; had I commenced "steeping out" at once, and not continued doctoring at them as I did, I am convinced my loss would not have exceeded a fourth of that sum.

11669. In answer to an honourable Member, you stated that you considered that on store cattle the loss suffered upon every beast attacked with foot and mouth disease was about 2 £.—I referred to two-year-old store cattle. I would calculate that, because you lose a month's keep upon the cattle. Generally during a month they make no progress, and then the value of the animals is deteriorated to that extent; that is to say, they take 1 £ for a month's keep, and 1 £ for the deterioration of the animals. It generally runs close upon that. I would rather pay a couple of pounds than have the disease.

11670. I suppose you do not believe the statement which has been very often made, that beasts which have had foot and mouth disease fatten more rapidly than beasts which have not?—I do not think that; no doubt, immediately after recovery, they seem to be doing well, but if you keep them on until they are ripe for the fat market, I do not think they do so well as animals which have never had the disease.

11671. Your view, I think, with regard to pleuro-pneumonia, is that the Aberdeen regulations ought to be carried out generally throughout the United Kingdom?—Throughout Great Britain, and Ireland also.

11672. That is to say, you would slaughter the beasts which are attacked with pleuro-pneumonia, and you would isolate the beasts which had been brought into contact with those beasts?—Yes.

11673. But you would not slaughter beasts which had been brought into contact with 0.58.

animals affected with pleuro-pneumonia?—No; I would rather that they should be kept, because in my own case I have had pleuro-pneumonia twice in my stock since I farmed in the north, and I have found, when you get pleuro-pneumonia in the bryes, if you continued to treat the animals, it generally went on until it killed a good many; but if you slaughtered the infected animals immediately, you might get rid of the disease, but if you hang on a little, I defy you to protect yourself.

11674. Do the farmers in Forfarshire, as a rule, when disease breaks out upon their farms, give information to the authorities?—I should say that they are not unwilling to give information, but there are a number of small farmers who are not well up to the rules, and who do not give information, partly through ignorance; but, upon the whole, I do not think there is any unwillingness to give information, upon the part of the farmers, when disease breaks out; at the same time, if they can manage it, it is only human nature to get rid of the animals as quickly as possible, and I should not be slandering my county if I admitted that they do the best they can to get rid of them.

11675. That would be the real difficulty, would it not; in carrying out stringent rules it would be easy to manage it if the farmers would all co-operate?—If they were well compensated I have no doubt farmers would co-operate; that is to say, if they get three-fourths of the value of the animal which was to be killed for pleuro-pneumonia. I believe that if the disease broke out, and information were given, you would soon get rid of pleuro-pneumonia. With regard to foot and mouth disease, I do not think it is right to kill the animal affected with it; but the only thing is to take care that where the disease has broken out it shall remain, and not poison the country by taking animals that have been in contact with diseased ones out of it; and any cattle removed from such a farm should only be by license.

11676. In fact, you would isolate the animal?—Yes, I would isolate the animal.

11677. But even in that case the farmers, in most places (I do not say with reference to Forfarshire) do not like to give information, which would lead to isolation, do they?—They do not like it; but if we had a head inspector who made it his business to know the state of the cattle in the county, I believe the disease could not break out in any place without its coming to his knowledge.

11678. Sir H. Scheyballer. I understand you to say that in Forfarshire they have not adopted the system of inspection which was applied in Aberdeenshire?—We have commenced it just now. We only did it at a meeting about 10 days ago.

11679. From your knowledge of the disease and the means of preventing it, do you not think that a system similar to that adopted in Aberdeenshire, if adopted universally throughout the country, would be very beneficial?—I think it would, so far as pleuro-pneumonia is concerned.

11680. You think that farmers generally would co-operate in carrying out such a system as they have done in Aberdeenshire?—I think they would; at least, if they were men who thought about it, I think they would have no hesitation in doing it.

11681. You heard the last witness state that 8 O the

Mr.
W. Goodlet.
—
30 June
1873.

Mr.
W. Goslett.
—
30 June
1873.

the expense of carrying out the system was about 4,000*l.* or 5,000*l.* a year; do you think the country would be prepared to carry out a scheme upon that scale?—I do not think the country could do it more cheaply; the loss may be more hidden at present, when it is not paid for, but I do believe that if that system were carried out, it would be the cheapest way of putting it down upon the whole.

11682. And the most effectual, would it not; because if it were adopted over the country generally, each district would be dealing with the disease in the same way; therefore you would not be subject to an influx of the disease from counties which were not inspected?—Certainly.

11683. Mr. *Clare Read*.] And notwithstanding that these pleuro-pneumonia rules are not now general, you adopted them in *Forfarshire*, although you are an importing county?—Although we are an importing county we have done it; but some of us think that it will not do; that we may carry it on, and see if it will kill out the disease in the county; but we are very doubtful if it will be effectual, unless it is carried on throughout the whole kingdom.

11684. Then you are setting us a good example?—We have certainly begun it.

11685. Although under those very great disadvantages as an importing county?—Yes.

11686. You say that you would restrict those diseases to the farm upon which they occurred?—That is so.

11687. Do you suppose that they originate upon the farms?—At present I do not think they do originate upon the farms; there is such a circulation of diseased cattle through the country; they are wandering all over the country; so that if I buy cattle, for instance, at one of those markets, I run a very great risk of bringing disease home with me; but if the disease were checked at the fountain head, then, although there were a great number of cattle wandering up and down, they would then cease to have the disease amongst them.

11688. When you say the "fountain-head," I suppose you do not believe in the spontaneous origin of these diseases?—I do not.

11689. Do you think they come from abroad?—Yes; and from the centres which exist in our own country now.

11690. But if we got rid of pleuro-pneumonia by these severe regulations which you propose, should we not incur great danger of the disease being re-imported from abroad?—Yes, but I would take care about that.

11691. How would you do so?—I think that all cattle ought to be slaughtered at the port of debarkation, or else let them send dead meat from abroad, as is done from *Aberdeenshire*, the county of *Forfar*, and others.

11692. But you could not obtain your Dutch heifers under those conditions; would not that be a great loss to you?—No; it would be very little loss; our great supply is from *Ireland*; if we could get clean cattle from *Ireland*, I should have no fear, so far as *Scotland* is concerned, with regard to getting rid of the disease.

11693. Supposing that you could insure healthy cattle coming from *Ireland*, what per-centage of increase do you think you could afford to give for them?—The price of cattle has lately risen to such an amount that it is very difficult to say what we should give for them; but I would say

certainly before this enormous rise in the price of cattle took place, we should have been able to give a considerable deal more for them.

11694. Mr. *Bareley*.] Would there be a difference of between 10*s.* and 20*s.* a head?—I have no doubt of it. The dealers buy the cattle in *Ireland* much more cheaply from the growers, and bring them across here much more cheaply than they could do then; they can sacrifice and lose a beast or two, and still get a good profit in our country when they come here. It would be much in the interest both of landlord and tenant in *Ireland*, that they should see that the disease was rooted out if possible, and that the cattle sent to us were sound, healthy animals; then the people themselves would reap the benefit, but at present the trade is all in the hands of jobbers.

11695. I dare say if they had a little more confidence in the *Irish* cattle, farmers would go over to *Ireland* and buy their store cattle themselves?—I have no doubt of it. Some of our large farmers do so at present.

11696. But the plan would be more generally adopted, would it not, if there was more confidence in the *Irish* cattle being free from disease?—Yes, it would; but we have no chance of that being the case at present.

11697. If you had stronger confidence in the *Irish* cattle, you would be disposed to give from 10*s.* to 20*s.* a head more for them, would you not?—Yes, for the two or three year old cattle; I do not refer to the young ones.

11698. Mr. *Maseell*.] Take the *Cheshire* cattle, for example; have you any better faith in the condition of the *Cheshire* cattle than you have in that of the *Irish* cattle?—We very seldom get any cattle from *Cheshire*.

11699. Mr. *Clare Read*.] You get *Yorkshire* cattle, do you not?—Yes.

11700. And you send them *dis*, did you not?—Some of them did. We used to have *English* calves; when they came home, they looked very well, but after a day or two they began to show symptoms of the disease, and we have given up buying those *English* calves unless to a very limited extent now. We buy what are called calves which are brought here in *October*; they are called calves, but they are approaching one year old.

11701. You think that those calves die chiefly from the privations they endure; not from any particular disease?—Not at all; it is chiefly from the privations that they endure; it is quite a different thing with them, from healthy older animals travelling by railway. I do not think, if the latter are in good condition, that they would suffer very much from travelling by railway.

11702. Mr. *Bareley*.] There is a system to which you very strongly object, I believe; that some of the *Irish* dealers bring over a drove of cattle themselves, and drive them from market to market, and sell them on the way?—Yes, they do.

11703. The consequence is that the cattle get into a very emaciated condition, do they not?—Some of the smaller ones are very emaciated looking; I do not deal in that class of cattle myself.

11704. That system is considered very objectionable by the farmers?—Yes, it is; they lounge about in the dyke sides, and wherever there is a little open spot, there you will be sure to find an *Irishman*.

11705. They

11705. They do not pay much for the rent of the ground, I presume?—When they come to the large Forfarshire markets they have to put them in the fields all night, and they have to pay a pretty fair allowance for doing that; that is to say, the large dealers; but when I speak of wandering from town to town, I am speaking of the small dealers who bring a score or 30 cattle from Ireland, whereas the large dealers bring hundreds.

11706. The large dealers take care of their cattle?—Yes, they try to do.

11707. But the small dealers drive their cattle about the country without taking those proper precautions?—It is very difficult to say whether they are small dealers or not; because they distribute them out in lots; the Glasgow salesmen frequently sell them, and the Irishmen are in attendance themselves. One salesman will probably have four or five different large lots, which he sells to the farmers, but you cannot tell whether these are one man's cattle or whether they belong to half a dozen men.

11708. Mr. Clegg.] I understand that you would recommend the slaughter of all animals coming from foreign countries; you would not allow them to be landed alive, or that you would slaughter them immediately on their landing?—I was referring to fat cattle coming to the fat cattle market. I think that the safest course would be to slaughter all fat cattle at the port of debarkation.

11709. You would admit nothing but dead meat?—I would not object to store cattle being imported if they were put under a certain sort of quarantine, and allowed to remain at the port of debarkation for a few weeks, and then, if they were found to be healthy, I should not object to letting them come from a clean foreign country.

11710. And you would approve of that destruction, as well as between scheduled and unscheduled countries?—I should think that, if certain countries were known to be clean, it would be safe enough to import cattle from those countries.

11711. Whatever restrictions you would recommend, you would recommend that they should be applied equally to Ireland?—I think that Ireland should be treated more like a part of Great Britain, and therefore that regulations and rules should be applied to Ireland similar to what we have in our own country, and let them be efficiently carried out. I believe the regulations in Ireland are now carried out by the police, as they have no local authorities similar to what we have in Scotland; but if they had proper local authorities in the different districts, and let the whole of the cattle in Ireland be under the same rules as are applied in England, then we should be glad to see them, because it is from Ireland chiefly that we get our most important supply, and very few cattle we get from Ireland sometimes.

11712. But you complain also of diseased cattle coming from Ireland?—Yes, undoubtedly, at present.

11713. Then why would you not extend to Ireland the same restrictions and regulations which you would apply to foreign countries?—Because it is not a foreign country.

11714. For the sentimental reason that it is the same thing as England?—No; but the journey from Ireland to the ports of this country could do them no harm, and it would be a wrong to
0.08.

Ireland to insist upon the same regulations that you would apply to a foreign country, because in the case of a foreign country they are perhaps two or three days upon the journey, but from Ireland they are only a few hours; and I would consider the question of distance between Ireland and England as only the question of there being a large river to cross; as I would treat Ireland just the same as I would treat England and Scotland, and let us have free interchange between us.

11715. Sir H. Seale-Hobbes.] And let us have similar regulations with regard to inspection?—Similar regulations with regard to inspection.

11716. Mr. Clere Read.] Which you could not have with foreign countries?—Quite so. We might say, with regard to foreign countries, when the cattle come to the port of landing you must slaughter them forthwith, but we will not allow them to go any farther.

11717. If your rule were carried out with regard to the slaughtering of all fat stock, what effect would that have upon the price of meat?—I do not think it would affect the price of meat, because where a great number of cattle used to be sent up from Aberdeen to London every year that quantity is getting smaller and smaller, and the amount of dead meat is becoming larger and larger, and we have dealers going about the country ready to pick up a fat beast, kill it and send it up dead to London, and they get returns upon the whole much the same as if they sent them up alive. But certainly, with regard to those very fine cattle, three or four year olds, it is important to send them up alive, because although they may suffer a little upon the journey, they do not look any worse when they arrive than when they start, but if you send up a less finished beast he does not bear the journey nor look so well.

11718. An opinion has been given to the effect that the stoppage of all foreign importations would probably even lower the price of meat; is that your opinion?—I do not think it would.

11719. Sir H. Seale-Hobbes.] At the same time you believe that the dead meat market is gradually increasing, and supplying the place of the live meat market?—I have not the least doubt of it. The dead meat market will more and more develop. One argument used to be that in summer we could not send up dead meat without its getting into a bad state on the journey, but we have found that we can. I sent up an animal just a short time ago, in the very warmest weather, and I got quite as good a price as if I had sent it up alive.

11720. Was that sent to London?—Yes.

11721. Mr. Bavelle.] In your opinion, there would be no objection to allowing fat cattle to come into the country, provided they were slaughtered at the port of debarkation?—No; and I should have no objection to store cattle coming into the country provided they came from a clean country, and underwent a period of quarantine.

11722. Do you think that the British farmer can afford to dispense with foreign store stock?—I think we might; it would be much to our advantage if we were to breed more.

11723. We could not afford to dispense with Irish cattle?—Not very well; but I remember the time when there was very little Irish stock sent into the country. But the reason why we have less breeding now than formerly is, that if
you

Mr.
W. Goodlet.

30 June
1873.

Mr.
W. Goodlet.
—
30 June
1873.

you have a large breeding stock, and disease gets into it, you have a loss far larger than if you merely buy animals, keep them for a short time, and sell them when fat.

11724. Mr. Dent.] Is it not really the truth, that the profits upon feeding Irish lean stock have been so great, that farmers gave up breeding, because they found it paid better to buy Irish stock, and feed them, than to breed their own stock?—It may be partly so, but I believe it was chiefly on account of the disease.

11725. Was it so altogether?—Not altogether, I think; Ireland is a fine cattle-growing country, and I should be very sorry to see the Irish cattle excluded from the country. Ireland has some very fine animals, and I find it better to buy cattle in the market than to keep a breeding stock, so long as infectious diseases are so prevalent in the country as they are.

11726. Is it not also the fact, that owing to farms having become a good deal larger in England, and perhaps in Scotland too, breeding has gone out of fashion, and that the class of farmers who used to bring up a good many calves are diminished, and the large graziers now buy stores, and feed them, instead of the small farmers rearing their own stock?—I think the reason why there is less breeding now than there was, is that it requires more capital to carry on a breeding stock than it does to buy cattle and feed them; and if that is the case, owing to a good many people being deficient in capital, that is another reason why breeding is not so much practised.

11727. Is it not rather the case that the capital is turned over more quickly in purchasing

store animals, and feeding them, not that more capital is required?—Less capital is required in this way; the farmer may buy cattle of a dealer, and give a bill for the price, and then, when he has fattened the cattle, sell them at a profit, and the bill is met, but you cannot carry on a breeding stock upon borrowed money.

11728. Do your farmers in Scotland carry on their trade a good deal with borrowed capital?—In many parts I fear they do to a considerable extent.

11729. Is it the custom in Scotland that the farmer buys lean cattle and gives a bill for them at three or six months, and does not pay for them until he has fed them off?—I do not say that it is an extensive practice, but it is not unfrequently done.

11730. It is an expensive practice, is it not?—Yes, a very expensive practice.

11731. Mr. Barclay.] It has become more common?—Yes, it has become more common than it used to be. Our great salesmen have got into the way of selling the cattle to farmers on credit, and then they have the privilege of selling them again when they are fat, so that the salesman in this way gets two commissions.

11732. Has the system of buying and selling on commission very much increased in Scotland?—Yes; but a system has sprung up which has militated a little against that of late; that is to say, of selling by auction. We have auctions in all the large towns and in some of the smaller ones, and it is often better for the farmer if he has anything to sell to send it there, rather than to put it into the hands of a commission agent.

Mr. GEORGE STEWART, called in; and Examined.

Mr.
G. Stewart.
—

11733. Mr. Barclay.] You are the inspector for the local authority of Perthshire?—Yes.

11734. Are you exclusively employed by the local authority to look after disease in the county?—Yes, I am.

11735. Are there any sub-inspectors in the county?—No, there are no sub-inspectors.

11736. Did the local authority of Perthshire adopt the pleuro-pneumonia rules for foot and mouth disease?—No, we never adopted them.

11737. What is the state of Perthshire with regard to foot and mouth disease?—We had only one case for the last month.

11738. Is that due very much to the restrictions, do you think, or would the disease have died out naturally without any interference upon your part?—The disease is dying out naturally in Scotland altogether; but as long as it was remaining in the other counties, we were always getting importations of it.

11739. Which renewed the disease?—Yes.

11740. But now that the disease is getting gradually exhausted all over Scotland, you are beginning to get free in Perthshire as well?—Yes.

11741. Do you know anything about the county of Fife, adjacent?—Yes.

11742. Have they got nearly free of foot and mouth disease?—I do not know what state Fife is in at present. I believe there is very little foot and mouth disease there.

11743. Did they carry out the Privy Council restrictions with regard to foot and mouth disease?—No; I believe they did not.

11744. They did not even put the foot and

mouth disease rules into operation in Fife, did they?—No; I believe that the county of Fife is very much in the position of Perthshire as regards foot and mouth disease at present.

11745. Still, you believe that the regulations and restrictions of the Privy Council were of advantage in Perthshire?—Yes, they were of considerable advantage in some cases.

11746. You have no doubt, I presume, that foot and mouth disease has been, in every case, brought into your county, and that it did not originate in your county?—That is so.

11747. You have heard it stated that foot and mouth disease had attacked hares?—Yes, I have heard that stated.

11748. Did you ever see a case of a hare attacked with foot and mouth disease?—Never so that I could say it was the disease. I have seen a hare in a field where foot and mouth disease was, which seemed hardly able to get out of the field; but the hare got away. That was the only opportunity I had of making an examination of it.

11749. You had no opportunity of making a close examination of it?—I had not; but I believe that hares are a means of spreading the disease, although they do not take it themselves.

11750. You think that they might carry the disease from field to field without being affected by it themselves?—Yes, without being affected by it themselves.

11751. You made up a statement of the amount of loss in 1872 by foot and mouth disease in Perthshire?—Yes, I did.

11752. How

11752. How many cases had you?—Twelve thousand, and I estimated the loss at 10 per cent. 11753. At 80 s. each?—That is so.

11754. Did you take into account sheep?—Yes; there were about 6,000 sheep affected. The loss on 4,000 sheep and 12,000 cattle came to 18,000 l.

11755. The total amount of cattle in Perthshire in 1872 is 81,702?—Yes.

11756. And of sheep 673,778?—Yes.

11757. Out of the number of 81,702 cattle, 12,000 were attacked?—Yes.

11758. Six thousand sheep were attacked?—Yes.

11759. How many cases of pleuro-pneumonia were there in the county last year?—There would be about 21 places; the total number of cattle upon the places where the disease existed was 608; of these 140 were killed, 34 died, 45 recovered, and 503 remained not attacked at the time the places were declared clear.

11760. Have any of the animals been attacked since in these places?—Yes, in two of the places.

11761. Where the disease is smouldering still?—Where the disease is smouldering still.

11762. Are you in favour of slaughtering animals affected with pleuro-pneumonia?—Yes, I would be in favour of that.

11763. As the most economical process of dealing with the disease?—Yes.

11764. The local authority of Perthshire has not adopted the slaughtering out provisions of the Privy Council, I believe?—They have not.

11765. But you think it would be an economical proceeding if they did so?—It would be an advantageous proceeding if it were done universally. I would not advise them to do it unless it were made universal; that is to say, unless all the other counties in Scotland were to do it.

11766. If the regulation were made general throughout the country, you would consider that it would be advisable for Perthshire to slaughter out also?—Yes.

11767. Have you a strong belief that you would be able to root out pleuro-pneumonia by slaughtering out the diseased animals?—I believe the tendency would be to root it out.

11768. You think that you could reduce it to very narrow limits in about 12 months?—I think 18 months would make a considerable difference in it.

11769. Could you tell the Committee the amount of loss in Perthshire from pleuro-pneumonia last year?—I estimate the total loss, direct and indirect, to be about 4,000 l.

11770. You have not the losses separately?—I have not the losses separately.

11771. As regards pleuro-pneumonia, would you wish that animals should be restricted from moving off an infected place for a longer period than 30 days after the last animal was attacked?—I consider 30 days of no value at all with regard to the restrictions upon moving cattle. I think it would take at least three months to do any good.

11772. You think that the period should be extended from one month to three?—Yes.

11773. With regard to the slaughter of animals affected with pleuro-pneumonia, do you think the owner should be compensated in full, or to what extent?—I do not think he should be compensated in full. I think the owner should

be paid about half the value of the animal before the time when it was attacked with the disease.

11774. If an animal of the value, say of 16 l. is attacked with pleuro-pneumonia, what would you give the owner?—I would give him 8 l. if no salvage, but if the salvage came to more than the half of the value no compensation to be allowed.

11775. And suppose it is a store animal in poor condition, what would you do with the carcass?—If it were fit for human food, I would sell it.

11776. If it were fit for selling, which I dare say it would be in the earlier stages of pleuro-pneumonia, would it be likely to fetch 8 l.?—If it were in good condition it would fetch 8 l.

11777. In fact, would it bring nearly the full value if the animal were in the early stages of the disease?—It might if the animal were in the early stages of the disease. I have known a carcass in that case sold for a pound more than the animal would have fetched if it had been standing in the market.

11778. In that case the local authority would have to give no compensation, because the carcass of the animal would fetch more than the compensation which you propose to allow?—It would do in that case, but there would be other cases in which there would be no returns at all.

11779. Do you think it of great importance to have an early discovery of the disease, for the purpose of putting it down?—I think so.

11780. And that a great object ought to be to induce the farmers to report the disease at its early stage?—Yes, I think so.

11781. Do you think that a liberal compensation would induce the farmers to do so?—What I think would induce the farmers as much as anything, would be if there were more liberty given in removing their healthy fat animals for immediate slaughter.

11782. You think that provision should be made to allow farmers to remove their healthy fat animals from an infected place to the nearest slaughter-house if they were not affected with the disease?—Yes; but even at the present time we allow them to be removed to the nearest slaughter-house; but I mean to allow them to be removed to a fat market, where they would have free competition for the price of the animals.

11783. What provision would you make for the slaughter if you allowed those animals to go into the fat market?—I would have the animals marked or branded so that they should be known, and if they were not slaughtered afterwards, then I would fine the person in whose possession they were found.

11784. Within what time would you propose that they should be slaughtered?—Within five days.

11785. What would be the advantage of allowing them to be exhibited in the market?—They would get a freer competition. If the animals were to be allowed to be taken from Perthshire to the Glasgow fat market, the butchers would not care whether they had come out of an infected stock or not, provided they were worth the money.

11786. Are there not plenty of buyers in Perth for fat cattle?—Yes; there are plenty of buyers, but if the animals are brought into Perth they cannot be taken away again.

Mr.
G. Stewart.
30 June
1873.

11787. Do they kill a great many and send them away from Perth?—Not a great number.

11788. If a farmer was allowed to bring those cattle for slaughter to Perth, the only difference would be the difference in price due to competition, which the farmer would have the advantage of if he were allowed to send to Glasgow?—There is a farmer a few miles from Perth who has been bringing in animals which have been slaughtered at the slaughter-house and the meat sent up to London, and he took some animals into the Glasgow market and slaughtered them there, and there was a difference of 6*l.* a head between the returns that he got from Glasgow and those he got from London.

11789. Do you believe that that farmer got 6*l.* more for his animals in Glasgow than he did in London?—That is his statement.

11790. Do you believe that statement?—I have no reason to doubt it.

11791. Of course markets vary very much; but if he sent the dead meat to Glasgow, is it probable that he would have got as much for the dead meat as for the live animals?—No; the returns are never so good for the meat as for the live cattle.

11792. Do I understand you to say that the returns are higher for the live cattle than for the dead meat?—I understand so; all the farmers around us are anxious to sell their cattle upon their feet.

11793. How do you account for butchers slaughtering animals instead of sending them up alive?—I cannot account for it at all.

11794. You have paid some attention to the transit of cattle from Ireland, have you not?—Yes, I have.

11795. Did the local authority send you across to Ireland to look into the matter?—Yes, they sent me over to Belfast and Londonderry.

11796. Have you been there oftener than once?—No, only once.

11797. You went to Belfast and examined the transit all the way, from the time the animals were received on board the steamer till they got to Glasgow?—Yes.

11798. What remarks have you to make upon the transit of those animals?—The night I came across it was very fine, and there was not an extra load in the boat; but in some loads that I saw going to England, I consider the cattle would become very much enfeebled from the manner in which they were crushed into the boats, and they would be very much more subject to take the disease, and convey it away through the country.

11799. Confining yourself to the steamer in which you came across, have you any complaint to make of the mode of transit on board that steamer?—I have no complaint to make of the mode of transit, excepting that there was no inspection at Glasgow when the boat arrived.

11800. Then, as regards the landing of the cattle at Glasgow, have you any remarks to make upon that subject?—With regard to the landing of cattle at Glasgow, they were immediately, a great number of them, driven up to the cattle market, and at the cattle market there are fat and foreign cattle, and dairy cows, and all sorts mixed up, and those animals pass through amongst them, and remain perhaps all night in the sheds, whence foreign cattle have just come out in the morning.

11801. Mr. Monseil.] But up to the time of the arrival of the cattle at the cattle market in

Glasgow, all was satisfactory; there was nothing that you could complain of, until you arrived at the cattle market in Glasgow?—I do not complain of anything in the cattle market in Glasgow, any further than I do not think it is right, just as I do not think it is right that they should be inspected before they went on board.

11802. Mr. Barclay.] We were talking in the first place of the manner in which the transit of animals was conducted; have you any complaint to make with reference to the treatment that those animals were subjected to, or with reference to the mode of transit, say between Belfast and Glasgow, and coming on to Falkirk?—No; I could not say anything against the treatment of that small lot that came over in the boat with me.

11803. They were reasonably treated?—Yes; there were very few of them, and it was a very fine night.

11804. You say that you saw other boats leaving for English ports, which were overcrowded?—I did.

11805. You would consider that those cattle would not arrive in an equally good condition?—I should consider so.

11806. What other provision would you suggest as regards the shipment from Ireland?—I would have all the animals thoroughly inspected before they were put on board; but also for the sake of Scotland, I think that Ireland should be under the same inspection as we are at present.

11807. Are you aware that inspection is carried out in Ireland?—There is no inspection at all carried out in Ireland.

11808. Are you aware whether the police take any cognisance of disease in Ireland?—The two constables who were appointed as inspectors at Londonderry, told me that they had no orders to stop a diseased animal going on board, and that they would not know a diseased animal even if they saw it.

11809. Are you speaking just now with reference to the inspection of ports, or as to inspection throughout Ireland?—I am speaking with regard to inspection at ports by the police. I believe there is no inspection throughout Ireland by the police.

11810. Mr. Monseil.] What you are talking about from your own observation is merely the inspection at the ports?—Yes; that is what I observed myself. I inquired of the veterinary surgeons at Londonderry whether there was any veterinary inspector for that district at all, and they informed me that there was nothing done in that way.

11811. There was no inspection by a veterinary surgeon?—No; I consider it is as good as nothing at all if it is not done by a veterinary inspector.

11812. Mr. Clare Read.] Are you aware that there is inspection carried out by the police in England, in some cases?—I am.

11813. Do you consider that is so good?—I would not consider it of very much good.

11814. Mr. Barclay.] You would be in favour of all cattle being inspected at the port of embarkation?—Yes, I would.

11815. Would you expect to be able to detect all cases of pleuro-pneumonia?—No, I would not expect to be able to detect them all.

11816. But you would expect to be able to detect the more conspicuous cases of disease?—I would expect that.

Mr.
G. Stewart.
30 June
1873.

11817. Do you think that would exercise a deterrent influence upon the dealers in Ireland?—I do not think it would much, because if there was an animal labouring much under disease the exporter would not take it to the boat if an inspector was standing there.

11818. It would, to this extent at least, deter a dealer from bringing that diseased animal?—That is so.

11819. I believe there is nothing at present to prevent his doing that?—There is nothing at present.

11820. Then, assuming that a dealer was bringing diseased stock in Ireland, possibly none of the animals might show the disease at the time he brought them?—It is quite possible.

11821. At the time the dealer got them up to the shipping port, and got them to the steamer, it might be possible that the disease should declare itself in a few days, by reason of the animals having travelled?—Yes.

11822. Mr. Mowell.] Are you speaking about what you have seen yourself?—No; not in Ireland.

11823. Mr. Barclay.] So far as concerns that cargo of cattle which you saw brought across from Belfast to Glasgow, you have nothing to complain of, but you think that they should have been inspected prior to their departure?—Yes.

11824. You saw other cattle being sent to English ports, which, in your opinion, would not have arrived in good order at the port of debarkation?—Yes.

11825. Have you any further suggestions to make as regards the transit of cattle from Ireland?—I would say that I would prevent them going into the markets. There should be sheds erected, where they could be put in and have some rest after coming off their sea voyage, and have something given them, so that they might be in better condition for going through the country afterwards.

11826. You would advocate animals having a few hours rest, after being landed from the steamer, and being fed and watered?—Yes.

11827. How long would you make that stay compulsory?—About 12 hours.

11828. Assuming that the dealers who bring across large quantities of cattle from Ireland to Falkirk Trust objected to that, would you attribute any weight to their opinion?—No; because it is a matter of self-interest for them to be as short a time as possible upon the road; it would be so much money to them; they are the very parties who would be very likely to object.

11829. Do you think the cattle would arrive in a better condition than if they were hurried on?—Yes.

11830. Would not that put money into the dealers' pocket in the end?—It should do, but I do not know that they would consider it in that light.

11831. You do not think the dealers take an enlightened view of the matter?—No, I do not.

11832. How many local authorities have you in Perthshire?—We have two; one for the county and one for the city of Perth.

11833. You have only one borough in Perthshire?—I think that is all.

11834. Do you think there is any conflicting interest, or any separate interests which would conflict together, between the city and the county, as regards the local authorities?—No, there was
0.58.

nothing conflicting; but at the time the county was shut up for cattle coming from England, they did not consider it necessary to shut the borough, and the consequence was the cattle were at liberty to go into the town.

11835. But they could not get them out of the town again?—It would be difficult to say; they might go to a sale, and be bought there, and be taken away as cattle having belonged to the farmers round about.

11836. You think it would be difficult to trace them?—It would be impossible to trace them. The station is within the borough, and they might get run in in that way.

11837. Was that on account of any special advantage that the borough wanted to get, or any special disadvantage that they wanted to avoid, or because they did not trouble themselves specially in the matter?—Because they did not trouble themselves specially in the matter. I think that was the whole thing.

11838. Would you have the Irish cattle inspected upon landing?—I would if they were detained, I think, or I would have them inspected upon landing, and again when they went away.

11839. If you found any disease at the port of landing, what would you do with the affected animals?—The only thing would be to stop them altogether if they were attacked with foot and mouth disease. I would stop them in Glasgow, and have a place where they could be removed to, and where they could be kept until they recovered from the disease.

11840. Would you stop the rest of the animals in the same lot?—Yes.

11841. Is foot and mouth disease rather prevalent amongst the Irish cattle which come across?—It is very prevalent.

11842. If it were very prevalent, I apprehend you would have to make provision for storing a month's import of Irish cattle at Glasgow, would you not?—It is possible that you might require that, but if it was done for a short time it would make the dealers and others who were sending cattle to Scotland more careful.

11843. It would stop the traffic very much, would it not?—Yes, for a short time.

11844. Mr. Mowell.] At whose expense should those buildings be erected?—I do not know at whose expense those buildings should be erected, but the Glasgow authorities would complain about their being erected at their expense; they would not get any benefit from it; I think it should be a national thing.

11845. Mr. Barclay.] You think that it should be paid out of the Imperial Exchequer?—I think so.

11846. You are not at all satisfied with the present system of cleansing and disinfecting railway trucks, are you?—No.

11847. What system would you suggest with regard to that?—I would have them cleansed and disinfected immediately the cattle were moved out of them.

11848. Do you think that would be feasible at all large markets?—The largest market we have in Perthshire is the Dean Trust, about as large as Falkirk Trust. Last October Trust, the company had a lot of men cleaning the trucks; I did not see a dirty truck going away on that day.

11849. Do the railway company have truck cleaners at Perth?—Yes, at Perth.

Mr.
G. Stewart.
—
30 June
1873.

11850. So that they kept the trucks in good order at Perth?—Yes, they kept the trucks in good order at Perth; but it is at the roadside stations where the trucks are not disinfected.

11851. Is that from want of will, or from want of time?—It is from want of time. The railway company's servants have not time to attend to the roadside stations. All the trucks which are sent to the roadside stations should be sent there clean, I think, because there is sometimes only one man and the station-master, and there would be a lot of cattle standing on the bank, wanting to go by the next train, and the man has not time to wash and clean the trucks for those cattle.

11852. Do you think that store and fat markets should be separate from each other?—Certainly. I think their being together is a great source of the spread of disease.

11853. What provision would you make for that?—The only provision you could make for that would be to have a market for the fat cattle alone, and to put a brand upon them when they went into that market, to show that they had been shown in the fat market, and they should not be allowed to be shown in the store market.

11854. Would you make it imperative that the branded animals should be killed within a certain brief space of time?—Yes; to be of any good I think they should.

11855. Within what space of time would you recommend?—Four or five days.

11856. Would you brand the store animals?—No, I would not brand the store animals.

11857. Would you prevent fat animals being shown in a store market?—It is difficult to say; what one would consider fat, another might consider store; it would not be very easy to define what was considered fat, and what was considered store in that case.

11858. Would you have more stringent penalties for moving animals affected with disease upon a public road, would you not?—I would have provision made in some form, so that an inspector would have some power in dealing with cattle travelling in a diseased state along a public road. At the present time, although inspectors may come across diseased cattle upon a public road, the practice is that the cattle are to be seized; but where are you to take them to? No farmer would allow you to lay a diseased animal upon his farm, and you might have to take the cattle 20 miles before you could place them in a field.

11859. What power would you have given in that case?—That where an inspector could see a place of ground, if it were an isolated place, he should have power to make some arrangement with the proprietor of the land.

11860. You think that the inspector ought to have summary power to take possession of a piece of land which he thought suitable?—Yes.

11861. Whether the owner was in favour of it or not?—Yes.

11862. Is there any deficiency just now in cleansing and disinfecting premises where disease is existing?—Yes, there is considerable difficulty. At the present time it is not defined at whose expense the place is to be cleansed and disinfected. I think it should be done at the owner's expense. And then there are other things, such as mason work out of order, which would require some time before they could be cleansed and disinfected thoroughly, which sometimes comes to a great deal of money.

11863. Who should have to do that?—The proprietors should have to do the mason work, but I think the owners of cattle should do the disinfecting work.

11864. At whose sight is the disinfecting to be carried out?—At the inspector's.

11865. You wish power to be given to the local authority also to order fencing between the fields?—Yes.

11866. So as to keep animals affected with the disease separate from others?—Yes.

11867. That power is not given under the Act at present?—No, that would only be in cases of pleuro-pneumonia. I do not think it would do any good to put up a fence perhaps six yards from an existing fence in the case of foot and mouth disease.

11868. Then in the case of animals in a field by a highway affected with foot and mouth disease, what would you do?—I would have a double fence off the road.

11869. How far should that extend?—Six yards, or thereabouts, from the existing fence.

11870. I thought you stated that that was of no use in the case of foot and mouth disease?—Not in parks; but it would be of considerable use upon public roads, as cattle would not come in contact when going along a road with other cattle in the field which might be affected.

11871. You think it is absolutely necessary, in order to deal successfully with disease throughout the country, that the action should be uniform throughout the whole country?—I do not think that inspection is of much use unless it is made uniform.

11872. The county authorities would not have confidence that their neighbours were acting to the same purpose as they were acting, unless it were made imperative throughout the whole country?—That is so.

11873. Mr. Maxwell? When was it that you went to Ireland?—It was in the beginning of last month.

11874. You went to Belfast, did you not?—Yes.

11875. And to Londonderry?—Yes.

11876. Did you see any diseased animals at either of those places?—I saw no diseased animals at either of those places.

11877. You came back in a steamer with cattle on board, did you not?—I did.

11878. And on board that steamer you saw no disease?—No.

11879. I believe you saw other vessels which appeared to have more cattle on board than were on board your steamer?—I saw them at Belfast.

11880. Was there any disease among those beasts?—I did not examine those beasts.

11881. All the questions which you have been asked with regard to Irish animals have been hypothetical ones, have they not? You refer to what you believe, not to anything you have seen yourself?—I refer to what I believe.

11882. Mr. Barclay? Have you any suggestions to make in reference to your views of dealing with cattle disease?—I would have a central board for Scotland; a central committee; and I would have that committee made up of members, one from each county a member of the local authority.

11883. Where would you have that committee meet?—At Edinburgh, in connection with the Agricultural Society there.

11884. Have you great confidence in the action

action which that society has taken hitherto in regard to cattle diseases?—No; they have taken no particular action that I am aware of.

11885. What would be the object of this central committee?—The object of this central committee would be, that in the event of disease breaking out in any other country whence cattle were being imported into Scotland, they should meet together and say whether this country should be shut up or not. Hitherto one country might be shutting up, and the next leaving its sales open.

11886. Do you think that that committee would act with greater decision and promptness than the Privy Council?—I think so. Sometimes it takes a considerable time before the different counties would communicate with the Privy Council and say whether they would like Scotland to be shut up or not, but under the plan I suggest, by calling a meeting of the committee, they would say what should be done.

11887. Would that committee be likely to act with better judgment and knowledge than the Privy Council?—Yes, they would have a better opportunity of knowing what was fit for Scotland than gentlemen would have at a distance.

11888. You have not great confidence in the Privy Council, apparently?—I have some.

11889. But you would have greater confidence in this committee?—Yes, I should; I mean in the carrying out of the Privy Council Orders in Scotland.

11890. Mr. *Clare Read*.] With regard to plague-*paratuberculosis*, I understood you to say that if you gave a man compensation to the extent of half the value of his cattle, and isolated them for three months, that would be an inducement to him to give notice of the disease?—Yes, I think so.

11891. Would it not be very much better for him to kill them and say nothing about them, if he only got half the value of them?—Even if he

did kill them and say nothing about it, I do not know what advantage that would be to him; he might be detected and fined for not reporting.

11892. I thought that the compensation was to be for the purpose of getting an early knowledge of the disease; but if you only give half the value, and isolate the man's cattle for three months, I ask you whether it would not answer his purpose better to kill the affected animal, and sell the rest, and not say anything about it at all, rather than have his cattle isolated for three months?—In that case it certainly would.

11893. Is not that done now frequently?—But in the other case I look upon it, that if they get full compensation, it will make them more reckless in trading; they would not be so particular in the cattle they would buy, and if they were buying cattle where disease existed, it might be an inducement to them to take them at a low rate, and get a higher rate for them subsequently, if they were attacked with the disease.

11894. With the certainty of having them isolated for three months?—But the farmer does not lose anything by that. He buys the cattle in this case, which I am supposing at a good deal under their value, and he gets them valued by the local authority, they not knowing that the cattle were bought out of a diseased stock. Perhaps the man buys them at about 11 £, and gets them valued at about 16 £.

11895. But if we are to get rid of this disease, it is most essential to get rid of the outbreaks in all cases, is it not?—Yes, it is, no doubt.

11896. Would not your plan be an inducement for a man to conceal the disease rather than to lose half the value of his animals which were killed, and get three months' isolation of the rest?—Yes, it might be so in some cases, but the fear of detection, in the majority of cases, would prevent that.

Mr.
G. Stewart,
30 June
1873.

Thursday, 3rd July 1873.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mr. James Barclay.
Mr. Jacob Bright.
Mr. Callan.
Mr. Clay.
Mr. Dudson.

Mr. Monsell.
Mr. O'Connor.
Mr. Poll.
Mr. Clare Read.

THE RIGHT HONOURABLE WILLIAM MONSELL, IN THE CHAIR.

Mr. JAMES THOMSON, recalled; and further Examined.

Mr. J. Thomson. 11897. Mr. Barclay.] WHEN previously examined you made a statement with reference to the cost of sending live cattle and dead meat up to London?—I did.

11898. Have you made further inquiry since then as regards the cost?—I have.

11899. What do you find as the total cost upon a ton of meat consigned to London for sale, including all charges, railway carriage, selling, and commission?—£ 4. 15.

11900. Then what do you make the expense upon a live animal consigned to London?—£ 1. 15.

11901. Will you tell the Committee, as regards the former case, what the items were made up of?—In the case of dead meat, railway charges per ton, 3*l*. 5*s*.; commission, 1*l*. 3*s*. 4*d*.; stamps returns, 4*s*.; toll, 2*s*. 6*d*.; total, 4*l*. 14*s*. 10*d*.

11902. Now will you give the Committee the particulars of the charges on a live animal coming up to London?—Railway charge, 1*l*. 5*s*.; commission, 5*s*.; lairage, keep, and droving, 5*s*.; making a total of 1*l*. 15*s*.

11903. What is the average weight of these animals which come up alive from Aberdeen to London?—From 7 to 7½ cwt. dead weight.

11904. The average weight of all the animals slaughtered in Aberdeenshire, the meat of which is consigned dead to London, would be less than 7½ cwt., would it not?—Yes, it would.

11905. Do you know the distance from Aberdeen to London?—Five hundred and sixty miles.

11906. Three animals averaging 7½ cwt., would make how much?—Three animals would make about 22½ cwt.

11907. And the cost of the three animals would be 5 guineas?—Yes.

11908. So that that brings the expenses of the live and dead meat, taking everything into account, almost exactly the same?—Almost the same.

11909. Twenty-two hundred weight of live meat costs about five guineas, and a ton of dead meat 4*l*. 15*s*.?—Yes.

11910. In your evidence on the last day, did you make any mistake in stating that the Dutch cattle came from Liverpool?—I did; they were landed at Hull.

11911. You intended to say Hull instead of Liverpool?—I did.

11912. Mr. Clare Read.] Have you heard many complaints from butchers who have consigned this meat to London of having lost any from bad weather?—No; occasionally there have been complaints, when the weather is very hot.

11913. Is it the fact, that the butchers send any meat to London at this time of year?—Yes, they send dead meat every day.

11914. Of course in your country cattle are mostly winter fed, and therefore the chief part of the meat would come in the cooler months, would it not?—Yes.

11915. Mr. Barclay.] But at the same time there are cattle killed in Aberdeenshire in the summer months which come 560 miles by rail, without any sensible depreciation of the value of the meat?—There are.

11916. Chairman.] In really hot weather, is it not your opinion that there would be very great danger that the meat would suffer?—Is really hot weather it would a little.

11917. Mr. Barclay.] It is occasionally the fact, that meat coming up from Aberdeen is condemned when the weather gets very sultry?—It is the fact that it is occasionally condemned.

11918. Chairman.] Therefore it would be impossible, would it not, all through the year to carry on a system of sending dead meat up from Aberdeen; you never could be quite certain of being able to send it up safely in the months of July and August, could you?—It is uncertain in these months; they do not go in so heavily for it in these months.

11919. Mr. Clare Read.] Is not there a certain amount of loss of meat in every live animal which comes up from Aberdeen?—I have no doubt of it.

11920. So that it is quite possible that the losses from the transit of dead meat are, upon the whole, no greater than the actual loss of meat sustained by the carriage of the live animal?—They may not be.

11921. Mr. Barclay.] Are the butchers deterred by the risk of the meat spoiling from sending dead meat to London?—No.

11922. They send all the dead meat to London during the summer months which they can produce in the district, do they not?—Yes, they do.

11923. Do any live animals come up in the summer months to London?—Very few.

11924. Are

11994. Are not the live animals consigned to London during the summer months a minimum altogether?—Yes.

11995. So that, in point of fact, notwithstanding any small risk which there may be of meat getting unsound during the summer months, all the meat which comes from Aberdeen to London may be said to be come dead even during the summer?—Yes, that is so.

11996. Mr. *Clare Read*.] Can you give the Committee the cost of a live bullock by sea?—Yes, the whole cost is 1*l.* 11*s.*, made up of the following items: steamer charge, 1*l.* 1*s.*; commission, 5*s.*; lirage, keep, and droving, 5*s.*; making a total of 1*l.* 11*s.*

11997. So that that is rather less than the carriage by rail?—Yes.

11998. Do you suppose that there is any competition at all between the railways and the steamers?—Yes.

11999. Is not that one reason why both charges are so reasonable for a live animal?—I am not aware; it is natural to conclude that that keeps the rates lower.

12000. Is not 25*s.* a very low charge for a journey of 560 miles?—Yes.

12001. Mr. *Barelay*.] Is there any dead meat coming from Aberdeen just now by the steamers?—I do not think so; it is so very uncertain that they would not send it by the steamers at this season.

12002. Could you tell the Committee the charges by steamer?—It costs by steamer 2*l.* 5*s.* per ton freight, and the same commission 1*l.* 3*s.* 4*d.*, stamps and returns, 4*s.*, tolls, 2*s.* 6*d.*, making a total of 3*l.* 14*s.* 10*d.*

12003. What was the charge by rail?—*L.* 4*l.* 10*s.*

12004. There is 1*l.* per ton of difference?—Yes.

12005. *Chairman*.] I find in a report from the Committee appointed by the Lord President of the Council in 1870, this passage: "The officers of every railway company who gave evidence before us agree in saying that the trade" that is the trade in dead meat, "is increasing, but at the same time they absolutely repudiate the idea that it could ever be made to supersede the trade in live animals; indeed several of the witnesses declared that it had extended itself almost as far as could safely be done without certainty of loss, and they instanced the great losses incurred by traders in meat at the time when, during the cattle plague, the carriage of live animals by railway was prohibited;" Does your opinion go as far as to say that the dead meat traffic should supersede the traffic in live animals?—Yes.

12006. You would wish to stop the traffic in live animals altogether?—I have no wish in the matter.

12007. Do you desire, for the sake of preventing the spreading of disease in cattle, that the carriage of live animals should be altogether stopped, and that the railway company should only be allowed to carry dead meat?—So far as the suppression of disease is concerned, it would be desirable.

12008. Do you not agree with the officers of the railway companies in the opinion which they have here expressed that there would be very considerable danger of the loss of meat by carrying on that process, particularly in the summer months?—I do not.

12009. Mr. *Clare Read*.] Are you not aware that during the cattle plague a vast number of animals had to be slaughtered in the fields and in the farmsteads, where no proper appliances for slaughtering could be had?—The conveniences were not so difficult to obtain in our country.

12010. But a comparison of the time of the cattle plague with the regular trade in dead meat would not be a fair one, would it?—I do not think it would.

12011. Mr. *Barelay*.] Do you recollect whether it was in the winter months that the cattle plague prevailed?—It was in the winter months that the cattle prevailed.

12012. And the losses to the butchers, if losses did arise at that time by consigning dead meat to London, could not have arisen on account of the meat becoming unsound by reason of the heat of the weather?—No.

12013. You know at that time very large quantities of dead meat were consigned from Aberdeen to London?—Yes.

12014. Being the meat of animals which were slaughtered to prevent the spread of cattle plague?—That is so.

12015. Was any of that meat condemned for being unsound?—None.

12016. You would have known if there had been any?—I should.

12017. So if there were losses on account of consigning dead meat to London at that time, that could not have been on account of the unreasonable weather?—It could not have been.

12018. Mr. *Callan*.] Have you any practical knowledge of the transit of live cattle by railway?—We have the local traffic, with which I am pretty well acquainted.

12019. Have you any practical knowledge with reference to the conveyance of cattle in the trucks, and the system of through-bocking, and the watering and feeding of cattle, and of the care of them upon the journey?—No.

12020. Therefore, you speak without any practical knowledge upon the subject?—Yes, so far as the carriage goes.

12021. Have you any practical knowledge of the transit of dead meat upon railways?—I have just given a statement about it.

12022. Have you any practical knowledge yourself of the carriage of dead meat by railway, as to the state in which it is received by railway companies, the time it occupies during its transit to London, and the state in which it is received in London?—I have had evidence from those who have received the meat in London; from those who have been engaged in the cattle trade.

12023. Your evidence, then, is hearsay?—Yes, but from reliable sources.

Mr. GEORGE STEWART, recalled; and further Examined.

12024. Mr. *Barelay*.] You wish, I believe, to supplement your evidence of the last day by referring to a case or cases of pleuro-pneumonia in

cattle, which you have no doubt was imported from Ireland, the cattle having the disease before they left Ireland?—I do.

12025. Will

Mr. Stewart. 11955. Will you state the particulars?—In the month of November 1872 there were 9 or 10 cattle bought in the Perth market by Mr. Drysdale, a farmer of Grange, of Elcho, about four miles from Perth, and an animal died a few days afterwards: he was hurried. Another animal was taken bad a short time afterwards; he died and was hurried. A third one was taken bad, and then the farmer reported the case for the first time to the local authority. We went to his place and had the first animal exhumed, and we found that it had died from pleuro-pneumonia, and that the other cases had also been pleuro-pneumonia. The parties that he had bought the cattle from were Messrs. Robinson & Young, cattle dealers of Glasgow; and they referred him to a party in Ireland from whom they had got the cattle, and they were going to raise an action for damages. I do not know the name of the party in Ireland, but I could have it. I asked them, but I have got no answer. I can send the name of the county in Ireland, and Mr. Robinson said he had only received the cattle from Ireland that week.

11956. This animal died of pleuro-pneumonia, within how many days of leaving Ireland?—It came from Glasgow direct to the Perth market; it would only have been out of Ireland about four or five days at the very most.

11957. You would say within a week, at the very most, of leaving Ireland?—Yes.

11958. That was one case; what was another?—There was another case in the month of April 1873; there was a lot of 40 cattle bought at Falkirk Tryst. We had not such strong evidence in regard to this case, because the first animal that died was not exhumed and examined for pleuro-pneumonia. But the lot of 40 was divided into four lots. Two of them went to Perthshire, one to Clackmannanshire and one to Kinross-shire, and in each of the places where they were divided pleuro-pneumonia broke out.

11959. How long had these animals left Ireland before the disease was declared?—It was presumed that the first case was pleuro-pneumonia; it would be about five weeks from the time they had left Ireland till the second case occurred.

11960. Have you any idea how long the second case was after the first?—It would be about a month from the first case.

11961. Did the first animal die very shortly after the cattle were taken to the place?—Very shortly after the cattle were taken to the place.

11962. In Perthshire you make considerable use of the police in discovering and dealing with the disease, do you not?—Yes, we do.

11963. When a policeman receives any information of disease, what does he do?—Immediately he has any information of any disease, if it is not reported to him by the party who has the disease upon his place, he makes a report and sends it to the chief constable, and the chief constable sends the report to me, and I immediately make inquiry. In the other case, where the disease is reported by the farmer to the constable, he goes to the farm and takes the number of cattle, both diseased and healthy, and he then sends on the report with the name of the farm, the nearest railway station, and the number of cattle, and the cattle are held under check by the policeman till I have made my examination of them.

11964. Have you found that system to work satisfactorily?—Yes.

11965. And you are enabled to deal with the

disease with considerable effect in Perthshire under that system?—Yes, we are.

11966. Mr. Collier.] When did the last case occur; the case of the cattle bought at Falkirk Tryst?—That was in the month of April 1873.

11967. Had you any proof that the first case of death arose from pleuro-pneumonia?—We had no proof.

11968. It was merely a presumption on your part?—It was.

11969. The cattle having been in Scotland for five weeks before the first clear case of death by pleuro-pneumonia occurred, do not you think it more likely that the disease would have been caught at Falkirk Tryst, than brought over from Ireland?—We had a great number of other cattle come into Perthshire from the Falkirk Tryst and they did not show pleuro-pneumonia, but these cattle being divided into four lots, and carrying pleuro-pneumonia with them, showed they must have had the disease amongst them.

11970. What precautions would you suggest should be taken to prevent such an event happening?—I would have an inspection in Ireland, the same as we have in Scotland.

11971. What is that inspection?—That where there is an animal that has any disease, or where there is any disease supposed to exist about the farm, the authorities immediately make inquiry into it, and if it is found to be a contagious disease, the whole of the stock are kept at the place.

11972. Suppose these cattle left a farm in Ireland where disease did not exist, what precaution would you recommend to prevent the importation of those cattle into Scotland; would you prohibit altogether the importation of fresh cattle?—Most decidedly not.

11973. What precaution would you take?—I would have them inspected at the port of embarkation.

11974. How could inspection at the port of embarkation detect disease which did not exhibit itself for five weeks afterwards in Scotland?—But we are presuming that the first animal that died had pleuro-pneumonia as well.

11975. But I am only taking the clear evidence?—It is quite possible that in that case the disease might have been caught in Scotland, if you do not take into account the first animal that died.

11976. But suppose that the disease had been caught in Ireland, what precaution could you recommend which would prevent the introduction of that disease, save and except the entire prohibition of the importation of cattle from Ireland?—The only preventative measure which could be taken, would be to have an inspection of all cattle upon the farms in Ireland, and have all the diseased animals removed from a public road, or other places where cattle would be travelling, and I would have them inspected upon embarkation, and inspected again when they were landed.

11977. With regard to pleuro-pneumonia, you would suggest the same stringency being observed as with regard to foot and mouth disease?—I would most decidedly.

11978. [Chairman.] Were the cases which you have mentioned the only cases of outbreaks of pleuro-pneumonia which occurred in Perthshire about that time?—I do not recollect just now whether there were any others.

11979. But take, say the last six months of last

last year, what number of outbreaks of pleuro-pneumonia were there in Perthshire?—At the present time I could not exactly say.

11980. At all events, I suppose there were several?—Several; there would be eight or nine, perhaps.

11981. One case you traced clearly to Irish cattle, and no other; will you mention your reasons for supposing that that was a case which was derived from Ireland; were not there many cases of outbreaks which came from other places, from cattle which were brought not from Ireland

but from other counties in Scotland, or from Mr. Stewart, England?—No doubt there were, but pleuro-pneumonia does not develop itself in so short a 3 July 1873. time as five days.

11982. Therefore what your evidence really comes to is this, that it is desirable that the regulations which exist in Ireland, just as much as in England and Scotland, should be properly carried out?—That is so; that they should be properly carried out, as in England and Scotland, and same regulations.

Mr. ANDREW MILNE, called in; and Examined.

11983. Mr. Barclay.] You are a Farmer near Craigo, in Forfarshire?—Yes, I rent two small farms on the estate of Craigo, near Montrose.

11984. You have paid very considerable attention to the manner of dealing with cattle disease, and also to the conveyance of cattle by rail, have you not?—I have paid a good deal of attention to the transit question especially, and I have paid a little attention also to the operation of the Contagious Diseases Act since it has been in force.

11985. You have, I believe, paid considerable attention to the manner in which the present Act works in Forfarshire?—Yes; but more particularly to the transit question.

11986. As regards dealing with cattle diseases, do you think it is of importance, or of absolute necessity, to have uniformity of action throughout the whole country?—I think so; I think it is next to impossible to carry out the provisions of the Act without unanimity and uniformity of action.

11987. You would make the power of the Act imperative and not optional on the local authorities?—I would.

11988. Are you in favour of having one local authority for each county?—Yes, I would be in favour of having one local authority for each county, except in perhaps exceptional cases where two small counties might combine, or a large county might perhaps be divided.

11989. Having the various interests represented in each locality?—Yes, the various interests as fairly represented as possible.

11990. Are you satisfied with the efficiency with which the present Act is carried out in Scotland generally?—I think that there is too much hesitancy and delay; one local authority may adopt one system and another adopt a different, and consequently the action taken by the one is frustrated by the non-action or delay of the other.

11991. Would you be in favour of having a chief officer or inspector general appointed for each county, to devote his time exclusively to looking after disease, and to take charge of the carrying out of the Act within his district?—I would.

11992. Assuming that any local authority in any county did not carry out the Act, or put the Act in force, what would you do?—I would most distinctly give the Privy Council power to enforce the carrying out of the orders.

11993. Are you in favour of slaughtering out animals affected with pleuro-pneumonia?—All animals showing any symptom of the disease, I would order to be slaughtered; and, although I fear such an opinion would not be generally 0.53.

endorsed, yet I think the cheapest and most efficient system of getting rid of the disease would be by slaughtering, not only animals showing symptoms of the disease, but also those that had been in contact with them.

11994. Do you think there would be much use in slaughtering out animals affected with pleuro-pneumonia in certain counties, if that policy were not adopted generally over the whole country?—It is of no use whatever; it is so much money thrown away for one county to slaughter out if the system is not generally adopted; for no sooner is the county which has adopted those measures thrown open, than it is inundated with fresh importations of disease from other counties.

11995. The fresh importations of disease are discouraging to the local authorities who are themselves carrying out the orders of the Privy Council or the Act with efficiency?—I have no doubt that that is so.

11996. Then with regard to the isolation of herds where pleuro-pneumonia has existed, how long do you think the animals should be isolated upon a farm where pleuro-pneumonia has existed?—That is rather a question for a professional man to answer than for me, but from conversations with veterinary surgeons and others, and from my observations of the disease, I should think that three months would be requisite.

11997. Would you allow fat animals from a herd where pleuro-pneumonia had existed, to be taken to the nearest slaughterhouse for immediate slaughter?—I think there would be considerable risk in so doing; it is quite possible that those animals might be affected, although there was no appearance of the disease about them.

11998. Are the farmers endeavouring to carry out the Orders of the Privy Council with regard to foot and mouth disease, in Forfarshire, with reasonable efficiency?—I am not sure that they are; I should not like to say that they are not endeavouring to do their best to carry out the provisions of the Act, but I am afraid the precautions which have been taken are not answering the purpose, and are not efficient for the purpose of stopping the disease.

11999. Is that on account of the orders themselves, or for want of their being carried out with sufficient firmness and energy?—I think it is for want of their being carried out with sufficient stringency.

12000. Do you approve of those Orders of the Privy Council with regard to foot-and-mouth disease?—I do.

12001. Would you be in favour of relaxing them?—Not at all; I would have them rigorously enforced.

3 P 2

12002. Have

Mr. Milne.

Mr. Milne.
3 July 1873.

12002. Have you any suggestions to make to the Committee as regards dealing with the foot-and-mouth disease?—Unless there were more strict supervision, it is a very difficult matter to deal with. There should be more strict supervision, and perhaps also more severe penalties in case of infraction of the Act.

12003. When a conviction has been obtained against a transgressor against the law, have large penalties been inflicted, or have any penalties been inflicted?—I cannot speak positively with reference to this question. I know that penalties have been inflicted, but in my opinion they are not stringent enough.

12004. *Chairman.* What is the tribunal in Scotland before which these cases are brought?—I understand that they are generally brought before the justices of the peace.

12005. *Mr. Barclay.* Are they also brought before the sheriff?—They may be. I am not aware of any having been brought before the sheriff.

12006. You have stated that you have devoted considerable attention to the transit of animals by rail?—I have of late especially.

12007. You have had some experience relating to the transit of animals between England and Scotland, on account of coming up to England to buy cattle occasionally?—I have had a limited experience. I have not been engaged in the cattle trade as a profession. I have chiefly purchased animals for my own feeding, and I have gone with them myself to save them in the transit, if I could. I have had a good deal of traffic in milch cows, having been engaged in the dairy trade.

12008. Where do you buy the milch cows?—In Ayrshire, and I convey them to Forfarshire.

12009. And where do you buy store animals?—In Cheshire.

12010. When were you buying there last?—I bought two lots last year; one in August and the other in November.

12011. What sort of cattle were they?—The first lot were two-year-old heifers in calf to calve in the spring; in fact, both lots were in calf.

12012. Those were rather breeding animals than store animals, apparently?—The first lot were bought as store animals, only they turned out to be in calf; the last lot were known to be in calf, and were bought for that purpose. They were well-bred animals.

12013. You have in certain cases accompanied these animals upon their way between England and Ayrshire, and Forfarshire?—More especially between Ayrshire and Forfarshire; but I have accompanied them between England and Scotland.

12014. What is the distance between Ayrshire and Forfarshire?—It is a roundabout route; sometimes we take them from Kilmarnock to Glasgow, and then unload them, and drive them through the city to the Eight-hill station, on the north side of the city; and in the other case they generally go off by Paisley and round by Motherwell on the Caledonian line, which is a very roundabout route; but going by Kilmarnock to Glasgow, the distance is about 140 miles.

12015. What length of time have they been upon the journey when you have accompanied the cattle yourself?—Seldom less than 24 hours, sometimes more.

12016. Are they longer on the journey when you do not go along with them?—Generally they are.

12017. What is your last experience in that way from Ayrshire?—I have not had a lot this year from Ayrshire.

12018. When did you have them from Ayrshire?—It was in 1871 that I brought the last lot from Ayrshire to Forfarshire; but in August last year I sent a lot of heifers at calving from Kilmarnock to Cheshire. The journey occupied about 30 hours.

12019. Where did you get your last lot from?—From Cheshire; that was in November last.

12020. Did you accompany those animals?—No.

12021. What was the length of time they were upon the journey?—Forty-six hours.

12022. Those were two-year-old heifers in calf?—Yes, they were.

12023. Did they suffer much upon the journey?—I consider that they suffered a great deal.

12024. Did they show the effects of the suffering for some time after you had them?—They did very little good through the winter.

12025. Was that due to the journey?—I attributed it to that; they were put into a truck quite open, and as it was very coarse weather, I attribute the very little progress they made during the winter to that exposure.

12026. You think that having suffered such great hardship between Cheshire and Forfarshire, it was attributable to that that they improved very little during the winter?—Yes, that was so. They were very good conditioned animals when I bought them.

12027. Did they get any special disease?—No special disease; but the first lot I bought took foot-and-mouth disease.

12028. Did they get that in the trucks or before they left Cheshire?—I cannot say. It was some weeks after I had them before it broke out.

12029. You have devoted considerable attention to improving the present trucks for the transit of cattle, have you not?—Yes; in travelling along with my own cattle I have seen the evils of the present trucks, and I have thought of a remedy, and endeavoured to provide one.

12030. You do not think the present trucks at all suitable for the conveyance of cattle?—I think they are quite unsuitable, especially in the case of large cattle going a long distance, say a journey of over 100 miles.

12031. You think that an improvement in the mode of transit would, by economising the condition of the cattle, amply recompense any expenditure which would be necessary for the extra cost of conveyance under an improved system?—It is my decided opinion that it would.

12032. And that looking at the matter in a national point of view, as well as regards individuals, it would be an economy to improve the transit of animals by rail?—I have not the least doubt of it.

12033. *Chairman.* What you mean is, to have a better sort of cattle truck?—Yes, a more comfortable and safe conveyance for them.

12034. *Mr. Barclay.* You have, I believe, caused to be prepared two models of improved trucks which you submitted to the consideration of the Highland Society in Edinburgh?—Yes, I have.

12035. One

12035. One of those trucks is an adaptation of the existing trucks, is it not?—Yes.

12036. And the other is a truck of a new construction?—Yes, there is not much difference in the construction of the trucks.

12037. You have models of those two trucks here, have you not?—I have.

12038. Will you explain to the Committee the rearrangement of the pre-entailed trucks?—This is the present truck reconstructed (providing a model). On account of the trucks being too narrow to accommodate the cattle properly standing across the waggon, I have rearranged them to stand with their heads towards the ends of the waggon, and their tails turned to each other, and as the present trucks are only 15 feet in length, in order to give sufficient accommodation for large cattle, I have adopted a simple, as well as strong and economical plan of lengthening the truck; I have also raised a portion of the end of the truck for a hay-rack.

12039. That is at the upper part of the end frame of the waggon?—Yes.

12040. You put up at each end of the truck a rack containing hay, and a water-trough?—Yes, a water-trough below; and on account of the present trucks being very low, 6 ft. 3 in. to the top of the waggon, it was necessary to raise the end to give room for the hay-rack.

12041. You have put at each end of the model a box?—I have raised that sufficiently to give room for the hay-rack.

12042. What is the height of the waggon?—The height of the waggon is 6 ft. 3 in. from the floor to the top rail, and the raised portion for the hay-rack is about two feet higher, and three feet in length.

12043. The box contains the rack for the hay?—The box contains a rack for the hay, with a simple provision for putting it in on each side.

12044. Below the rack is the water-trough?—Below the rack is the water-trough.

12045. With a hole on each side for introducing the water?—Yes.

12046. Then as regards the inside of the truck, it is divided across the middle by a partition?—Yes, by a moveable partition.

12047. That partition swings upwards, does it not?—Yes, the divisions in one end of the waggon are fixed; the hanging partition in the centre is lifted up to allow the fixed end of the waggon to be filled, and then it is shut down and bolted, and the other end is fitted up with folding divisions.

12048. The waggon is divided into six divisions, three in each end. The two divisions in one of the ends are fixed, while the two divisions in the other end are moveable. When you are going to fill the waggon, you open one of the side doors, lift the swinging division, and introduce three animals into the end, where the fixed divisions are?—Yes, precisely.

12049. The hanging division is then lowered, and the cattle are introduced one after another into the end where the divisions are moveable, the divisions being fixed behind each animal after it is put in, and the latter divisions are upon hinges swinging laterally?—That is so.

12050. According to this arrangement, one of the existing trucks would carry six animals only instead of the present number which it may contain?—Of course it depends upon the size of the animals; in the case of full-grown animals from two to three years of age, fat animals especially, 658.

three in each end, six altogether, I consider would be quite sufficient to fill the waggon. In the case of store cattle, two years old and under, the truck might be divided into eight compartments, and still give them sufficient room.

12051. Some of the trucks you would convert into six-stalled trucks for large fat cattle, and the others you would convert into eight-stalled trucks for small cattle?—Quite so.

12052. Chairman.] What do the trucks carry now?—It depends upon the size of the animals.

12053. Taking fat cattle, what would be the number?—Taking fat animals, from two to three years old, in this, which is the medium waggon, eight cattle are put in; it usually depends upon the weight, from seven to eight bullocks, weighing from seven to eight cwt. each.

12054. This truck would carry six instead of eight fat animals?—Yes; but I may add that in the case of fat animals going from Aberdeen to London, usually six animals are put in, it being considered unsafe to allow the animals to put their heads out over the sides of the truck, as is usual on most of the Scotch lines; they require more room on that account, as they cannot stand fair across the truck, unless in a most unnatural position.

12055. Mr. Barclay.] What would be the cost of improving the trucks according to your model?—From 25 l. to 30 l. each.

12056. That is fitting the waggon up complete as shown according to your model?—Yes.

12057. You propose to cover up the truck as well as to make the other alterations?—To cover it entirely.

12058. You also enclose the sides, do you not?—I enclose the sides with the exception of leaving sufficient space for ventilation; there is a provision for opening all the space above the doors, and in addition to that there are two ventilators.

12059. Will you explain the new trucks to the Committee?—In the first place, I make the truck of sufficient length to allow of the largest animals standing with their heads to each other.

12060. What is the length of the new truck?—Seventeen and a half feet is the inside measurement.

12061. It is framed and arranged very similarly to the one you have already described, with this difference, that instead of there being boxes at the end, the whole truck is of the height of the boxes from end to end?—The truck is made a sufficient height, and it is not required to be raised for the hay-racks.

12062. That is to say, you make the truck from 18 inches to 2 feet higher than the present trucks?—Yes.

12063. In this new truck, the water-trough is placed in the middle of the truck, is it not?—The rack and water-trough are placed in the middle transversely instead of at the end.

12064. One water-trough serves for both ends of the truck as the animals stand looking towards each other?—It does.

12065. You have openings on the side of the waggon for the purpose of introducing hay, and a hole for introducing water into the trough on each side?—Yes.

12066. This truck is divided into six stalls the same as the other, is it not?—The stalls are a matter of arrangement; the trucks can be divided into four, six, or eight compartments.

12047. You

Mr. Miles.

3 July 1879.

Mr. Milne.

12067. You contemplate that that truck will be large enough for eight store animals?—It will accommodate comfortably eight average-sized store cattle.

12068. You would propose, I believe, to fit up so many trucks with six stalls, and so many with eight stalls?—I would.

12069. Is the additional cost of this improved waggon material as compared with the price of the present trucks?—It would be about a fifth more. The present waggons, I believe, cost from 180 £ to 160 £, at the existing rate of labour and material.

12070. And your truck proposed would cost how much?—The difference would not be so much in constructing a new waggon as the altering would; I should suppose 25 £ additional would cover the cost.

12071. A new waggon, you think, would cost from 180 £ to 170 £?—Yes, in proportion to the way in which it is finished and fitted up.

12072. The railway companies would have to make some additional charge in respect of this improved waggon, would they not?—Yes, if they would reap the same profit as they do now.

12073. What additional sum do you think you would be prepared to pay for your animals which you take from Cheshire to Forfarshire, or from Ayrshire to Forfarshire, if you had them carried in this improved truck which you suggest, as compared with the present means of transit?—I would be very willing to pay from a fifth to a fourth more.

12074. What do you pay from Cheshire to Forfarshire?—It depends upon the number of animals you put into a waggon; from 12 s. to 15 s. they have cost me hitherto per head.

12075. How much is that per truck?—Of course there are medium and large waggons; the charges have been twice raised of late.

12076. How much is a medium waggon now?—Eight pounds, I think, was the cost from Frodsham to my station, Cringe.

12077. The additional cost by your improved truck would be from 2 s. to 2 s. 6 d.?—From say 3 s. to 3 s. 6 d.

12078. You would have to pay, in order that the railway companies should have as much profit from this improved waggon as from the existing waggons, 3 s. to 4 s. extra upon your animals between Cheshire and Forfarshire?—That is so.

12079. And you would be very willing to pay that?—I would be very willing to pay that; it would have been much to my profit if I had been able to do so.

12080. What are the objections to the animals being carried along in the trucks loose as they are at present?—The paramount evil is that there is no provision for feeding and watering upon the journey, and no efficient plan of feeding and watering in the truck can be provided, unless the animals are separated.

12081. Do you think that the animals suffer considerably in consequence of the want of food and water?—Especially in consequence of the want of water in long journeys, varying from 30 to 46 hours; I have no doubt they also suffer from want of food.

12082. What other objection is there to the present mode of transit?—There is the danger to the animals from being trampled on when one lies down in the waggon, which is a very serious evil in my estimation.

12083. In the case of cows?—In the case of cows more especially so, as they are generally at or near calving when conveyed in trucks.

12084. Does the present mode of travelling frequently bring on premature calving?—I have no doubt that the knocking about which they receive in shunting and otherwise, has a tendency to induce premature labour. The state of fear and excitement also into which they are thrown by going each other I doubt not will produce the same effect.

12085. But you have not had cases of that, have you?—I have only had one case of calving in a waggon; but many cases of premature calving, brought on as I believed by the treatment received in the truck.

12086. Do the animals sometimes gore each other with their horns?—Very much so, especially in the case of Ayrshire cows. I have never conveyed a truck of Ayrshire cows without having them more or less gored.

12087. All those objections would be obviated with this improved truck, the model of which you have now submitted?—The evils I have referred to would certainly be obviated.

12088. You would have food and water for the animals?—You would have food and water for them.

12089. And you would not have them crowded or exposed to the weather?—You cannot crowd them.

12090. They cannot gore each other?—They could not touch each other, so that there is perfect safety provided.

12091. Have you any other suggestion to make with regard to these models?—There is another evil I would refer to, namely, that of cramping, which is a very serious evil; it is perpetrated in those trucks in which the animals are prevented from getting out their heads; when one of those trucks is filled, and the animal is made to stand across the waggon in a space of, say, one foot less than the length of it, it must necessarily get into an unnatural position, to retain it in which for any length of time is extreme cruelty.

12092. Do you consider that the trucks are well cleaned?—Very far from it; I have never seen a truck that I considered properly cleaned.

12093. Do you consider it practicable to cleanse the trucks properly every time after having had cattle in them?—There are circumstances under which it would be difficult thoroughly to cleanse them, such as large markets where cattle are conveyed away in the afternoon in the same trucks in which they were sent in the morning; it might be difficult to meet such a case as that, but it might be done by providing a special staff for those special occasions; upon ordinary occasions I see no difficulty in properly cleansing the trucks; it should be done when the cattle are taken out of the waggon and not when they are going to be put in.

12094. You think that provision should be made for cleansing the trucks immediately after they are unloaded, and not allow them to lie until they are wanted, and then cleanse them immediately before putting cattle into them?—That is my opinion.

12095. Mr. Jacob Bright. What did I understand your profession or your occupation to be?—I occupy or rent two small farms, embracing about 150 acres.

12096. Then you are a farmer?—I am.

12097. You are in favour of slaughtering animals?

animals which have been in contact with diseased animals, are you not?—Not in all cases; not in the case of foot-and-mouth disease, but certainly in the case of cattle plague and pleuro-pneumonia.

12098. You will be in favour of slaughtering the animals only in the case of those two diseases?—That is so; those are the only two diseases in existence at present in which I could recommend animals in contact with diseased animals to be slaughtered.

12099. When you say you would not only kill the diseased animal, but the animals in contact with the diseased animal, what do you mean by the word contact?—Having been with them in the same byre or the same field for a certain period, say a day, or even less.

12100. Even for a very short time?—Not being a veterinary surgeon, I could not attempt to say the precise time which it would require to infect them.

12101. However, you say that you would have animals which had been in contact with a diseased animal, slaughtered if they had been in contact for less than a day?—It is my own opinion that it would be the most efficient and cheapest way in the end of getting rid of those diseases.

12101*. Therefore, in case there had been a diseased animal in the market, would you have all the animals in the market slaughtered?—That certainly would not be necessary in carrying out my theory; it is not to be expected that a diseased animal would come in contact with every animal in the market and infect it.

12102. Nor in a field?—No; it would depend upon the length of time the animal had been in the field. Cattle, as a rule, do not stand in a market more than six or eight hours.

12103. Then there is some difficulty in explaining what is meant by the word "contact," is not that so?—I have no doubt there would be difficulties in carrying out such a scheme as I propose; but we need expect that there would be difficulties in adopting any new measure.

12104. But you yourself, although recommending that animals should be slaughtered which had been in contact with other animals, do not seem to understand exactly what you mean by that term?—I think I do understand what I mean.

12105. You do not know whether you would have animals slaughtered which had been in the same field or in the same market?—I would not have them slaughtered if they had been in the same market. I think that is very different from being in the same field.

12106. In what way is it different?—Because cattle in the same field have access, the one to the other; you do not make any attempt to keep them separate, but in market each lot is kept by itself as much as possible.

12107. In a market, therefore, you might have a certain lot slaughtered without interfering with the market generally?—I admit there is some difficulty as applied to markets; but I do not think it is impossible to carry it out.

12108. Do you think it would not be difficult to draw an Act of Parliament to meet the case?—I think it would not be difficult to draw up regulations applicable to the case.

12109. Are you sanguine that we shall ever get rid of foot and mouth disease and pleuro-pneumonia from the country?—Not by the machinery at present in operation; at least, not 0.58.

until we have, as I have stated, more uniformity and unanimity of action on the part of the local authorities.

12110. Do you think that means might be taken absolutely to get rid of both these diseases, foot and mouth disease and pleuro-pneumonia?—Yes, I do think so. In the case of foot-and-mouth disease there might be more difficulty, but I am not without hope that that disease might be eradicated. In the case of pleuro-pneumonia and cattle plague, by the universal adoption of the stamping-out process, I have no doubt in my own mind that we might get rid of those diseases in this country.

12111. Are you one of those who believe that it would be important to stop the importation of foreign cattle, in order to get rid of these diseases?—I am of opinion that, considering the very small percentage of our foreign supply, it would not be a very serious matter to derange the import trade for a time, if such an object were to be accomplished. I apprehend it would only be necessary for a time.

12112. What would occur when you admitted the cattle again?—Of course the regulations would still be in force in regard to thorough supervision and inspection.

12113. But you think that to exclude foreign cattle for a time might be of service in getting rid of those diseases?—If an attempt were made and it were resolved by the country to resort to the stamping-out process, it might be necessary during that time to stop foreign importations.

12114. What would happen when you admitted cattle again?—It is supposed that those regulations would remain in force upon the re-admission of foreign cattle into the country; if the stamping-out regulations were adopted, the disease could not spread.

12115. If it is of advantage to assist in getting rid of those diseases to suspend the importation of foreign cattle, would you also mean that the import of Irish cattle should be suspended with the same object?—I would have the same regulations enforced in Ireland as in Great Britain.

12116. But whilst you were trying to get rid of the disease here, would you not interfere with the Irish import as you would with the Russian and Dutch?—No, not if the same regulations were in force in Ireland as are in Great Britain.

12117. Then you think that those diseases might be really stamped out?—I think they might.

12118. Do you think that the farmers would submit to such regulations as would be required for stamping out pleuro-pneumonia and foot and mouth disease?—I think that the farmers would be willing to do so, at least so far as I have come in contact with the farmers of Scotland.

12119. With regard to carrying cattle by railway, is there no railway which has a satisfactory system of carrying cattle?—I am not aware that there is any satisfactory system in existence in this country at the present time.

12120. Is that owing to the ignorance or the carelessness of the railway people, or the farmers?—I am not aware that it is owing to the ignorance of either party; it is the object of course to convey cattle as cheaply as possible; it may be that a better system has not been

Mr. Milne. thought of, or has been difficult to devise, but I cannot speak to that.

3 July 1873.

12121. Supposing a leading railway company, for example, had two plans of carrying cattle; one, we will say, the present imperfect plan, and another what you consider the very much better plan which you propose as exhibited by that model, they would charge somewhat more for the better plan than for the worse, would they not?—Of course they would.

12122. Do you suppose that the majority of the farmers would adopt the better plan and pay a somewhat higher price?—I have not the least doubt the farmers would adopt it after a little experience of the benefit they would derive from it; that is my own conviction.

12123. Do not you think that at agricultural shows and at Agricultural Chambers, and so on, if those questions were discussed, they might be settled without coming to the House of Commons upon the subject?—I think that if any of the railway companies could be induced to build a few of these trucks, so that the public could have a trial of them, and really know from practical experience their benefit, they might come to be adopted without any compulsory measures being taken.

12124. It seems to you reasonable that these improvements should be voluntarily undertaken, seeing how the landowners and the farmers are interested in the matter, and the great stake which they have in the matter, and what a powerful case they are?—I think it very probable that self-interest would induce the adoption of the improved truck after a trial of it.

12125. [Chairman.] I think you stated, in answer to the honourable Member for Manchester, that the farmers of Scotland are in favour of this system of stamping out?—I may say the majority of them are with whom I have come in contact, and spoken to upon the subject.

12126. I suppose stamping out involves compensation?—I should say it would. I would not be in favour of the system of stamping out without compensation.

12127. What amount of compensation would you think it necessary should be given?—I think it would be necessary to give three-fourths of the value of the animal.

12128. Out of what funds should the amount of compensation come which should be paid?—I believe it must be out of the county rates.

12129. Do you think that the farmers in Scotland, generally, would be in favour of stamping out and introducing, of course as a necessary consequence, this system of compensation, and paying the compensation out of the county rates?—I think so, so far as I have considered the question.

12130. You suggested some very ingenious alterations in the cattle trucks; I think you stated that the cost of the alteration you suggested would be about 30*l.* for each truck?—Not more than 30*l.* for each; that is to say, at the present rate of wages and material.

12131. The improved truck would carry six cattle only, where the old truck carries eight?—Not in every case, because we find that in some cases at present only six cattle are conveyed in the same space in which I propose to convey six; that is to say, in the case of fat cattle going from Aberdeen to London.

12132. Upon the other hand, do you not often find that cattle trucks carry 14, or even a larger number of store cattle?—A truck which can accommodate eight heavy fat cattle, or say six three-year-olds, can accommodate, say, 12 two-year-old ordinary sized store cattle. I believe there are cases in which 14 may be put into that space, but that would be too many.

12133. I have got the numbers of trucks which there are upon seven of the principal railways, and they amount to 6,587, so that your plan would involve a very large expenditure indeed upon the railway trucks?—I do not propose to alter all the trucks to this plan; only a certain number would be required; it is only in cases where cattle have to be sent for a distance of say 50 miles and upwards, that an improved divided waggon would be required.

12134. You would like to see a first and second class waggon similar to a first and second class carriage for passengers?—For short distances the present waggon would do where the cattle are not required to be provided with food and water, and also with regard to young cattle under a year old; it would be too expensive to provide a separate stall for each, and they would not hurt each other so much as older cattle.

12135. These matters have been considered very much by the railway companies; there was a Committee suggested by the Lord President of the Council some years ago to inquire into these matters; how do you account for it that none of these improvements have been tried?—I know it is difficult to account for it; a new truck was patented by Mr. Reid, of Granton, near Edinburgh, but it was considered by the railway companies too expensive in its construction, and it was discarded upon that account, although I am informed it has been adopted on the Continent.

12136. Do you not think it seems clear that the railway companies think that these improved trucks would not pay?—I suppose they consider it would not pay to charge the same rate as at present for the improved waggon, and they suppose the public would not be willing to pay the increased rate.

12137. Mr. Barclay.] With regard to "contact," I suppose you would leave it to the local authority in each particular case to define what "contact" was?—There must be a certain amount of discretion left to the local authority; you cannot lay it down exactly.

12138. Is there any opportunity given now, in the way of farmers communicating with railway managers or railway directors?—I am not aware that there is, unless it is through the medium of the newspapers.

12139. Is there provision at any of the stations as you come up, between Ayrshire and Fife-shire, for giving water to cattle?—At Sigs-bell, in conveying the cattle through Glasgow, there is provision made for feeding and watering.

12140. And in coming by the other road, is there any provision made?—At Motherwell, also, I think there is provision for watering.

12141. What is the objection to taking the cattle out of the waggon?—Because there is such a loss of time, and if you are taking them by a through goods train, you must necessarily lose it.

12142. So that the watering places upon the road are impracticable for the use of animals passing

passing along?—I do not say that they are impossible; if you make up your mind to have your cattle detained, you can allow your feeding and watering to be done at the stations; but it is a serious matter to have the stock taken out and delayed; for instance, if you are having your cattle conveyed from Cheshire to Scotland by the through goods train, if they are untrucked at Carlisle they must lose the train and go on by an ordinary stopping train, or wait until the next day, there being only one through goods a day.

12143. Therefore, as regards cattle upon the road, the watering places are practically of no

value?—Almost of no value, inasmuch as I believe they are seldom taken advantage of.

12144. Those watering places are only of value and advantage to the animals while being loaded at the particular station at which there may be a watering place?—I do not say but what some people would take advantage of them; rather than not feed their animals they would detain them for a day perhaps.

12145. Do you know of any case in which they have been taken advantage of for the use of cattle upon the journey?—No case has come to my own knowledge of any one using those watering places.

Mr. WILLIAM STUART WALKER, called in; and Examined.

12146. Mr. Barclay.] You are a Landed Proprietor in the County of Mid-Lothian?—Yes.

12147. And Chairman of the Local Authority for that county?—Yes, I have been so since the first Act was passed in 1866.

12148. You have taken great interest in the subject of dealing with cattle diseases, have you not?—Yes, I have.

12149. You published an explanatory manual of the Act of 1866?—Yes, I did.

12150. You are not yourself farming any land in your own county?—No; I am not a practical farmer.

12151. You are also, I believe, a director, and have been for some time, of the Highland Society?—I have been; I am not at the present moment; I have twice served as a director; now I am the chairman of one of their standing committees.

12152. Had you a meeting of the local authorities of the county of Mid-Lothian, for the purpose of considering the present operation of the acts and orders in council, with a view to your giving evidence before this Committee?—Yes; when I was aware that I was to be examined before this Committee, although I believed that my views were fully in accordance with those of the other members of the local authority, I was desirous of coming here to state, not my own individual views, but those of the local authority of the county; therefore I summoned them, and intimated to them the suggestions which my experience upon the subject prepared me to make, and I found that, speaking generally, they entirely acquiesced in the views which I was prepared to state, as I expected they would do, as we have acted in accord since the beginning.

12153. Now with regard to the future mode of procedure, and dealing with cattle diseases, do you approve of having only one local authority in each county, that local authority to represent also the boroughs as well as the rural parts of the county?—Yes, I think that would be better than the present system; in the county of Mid-Lothian there is one county local authority, and four borough local authorities; one for the City of Edinburgh, one for the borough of Leith, one for the borough of Portobello, and one for the borough of Musselburgh, making five in all; I think a single local authority for the whole county embracing the boroughs would be much more likely to produce uniform and satisfactory action.

0.98.

12154. Do you think that there is any conflict of interest between the boroughs and the county?—No, there is really none. I think at one time there was an impression upon the part of the residents in the towns that there was a conflict of interest, but I do not think that impression now exists.

12155. You find that although there might be some slight feeling of jealousy between the city of Edinburgh and the county upon this subject of cattle diseases, the city of Edinburgh local authority is now coming more to adopt your views upon the subject of cattle diseases, and that you are acting now more in unison than you were at first?—I think so; they have now come to be of opinion that efforts made to eradicate disease are really beneficial to the inhabitants of the towns. The large towns, Edinburgh for instance, have a considerable interest in the weekly market, both for fat cattle and lambs, and their experience has taught them that when their market became a suspected place, it was not so much frequented as it had been.

12156. Have you one market for fat and one for store cattle?—The markets are held upon the same day, but at separate hours.

12157. The Edinburgh local authority found that when it was suspected that this market was an unsafe place to send cattle to, or to buy cattle from, the attendance at the market fell off?—Many of the farmers become averse either to buying stock there or to sending stock there on sale, because they would not like to bring them back if unsold.

12158. In case they did not happen to sell the stock in the market, they were afraid to bring them back?—They were afraid to bring them back, and they sold them for what they could get. With regard to there being only one local authority for a county in which there are large towns, such as Leith and Edinburgh, it would be necessary, I think, that the borough proportion in the constitution of the local authority should not be preponderating. In many other matters, the population and valuation might entitle them to a preponderance, but in this matter, which refers to farm stock, the proportion should rather be determined with regard to the amount of stock in the two portions of the county, than regard either to the population or the valuation.

12159. Would you approve of some general provision such as this; that one-third of the local authority should be elected by proprietors, one-

3 q 2

Mr. Milne.

3 July 1873.

Mr. Walker.

Mr. Walker. third by the farmers, and one-third by the boroughs?—Yes, that I think would be quite fair. I would not wish to commit myself without further consideration to a precise scheme, but something of that kind I think would do.

3 July 1873. 12160. You think that some general regulation or provision, such as I have indicated, and being made applicable, generally, throughout all Scotland, would represent all the interests involved in this local authority question?—I think so.

12161. Are you in favour of leaving much discretionary power with the local authority with reference to issuing regulations?—No, I am not.

12162. Are you in favour of simply making the rules and regulations imperative throughout, under Act of Parliament?—Yes, and I think that all the regulations framed by a local authority should be submitted to the Privy Council for approval before they came into force, and that the Privy Council should have power to alter them if they thought fit.

12163. You would be in favour of restricting the power of the local authority as regards making regulations, as much as possible, and to make it imperative that such regulations as they did issue, should be approved of by the Privy Council?—Yes; I made that suggestion for the purpose of having a central authority, which should take care that the regulations made by the local authorities of different places, should not be so different as to defeat the object which they had in view.

12164. You are strongly of opinion that uniformity of action in the different places, is the best means of dealing with the disease?—I am.

12165. And that as far as possible, the regulations ought to be uniform, and made imperative by the Privy Council?—I think so.

12166. Then in case it was found that any of the local authorities were not discharging their duty, and carrying out the Act efficiently, what check would you propose that there should be upon such local authority?—I would suggest that the Privy Council should appoint Government inspectors, who should move about the country, I do not mean for the purpose of paying very frequent visits, but occasional visits, to make inquiry, and to report to the Privy Council in any cases where they find either that the local authority or the local inspectors are not enforcing the law.

12167. In order to see that the Act was carried out throughout the whole country with uniformity and efficiency, you would propose that Government should appoint certain inspectors to visit counties to see that such was the case, and in the event of any county neglecting to do its duty in respect of carrying out the provisions of the Act, you would give power to the Government inspector to put the Act in force at his own instance?—I would.

12168. *Chairman.* Should that be at the cost of the county?—Yes, at the cost of the county, but I do not think that such a step would often be necessary; I think that a communication from the Privy Council to the local authority upon the inspector's report would in most cases produce the desired result.

12169. Do you think that in Scotland a communication from the Privy Council to the local

authority upon a report from the inspector would be sufficient?—It would in most cases be sufficient.

12170. *Mr. Boreley.* Do you think that the penalties under the existing Act are very rigidly enforced?—So far as I have been able to ascertain, the penalties in some cases are scarcely enforced, and I think that indicates a defect in the Act; a maximum penalty is stated, but not a minimum.

12171. You would have a minimum penalty stated against the infraction of any of the provisions in the Act?—Yes; I would, to some extent, limit the discretion of the justices.

12172. *Chairman.* What is the tribunal before which these cases are brought?—Generally, before the magistrates in the towns, and the justices of the peace in the country.

12173. *Mr. Boreley.* Does the sheriff hear these cases?—I think the sheriff generally hears them as justice of the peace, but he may also do so at times.

12174. Is not the prosecutor which the local authority employ, the procurator-fiscal for the justices of the peace, and he brings the case before the justices?—Yes.

12175. The procurator-fiscal for the borough of Edinburgh, or the county of Mid-Lothian, does not prosecute these contraventions of the Cattle Disease Act, does he?—As regards the City of Edinburgh, I do not know, but in the county the justice of the peace fiscal prosecutes.

12176. As regards the importation of cattle from abroad, do you think that any store cattle ought to be imported from abroad?—I think that store cattle ought not to be allowed to leave the port where they are disembarked until they have undergone quarantine.

12177. Then you would be in favour of quarantine for store animals?—I would.

12178. For how long?—For 7 or 10 days.

12179. You do not consider Ireland a foreign country, I apprehend?—Certainly not.

12180. Then as regards fat animals, what would you say?—With regard to fat animals, they should all be slaughtered at the port of debarkation, or taken by railway or covered carriage to a slaughterhouse.

12181. Would you allow fat animals to be taken from Leith to Glasgow?—Yes, by rail to the slaughterhouse. A fat animal is at present landed at Leith, and he is sometimes walked along the line of streets the whole way from Leith to the market-place of Edinburgh, about 2½ or 3 miles; it is a market-place for fat cattle, and at a different period of the day for store cattle, but the animal is not slaughtered there. I think they should all be taken to the slaughtering place by rail, or in a covered conveyance.

12182. You object to foreign fat cattle being exposed in a market along with home cattle, fat and store?—I do.

12183. You would not object to fat cattle being taken by rail from Leith to Glasgow, provided they went direct into the truck from the side of the vessel, and were taken into the Glasgow slaughterhouse and slaughtered there?—Provided the railway had a line of rails into the slaughtering place, or had a slaughtering place upon their own premises, so that they should not be conveyed on foot through the streets.

12184. *Chairman.* The Order in Council with regard

regard to Edinburgh is, that "foreign cattle may be removed out of the said landing-place to the public slaughterhouse at Edinburgh for the purpose of being there slaughtered, and for no other purpose, by the following route, namely, along the Caledonian Railway, by the shortest route of that railway, from Granton to the Lothian-road Station of the Caledonian Railway in Edinburgh; thence, by the shortest way, from the southern end of the buildings of the said station, through property of the Caledonian Railway Company, across Castle Barns, and along Sempole-street, part of Fountain-bridge, and part of Portman-street, to the Edinburgh public slaughterhouse; and they shall be brought along the said railway, without stopping, in trucks appropriated for foreign cattle, and having a red stripe two feet wide all round to distinguish them as so appropriated, which trucks shall after each occasion of use, be cleansed and disinfected in manner provided by Article 21 of the Contagious Diseases (Animals) Order of August 1869." This is the regulation you advocate, is it not: "Cattle being at any time within that part of the City of Edinburgh which forms the route between the Lothian-road station of the Caledonian Railway and the Edinburgh public slaughterhouse, as before described in this order, shall not be removed therefrom alive, except into the Edinburgh public slaughterhouse, and cattle being at any time within that slaughterhouse shall not be removed therefrom alive?"—But there is an interval between the Caledonian Railway station and the slaughterhouse during which they are passing on foot through the streets.

12185. *Mr. Barclay.*] But they do not walk from Leith up to the market, as I understand you to say?—There was, and there is still, I think, a line defined by the Privy Council, by which they can pass on foot up Leith-walk; the whole way from Leith to Edinburgh.

12186. Do you wish to have inspection of market places, fairs, and stall yards?—Yes; I think that all market places, and stock fairs, and public sale yards, should be under Government inspection, and that the Government inspectors should have power to regulate the arrangements with regard to the proper washing and disinfection of a market or sale place after each market or sale. One arrangement which I should very much desire to see made is, that a proper flooring should be put down in all these places; the flooring is generally very rough, being composed of stones placed together with intervals between them, and it is utterly impossible to disinfect or thoroughly cleanse those places; an asphalt floor, which could be washed and thoroughly disinfected, would be an immense advantage in preventing healthy animals coming into one of those places from contracting disease, in consequence of diseased animals having been there upon a previous occasion.

12187. What would you say with reference to large market places, such as Hallow Fair?—Those are quite different, but with regard to the country fairs, such as Hallow Fair and Falkirk Tryst, I think the Government inspector should see that the arrangements were properly made; for instance, he should see that the fat stock and the lean stock should be put into separate flocks.

12188. *Chairman.*] You mean by the Government inspector, an inspector appointed by the Privy Council?—Yes.

12189. *Mr. Barclay.*] Would you have the inspector appointed specially for the purpose?—Yes; but I mean that the Government inspector should not act over the local inspector, not in lieu of him.

12190. Why should not the local inspector see to the cleansing of the fairs and markets within his district?—He has not got sufficient authority, and looking at the condition in which the markets are, I do not think he has got sufficient power to regulate them.

12191. Assuming that he had sufficient powers under the Act, could he see to the regulation of the markets?—Yes, if he had sufficient power under the Act; but I think the authority of a Government inspector would be yielded to more readily.

12192. Would you have a Government inspector visit all these fairs and markets?—No, he would visit the market places from time to time in order to check abuse and laxity.

12193. *Chairman.*] And that the Government inspector should see that the local inspector discharged his duty in this particular?—Yes.

12194. *Mr. Barclay.*] Then the duty would lie, in the first place, upon the local inspector?—Yes, clearly.

12195. Do you propose to have separate markets for fat stock, and store stock, and milch cows?—It might very probably be difficult to have separate markets, but I think there should be a separation in the market places; that the stock should not be mixed; that there should be separate portions of the market place set apart for each class of stock.

12196. How do you propose to distinguish fat stock from store cattle?—I suppose it is very easily seen whether an animal is at all fit for food or not; there may be a difficulty, which I do not apprehend, in some cases.

12197. I suppose you have seen animals which were to be killed in different degrees of fatness?—Yes.

12198. And possibly one man may buy an animal to fatten it up to prime condition, and another man might buy to kill immediately?—Yes, but those would be exceptional cases; the great bulk of the stock would be divided into two distinct classes.

12199. What provision would you make to see that the animals exposed in the fat cattle market were slaughtered?—I do not think I propose that.

12200. What would you propose should be the regulation as regards fat cattle markets?—Merely that they should be kept properly cleansed and disinfected after each market day; of course any person bringing diseased cattle into the market should be prosecuted.

12201. What is your object in discriminating between fat cattle, and store cattle, and milch cows, so as to have separate markets for each of them?—I am not a veterinarian, but I believe that up to a certain point an animal may be fit for the butcher, and yet may be a very dangerous animal to put your store cattle along with.

12202. What regulations would you impose upon the animals frequenting different markets, or what is the object of keeping them separate?—From my belief that cattle which are perfectly fit for food are capable of communicating the disease of pleuro-pneumonia to healthy animals.

Mr. Walker. Among fat stock of course the infection is of no importance; they are all to be killed immediately, or we assume that they are; the bulk of them are certainly, but as regards the other class, the store animals, none are to be killed immediately, they are to be taken away and scattered all over the country.

12203. I suppose milch cows and store stock are pretty frequently attacked with pleuro-pneumonia?—Yes, no doubt they are.

12204. You propose that they should be exhibited in the store market, and be allowed to be taken out into the country again?—They can be only there illegally, if they have pleuro-pneumonia upon them, or come from an infected place.

12205. It is also illegal to expose an animal affected with pleuro-pneumonia in a fat cattle market, is it not?—He may be removed for slaughter at present.

12206. Not to a market?—No, I think not.

12207. As regards the regulations applicable to foot-and-mouth disease, what do you propose?—All the tenant farmers who are members of the local authority of the county of Edinburgh are unanimous both with regard to foot-and-mouth disease, and pleuro-pneumonia, and scab in sheep also, that the great object is to prevent the movement of animals which are infected; and, therefore, what I would suggest is that the regulations with regard to those diseases should be restricted, first, to immediate notice to the police; (of course I intend that a breach of those regulations should be visited by heavy penalties); second, the absolute irremovability of animals infected, or which are upon the same premises with animals which are infected during the existence of the disease, and for a stated number of days afterwards. Of course I would have a different number of days in the case of pleuro-pneumonia from the case of foot-and-mouth disease.

12208. How long would you have in the case of pleuro-pneumonia?—I cannot undertake to answer that question; it is entirely a veterinary question. Professor Williams, of Edinburgh, who is our principal inspector, thought that a quarantine of seven days in the case of foot-and-mouth disease was sufficient, but I do not know what his opinion is with regard to pleuro-pneumonia.

12209. I thought you stated that the tenant-farmers of Edinburgh were of one opinion as regards the provisions for pleuro-pneumonia, and I hoped they would have stated their views as to the time the isolation should last?—I think you will find among them a variety of opinions; some going the length of three months, and others shorter periods. Then with regard to the irremovability of stock in infected places, I would suggest this. I do not propose that they should not be moved from one part of the premises to another upon the same man's occupation, but that the following restrictions should be put upon that internal movement, viz., that no animal should be moved, even upon the same premises, to any field or shed contiguous to a public road, or contiguous to premises in a different occupation.

12210. Have you anything further to suggest to the Committee?—Not upon that point; another suggestion which has been made with reference to which there is a difference of opinion, is that the names of all places in which either foot-and-mouth disease, or pleuro-

pneumonia, or sheep scab, exists, should be published in the local papers. There is a difference of opinion with reference to whether that is advisable or not. Individually, I think it would be advisable. The county of Berwick, and the county of Roxburgh, have done so for two or three years, I think. The local authority of the county of Mid-Lothian considered the matter, but we are doubtful as to the propriety of it; if it were made statutory, there would be no difficulty.

12211. Are you in favour of slaughtering animals affected with pleuro-pneumonia, and giving compensation, and having that carried out as a general principle all over the country?—I cannot say that I am, because I do not see that it could be carried far enough to make it certain to be of much value.

12212. What do you mean by "far enough"?—You first of all slaughter the animal which is diseased, you next slaughter the animals in the same shed with it.

12213. I was speaking first of slaughtering the animal affected with disease?—I do not think that would be any use unless you go further.

12214. You do not think that that would be of use, unless you are going to slaughter all the animals upon the same farm?—I am afraid not.

12215. If we have had evidence before us that pleuro-pneumonia has been stopped with the slaughter of less than ten per cent. of the animals upon a farm, would that modify your opinion upon that subject?—It would depend upon the nature of the evidence.

12216. The evidence is to this effect, that by the slaughter of ten per cent. of the total number of animals upon a farm where disease has appeared, it has been sufficient to stop the progress of the disease; would that evidence, assuming that it is a fact, modify your opinion?—It would show that in some cases it had that effect, but I do not think it would prove that it would be certain to have the same effect in all cases.

12217. The question I asked was, whether that evidence would have the effect of modifying your opinion as to the advisability of slaughtering out all animals in the case of pleuro-pneumonia?—I do not think it would convince me.

12218. Would you state your objection to the slaughtering of all animals which were affected with pleuro-pneumonia?—My objection is that, if you slaughter the animals affected alone, I do not believe it is certain to produce a beneficial result, and that to extend it to the necessary limits is impracticable.

12219. How is it impracticable?—Because there would be such a large number of animals destroyed.

12220. It would not be difficult to destroy the animals, but how would it be impracticable?—It would practically be so.

12221. Is that because it would involve such a heavy rate upon the county?—Yes; and the waste of stock in the case of live animals which are not ready for the butcher.

12222. Do you object to this system of slaughtering out the disease, upon the ground of the rate which would fall upon the county?—The rate no doubt would be heavy, but I would object to it not upon that ground solely, but because I believe people would never submit to it, and therefore it would be impracticable.

12223. I

12223. I was asking you for your own opinion, whether you object to the slaughtering out process of animals affected with the pleuro-pneumonia on account of the rates which would be involved?—Until I knew what the amount of rate would be, I should find it difficult to answer that question.

12224. I suppose you have formed no idea of what rate you would be willing to pay for getting the pleuro-pneumonia animals slaughtered out?—No.

12225. You object further to the slaughtering out process because you think the slaughtering out would not be attended with beneficial results?

—When you say I object, I scarcely put it in the shape of an objection, but my opinion is that if the movement of animals (diseased and under suspicion of disease) is entirely stopped it would be unnecessary, as the same result would thereby be obtained.

12226. I understand you think that slaughtering is an extreme measure which is unnecessary, because the same result could be obtained by stopping all movement of cattle from infected places?—Yes; if it could be done perfectly I believe it would be quite effectual.

12227. Do you think it can be carried out practically?—Yes, I think it can.

12228. What machinery do you depend upon for carrying out the stoppage of the movement of cattle?—My opinion is drawn from my experience at the time of the rinderpest; here, by the infliction of heavy penalties, entire success was obtained in the county of Mid-Lothian, and certainly in Aberdeenshire also.

12229. Do you think that the mode of dealing with the cattle plague was successful in Aberdeenshire, on account of the heavy penalties inflicted for moving cattle?—To a great extent the law was sufficient for the purpose.

12230. Do you know the circumstances of Aberdeenshire?—I am aware they stamped it out there.

12231. Do you think it was due to the heavy penalties which were inflicted upon the moving of cattle, that they stamped out the cattle plague there?—I should think it partly was; certainly it was so in Mid-Lothian.

12232. I understand you think that the stoppage of the movement of cattle from infected places, may be made effective by the infliction of heavy penalties?—I think so.

12233. I suppose you would have first to discover the disease upon a farm before you could put this machinery into motion?—Yes, you would.

12234. You tell me that you are chairman of the local authority of Edinburgh, and I presume that you have had some experience in knowing how disease is dealt with in consequence; in your opinion is pleuro-pneumonia easily discovered, have your inspectors any difficulty in discovering pleuro-pneumonia?—I believe there is none after the disease is developed, but some of its symptoms may be dormant for some time, without its being possible for anybody to discover it.

12235. That is to say, if an inspector is sent to discover a case of pleuro-pneumonia after a certain stage, he can readily determine it?—Yes, he can.

12236. Would you consequently propose a general system of inspection all over the county?—No.

constantly, for the purpose of discovering pleuro-pneumonia?—No.

12237. You would impose heavy penalties for not giving notice of the existence of the disease?—Yes.

12238. Have heavy penalties been inflicted in Edinburgh for not reporting pleuro-pneumonia?—I believe there have been heavy penalties inflicted.

12239. Do you know that?—I have not attended to it lately, but I sat as chairman of the Justice of the Peace Court all the time of the rinderpest. I have not had to do with that lately.

12240. I was speaking of pleuro-pneumonia, and I thought, as chairman of the local authority, you might have been able to tell the Committee whether penalties had been inflicted for not reporting pleuro-pneumonia in Edinburgh?—I think there have been very few cases lately, but the local authority are not prosecutors in those cases.

12241. But I thought that you, as chairman of the local authority, might know about the state of disease in Edinburgh, and be able to tell us whether penalties have been inflicted for not reporting pleuro-pneumonia?—I could get information from the clerk of the peace.

12242. You expect, as I understand, that the heavy penalties would induce farmers to report any cases upon their farms which they suspected to be pleuro-pneumonia?—They do, in point of fact, do it with considerable regularity at the present moment in Mid-Lothian.

12243. Have you much pleuro-pneumonia in Mid-Lothian at present?—Within the last two months a good deal has broken out in several places.

12244. Do you think that the farmers all report promptly the existence of pleuro-pneumonia to the local authority?—As a rule they do; the persons who do not report are generally the small dairymen in the towns, and there the discretion of the magistrates is exercised to a large extent, that is to say the offenders are dealt with too leniently. I saw a case of a dairyman in Edinburgh reported in a newspaper lately, who was discovered to have two cows ill with pleuro-pneumonia which he had not reported, and the magistrates fined him one guinea.

12245. You think that the justices of the county would not act with the same leniency if such a case occurred in the county?—I do not think they would.

12246. How do you know that all the cases of pleuro-pneumonia are reported in Mid-Lothian?—The police are instructed to obtain information on the subject all over the county, and if in conversation they hear of any animals being ill, they make inquiry, if the case has not been reported.

12247. Assuming that a farmer suspecting his animals to be affected with pleuro-pneumonia, sent them to the fat cattle market, or even to the store cattle market in Edinburgh, and sold them off, and assuming that there really was pleuro-pneumonia amongst them, would you have any chance of hearing of such a case?—It is possible that cases may occur which are not heard of.

12248. I think you told the Committee that in the earlier stages of the disease, pleuro-pneumonia was not easily discovered?—I believe not.

Mr. Walker.

3 July 1873

12249. In those earlier stages of the disease, is there anything to prevent a farmer sending his cattle to market, if he suspected that it was pleuro-pneumonia with which his cattle were affected?—He would not act very honestly if he did. If he has no reason to know that his animal has pleuro-pneumonia, he is entitled to send it to market, but if he has reason to know that his animal has pleuro-pneumonia, he ought not to send it according to the present law.

12250. I hope there is very little difference of opinion upon that subject, but in fact is there anything to prevent a dishonest farmer from doing so if he were placed in those circumstances?—No, I suppose not.

12251. Would it be better for the farmer in a pecuniary point of view to sell off his cattle even at a somewhat less price or to report to you, and have his place put under restrictions?—From a short-sighted view it would be of course his interest to sell off at once.

12252. That would put the most money into his pocket in the meantime at least?—It would.

12253. In speaking of the regulations affecting England and Scotland, you understand that the same regulations would be applied to Ireland?—I understand so.

12254. Do you import Irish cattle largely into the county of Mid-Lothian?—A large number come from Glasgow.

12255. Have you any suggestions to make to the Committee with reference to the import of those Irish cattle?—Not further than this, that I think the local authority of the county of Mid-Lothian would be quite satisfied if the laws in Ireland were identical with those in Great Britain, and were properly enforced, and the traffic by steamers regulated. Their feeling I think is, that they must deal with Ireland as a part of the United Kingdom, and that the same measures which are thought necessary in the one part of it to eradicate disease, should be taken in the other.

12256. Would you think inspection at the port of shipment in Ireland of advantage?—Of course it would be an advantage in certain cases, in cases of developed disease for example, but if animals with developed disease in Ireland could not be moved, (and they could not under a sufficient law, if the police did their duty), they could not get to the port.

12257. *Chairman.* Inspection could not touch undeveloped pleuro-pneumonia, although it might touch foot-and-mouth disease in some cases?—That is so.

12258. Mr. Barclay.] Have you any further suggestions to make to the Committee with regard to the transit of cattle from Ireland?—No; I am not practically acquainted with the trade, so that I can give no suggestion with regard to it. I believe it is known to require a good deal of improvement.

12259. The Highland Society has paid a good deal of attention to the transit of animals by railway in this country, I believe?—They have.

12260. They have submitted certain resolutions to the Privy Council upon the subject from time to time, have they not?—They have.

12261. *Chairman.* What suggestions have there been made to the Privy Council by the Highland Society, with regard to transit of

animals by railway?—I cannot speak with reference to that matter.

12262. Is there any suggestion which strikes you as important?—No; I have not paid attention to that part of the subject.

12263. Mr. Cloy.] Do I understand that you would recommend the amalgamation of the local authorities of counties and towns?—I do.

12264. You consider that of considerable importance, do you not?—I think so, judging from my own experience, where in the county of Mid-Lothian, with a population of about 328,000, there were five local authorities.

12265. That is to say, one for the county and four for the boroughs?—Quite so.

12266. Of course both bodies have a strong interest in the extinction or prevention of disease, but with reference to details, does not it strike you that the counties and the towns have frequently very opposing and different interests?—Not opposing interests. I think their interests are identical; they may have opposing views with reference to what they should do.

12267. Their ideas are opposed as to what their interests are?—That may be so.

12268. Therefore, does not it appear to you, that if both bodies were amalgamated upon the same committee, they would not unfrequently come to loggerheads in consequence of those opposing views?—No, I think not. Last autumn, in consequence of the state of matters in the county of Mid-Lothian, the county desired a conference with the Town Council of the city of Edinburgh and Town Council of the borough of Leith. They met us, and we entirely agreed as to our course of action after the conference. I can put in, if it is desired, the report of the joint committee upon the subject; if had reference to foreign animals, chiefly.

12269. That related chiefly to the introduction of foreign animals into this country, did it not?—To the Edinburgh market.

12270. Did any of those local authorities represent the port?—Yes, the port of Leith; there are only two ports in the county at which foreign stock are landed: Leith and Granton; and Leith has much the largest share.

12271. Can you tell me what resolution this joint committee came to?—This is the report of the joint committee of conference of the local authorities of the county, the city of Edinburgh, and the borough of Leith. "The joint committee recommend to the several local authorities that they should all adopt the regulations of the county local authorities as to foot-and-mouth disease, dated 1st November last, combined with notices similar to those issued by the Glasgow local authority on 7th August current against the removal of infected animals without a license, and against such animals entering the market." The Glasgow regulations had reference to the town portions of the county. "The joint committee further recommend each of the three local authorities to request the Privy Council to prohibit the removal of animals affected with contagious disease for slaughter along the road, except in a suitable conveyance, and to prohibit the movement for slaughter of animals herded with other animals so affected, except with a license, or in such conveyance, or to grant power to local authorities to issue regulations to the above or similar effect. The joint committee further recommend each of the three local authorities to request the Privy Council

Council to issue an order to the effect that all foreign fat cattle should either be slaughtered at the port of debarkation, or be conveyed to a slaughter-house by railway or suitable conveyance for slaughter, and that all foreign store cattle, on their arrival, should be subjected to a quarantine for a period of not less than seven days, to be during that period thoroughly cleaned and disinfected by such mode as the local authority shall direct, to be kept separate from other animals landed either before or during the said period, and not to be moved from quarantine without a certificate by an inspector that they are free from disease. The Joint Committee further recommend to each of the three local authorities to require certificates of the immediate slaughter of all animals removed for that purpose, which either are affected with disease or have been berded with animals so affected. The Joint Committee lastly recommend, with reference to the proposed arrangements for Edinburgh, Leith, and Mid-Lothian, that each of the three local authorities should appoint Professor Williams as their consulting inspector." This report was acted upon by each of those three local authorities.

12272. Those three local authorities, to whom this recommendation was given, under your scheme, would probably have been the general local authority for the county and towns as well?—Yes.

12273. Having some experience in this matter, do not you think that there would be the inconvenience of difference of opinion in such a body?—I think not.

12274. All parts of the country are not quite so calm and so wise as the Scotch are: how would you propose to elect this body?—At present the county local authority consists, in Mid-Lothian, of eight proprietors, chosen by a body which is called the Commissioners of Supply—they are all proprietors of 100 l. a year and upwards—eight tenant farmers, chosen by the tenant farmers, and three *ex officio* members; the numbers vary in different counties according to their size, but those are the numbers for the county of Mid-Lothian. The three *ex officio* members are the lord-lieutenant of the county, the convener of the county, and the sheriff of the county. In boroughs the magistrates and town council, I should imagine, would be the persons to elect the members of the local authority to represent the burgh.

12275. What was about the number of the constituent body of these county local authorities?—I cannot give you the numbers.

12276. What were the constituency who elected the proprietors—the Commissioners of Supply?—They were proprietors of 100 l. a year and upwards. I do not recollect the exact number, but probably about 130.

12277. Of course, in some counties a constituency formed upon that basis would be a very numerous one?—I do not propose that as the precise manner in which the thing should be done; there would be no difficulty in Scotland about it.

12278. Mr. Barclay.] Has there been any difficulty in electing the tenant-representatives or those of the Commissioners of Supply under the present act?—Not that I am aware of. With regard to the proposal that there should be one local authority for the counties and boroughs combined, 058.

I would mention that we have an illustration of that already in Scotland. The County Prison Board is so elected, partly by the boroughs and partly by the counties. In that case the preponderance is given properly enough perhaps to the boroughs from their greater population and greater valuation; but in this matter, I do not think that that would be the right course, because this, is a county matter more than a town one.

12279. Chairman.] With regard to the question of the Privy Council Regulations, relating to Edinburgh and Leith, is it not the fact that all animals from scheduled countries on being landed, must be taken direct to the slaughter-house without crossing over any street or road?—Yes.

12280. Mr. Barclay.] Are you aware of the difference in the Privy Council Regulations as regards cattle from scheduled and from unscheduled countries?—I am.

12281. The cattle from unscheduled countries may be taken into the country, and into any of the markets?—That is so.

12282. And it is probable that these were the cattle you referred to when you gave the Committee to understand that the cattle were walked up from Leith to Edinburgh?—That may be so, but we think they are full of danger nevertheless.

12283. Chairman.] Take the case of Portugal or Spain, why do you think there is any danger in animals coming from Portugal or Spain, assuming that no disease exists in either of those countries?—There is a strong impression that these cattle do not always come here quite healthy, and the inspectors say it is utterly impossible, within the time they have allotted to them now, to ascertain with certainty that the animals are free from disease.

12284. But that would apply as much to cattle coming from one country as from another?—Yes; but we cannot help that.

12285. As I understand it, those whom you represent are entirely opposed to relaxing the present restrictions with regard to foot-and-mouth disease?—Yes, quite so.

12286. And what you desire is that there should be severe penalties for exposing diseased animals in fairs or markets, and for not reporting the existence of disease at once to the police by the farmers?—Yes.

12287. Now when you talk about severe penalties are you dissatisfied with the present penalties, or are you only dissatisfied with the way in which the law is put into force as regards them?—I am merely dissatisfied with the absence of a minimum fine. I intended to make one other suggestion which I intended to have made, and that is, that there should be an alternative of imprisonment failing payment. Under the statute there is no power of imprisonment if a man cannot or will not pay the fine. I think that there should be a power given to the justices to impose imprisonment if the person convicted fails to pay the fine.

12288. Your suggestions which are very valuable and important ones, are simply these, that there should be some means or other taken for severe penalties being imposed upon those persons who transgress the law in exposing cattle, either in markets or in fairs; and upon those who

Mr. Walker.

3 July 1873.

Mr. Walker. who do not report the existence of disease to the police?—And after the existence of the disease is ascertained, that the animals should be absolutely immovable for a certain period.

3 July 1875. 12289. Do you think the farmers would in a time, when there is no very great alarm about disease, when it is not very prevalent, be quite satisfied to submit to those very severe penalties?—The tenant-farmers with whom I have to deal are most anxious that that should be done.

Mr. DAVID SMITH, called in; and Examined.

Mr. Smith. 12292. Mr. Barclay.] You are a cattle dealer in Forfarshire, I believe?—I am.

12293. You are also a farmer occupying land in Forfarshire?—I am.

12294. How much land do you and your brother farm?—Rather over 700 acres.

12295. You have been a cattle dealer for about 30 years, have you not?—I think for about 30 years.

12296. How many store cattle do you bring into Forfarshire during the year?—We buy in Forfarshire and Perthshire as well as bring them in, but we have bought rather over 3,000 a year for a number of years.

12297. Where have you got those store cattle from which you brought into the counties of Perthshire and Forfarshire?—Before the rinderpest, we got about a thousand a year from Schleswig Holstein and Hanover, but since that time from England and some from Ireland, wherever we could buy them cheapest.

12298. Were you dealing in foreign and store cattle from 1858, until you were stopped by the cattle plague?—Yes, I was.

12299. You imported about from 1,500 to 2,000 animals annually?—Yes.

12300. From 1858 to 1864, where did you get those store animals that you imported into Perthshire and Forfarshire?—The greater part were from Schleswig Holstein and Hanover, but some from Holland.

12301. Where were they shipped?—Mostly at Hamburg and Cuxhaven.

12302. Those are ports upon the Elbe?—Yes; and they come to Dundee.

12303. In 1864, did you import any Dutch beasts?—Yes, I had 500 or 600; I am not exactly sure as to the number.

12304. Again in 1871, did you import some Dutch stores?—Yes, about 200.

12305. What was the character of the Hanoverian and Schleswig Holstein cattle?—They were very healthy, and they paid better for meat consuming than any cattle that we have, I think.

12306. The cattle fattened well, were free from disease, and paid the farmers well?—I believe that is so.

12307. What was the character of the Dutch cattle?—It was not very satisfactory.

12308. You do not approve of the Dutch cattle in point of quality?—I kept some myself, but they did not do very well, and the farmers to whom I sold them complained. I was going to take some more, but I found that it was my interest to stop them; so I stopped them, and did not let them come.

12290. That you state as the general opinion of the county of Mid-Lothian?—Yes, the most respectable farmers of the county see great benefit in the restrictions; they think they would do good.

12291. They entirely differ with the view which has been expressed before this Committee, that it would be expedient to relax the penalties and the restrictions, with regard to face-and-mech disease?—Quite so.

12309. Was there disease amongst those animals?—There was disease amongst them after they came, but they did not any of them thrive well.

12310. Was it pleuro-pneumonia that they had?—Yes; but they did not thrive well.

12311. The diseases you were best able to detect were pleuro-pneumonia and liver disease?—Yes; they were just delicate, bad thivers.

12312. You do not think they were the kind of cattle to be imported into the country, so far as the farmers were interested in them?—I do not think so; some of them were very lean, and some of them came through London.

12313. When you used to get the Hanoverian and Schleswig Holstein cattle, did you find them of good quality as stores for feeding, and free from disease?—They were very healthy beasts.

12314. Do you know what is the price of those beasts just now in Schleswig Holstein and Hanover?—I cannot say exactly, but Mr. Abbie, our correspondent in Hamburg, wrote me that he could send them just now; that they would suit my purpose, and that they were far cheaper than our own.

12315. You think you could import those animals then with advantage?—I could send out a thousand of those animals if they were coming in; there would be no price stated; the people would have confidence in them.

12316. A good many of the farmers employ you to buy cattle for them leaving it entirely to your discretion?—They do not do that; we sell a number of cattle that way, but a number of cattle which we sell in as lean, we buy back again as fat.

12317. You sell cattle to farmers as store and buy them back again when fattened?—That is so.

12318. Stores are, at present, very dear in Scotland, are they not?—They are very dear, but no dearer in comparison than fat cattle, I think.

12319. They are very scarce?—They are very scarce, or else I would not come into England to buy them.

12320. You are aware that you can import cattle into England from Tanning now?—I am aware of that.

12321. What is the obstacle to the importation of cattle from Tanning?—We have no direct communication for one thing.

12322. How would you have to bring them? They would have to be shipped at Tanning.

12323. How would they have to come if you did import them?—By chartering a vessel and bringing them direct, or coming via London, which we do not like.

12324. You

12334. You would not bring the cattle from Tooting via London to Forfarshire owing to the risk of disease?—That is it.

12335. What is the objection to chartering a vessel direct from Tooting to Dundee?—We could not buy them at the same price as Englishmen. They would say, "You may give us a little more for a cargo of beasts, but you do not come back for a time, and that puts us out in our market."

12336. The farmers in the neighbourhood of Schleswig-Holstein and Tooting prefer to deal with a regular buyer to selling to you, if you were going across there for the purpose of buying a cargo?—Yes.

12337. Would it suit you to import from 50 to 100 beasts weekly to Leith, and get them thence to Forfarshire?—Yes, it would.

12338. How was the store cattle trade carried on between Hamburg and this country before the cattle plague came?—At first I had a partner here who bought them, but latterly I arranged with Mr. Abbie; he bought them for me, and he took charge of the animals.

12339. Were these cattle bought from the market, or from the farmers?—There were a good many of them bought from farmers, but immediately before the market.

12340. Did you buy them at the farmsteads?—Some of them; I bought them before they were shown at the market, so as to keep them from coming in contact with cattle shown in the market.

12341. You bought them just before they were shown in the market in order that there might be no risk of their taking disease?—Yes, that was the reason, and some beasts were bought in the market; I bought them both ways.

12342. Have you tried to buy cattle from the farmers in Schleswig-Holstein yourself?—Yes, I have.

12343. With what result?—I have bought some beasts, and between the cost price and the expense they did not reach a profit.

12344. You found that you could buy cheaper in the market than you could from the farmers in the country?—Yes, I could do it a great deal cheaper, and save a lot of expense.

12345. Were there any markets in Tooting in 1856? I think the first market was upon the 21st of October.

12346. That market does not suit the importation of store beasts?—No; you get bad weather about that time, and the farmers want to have good store cattle, if possible, before that, for trying up.

12347. You know something of the trade in fat animals, do you not?—I have had fat animals from abroad.

12348. Do you know about the importation of fat animals into Leith?—Yes; you cannot remove them. I had 10 there a fortnight since, but there is no market at Leith; they come to the wharf side and have to be sold there to be slaughtered.

12349. There is not a sufficient demand for the fat cattle in the Edinburgh market to induce exporters to send?—It comes to be entirely in the hands of one or two carcass butchers; the Glasgow retail butchers cannot afford to go a distance and lose the offal and incur the expense.

12350. In consequence of the limited demand which there is for those cattle in Leith, the 10 that you imported did not fetch so much as they
0.56.

would have fetched if you had been able to send them to Glasgow?—No, they did not.

12341. Is that in consequence of the smallness of the import into Leith?—It is not exactly that; the people at Edinburgh seldom buy so big a class of cattle as the Glasgow people will; they want them rather of a better quality and smaller in size, so that the big, strong, rough sized cattle answer the Glasgow market better.

12342. What is to prevent a regular trade being established by carcass butchers establishing themselves at Leith and sending them across to Glasgow?—It has never been done; there has never been treading in the Glasgow market; if I had a man who sold 10 beasts together, I would consider he sold them badly for me; it is the man who buy one or two beasts who are the best customers.

12343. Do the small butchers buy their meat in Glasgow, but prefer to buy it alive?—Yes.

12344. They do not like to buy dead meat?—No; there are a good many little places round about Glasgow, and if they took dead meat into them the inhabitants would think there was something wrong about it; they must take in live cattle.

12345. Is the price of meat high in Glasgow just now?—I think fully a penny a pound more than it is here, from what I saw to day.

12346. Were you in the metropolitan market this morning?—Yes, I was.

12347. Do you attend the Dundee and Glasgow markets every week?—I attend the Glasgow markets every week, and the Dundee market every Tuesday.

12348. What is the difference between the price of beef in London and in Glasgow?—In Glasgow for the last four weeks they were quite willing to give 100 s. a cwt. for it, which is nearly 11 d. a pound. I do not know what they would give here for them, for there were very few people buying them; but from what I saw the people asking for big foreign beasts, they would have fetched more in Glasgow.

12349. What do you say is the difference of price between the two places?—About a penny a pound. I have seen sheep offered here at 9½ d. which we could not have bought at 9½ d. at Glasgow.

12350. What do you think you would have to give for them in Glasgow?—Ten-pence half-penny.

12351. Is that a very exceptional state of things?—I think it has been so since 1855 or 1856. I used to send 40 beasts a week here, but since 1855 or 1856, I have only sent a stray wagon now and then, and have always lost money by it. I think 1856 was the last year when I sent many.

12352. Has there been a great increase in the consumption of beef in Glasgow and other adjacent places?—Yes; the Glasgow market has trebled since I went there in 1851 or 1852.

12353. There is a very large population in Glasgow now, and the neighbouring towns?—It is the neighbouring towns which take up so much.

12354. Do the neighbouring towns depend upon Glasgow for the supply of beef?—Entirely, during the spring months.

12355. Do you think it would be a very considerable advantage to the people in Glasgow if the foreign cattle were allowed to be taken from
3 x 2 Leith

M. Smith.

3 July 1871.

Mr. Smith. Leith across to Glasgow to be slaughtered?—
 — Yes, it would be a great advantage; and I think
 3 July 1873. that a deal more cattle would be likely to be sent.

12356. You think that a good deal more cattle would be sent alive to Leith if they could be taken across to Glasgow to be slaughtered there? Yes, I am sure there would.

12357. What cattle are you speaking of just now when you say they cannot go from Leith to Glasgow?—Cattle shipped from any port upon the Elbe.

12358. The Elbe district is scheduled just now by the Privy Council, is it not?—Yes; there are beasts which we get from Aarhus and Denmark, Norway and Sweden; we have them coming every week in Glasgow, but none from Hamburg.

12359. Do you think that an effort should be made to get Schleswig Holstein and Hanoverian stores into this country?—We are very much in want of store cattle, as well as fat cattle, in Scotland.

12360. Then those store animals from those districts would be a valuable acquisition to the farmers in Scotland?—Certainly they would.

12361. You would not be at all anxious to get in any Dutch cattle from the character you gave them?—No; they may be of advantage, but I would not have them.

12362. Do you think the present regulations regarding foot-and-mouth disease are of very great value in putting down disease?—No, I do not think they are; as far as I know foot-and-mouth disease in our neighbourhood, we do not think much about it. The proper time to get our cattle is of far more importance than the loss occasioned by foot-and-mouth disease.

12363. Do you think that the cost of the regulations and restrictions is greater than the value received from them?—Yes; I do think that as regards foot-and-mouth disease.

12364. What restrictions would you have as regards foot-and-mouth disease?—I could scarcely tell.

12365. Would you allow the owners of diseased animals to drive them along a public road, and to exhibit them in fairs and markets?—Not to exhibit them in fairs and markets, and not to drive them along public roads, if you can possibly avoid it, but at the same time it is a very great hardship if you have cattle at a distance and cannot shelter them; when they suffer so much, they lose so much that there is a great loss to the country.

12366. You think under certain circumstances it should not be impossible for the owners of animals affected with foot-and-mouth disease to move them along a public highway?—Yes; to get them home and get them attended to; there is nothing serious about it then.

12367. Would you give the local authority discretionary power in the matter?—No, I do not know about the local authority; I am a member of it myself; they are very contradictory sometimes.

12368. As regards pleuro-pneumonia, are you in favour of slaughtering animals affected with this disease, provided that system is carried out generally throughout the country?—Yes.

12369. You think it is not desirable to slaughter out animals affected with pleuro-pneumonia, unless that regulation is carried out throughout the

country?—If a beast is badly affected I would kill him.

12370. If a beast were fat you would allow him to be removed to the nearest slaughter-house on permission from the local authority?—Yes; to the nearest slaughter-house, or the nearest fat market; you could get him there if he were a fat beast.

12371. For the purpose of immediate slaughter?—Yes.

12372. You would have to see that the animal was slaughtered after he got there?—Yes; I would make that imperative.

12373. The local authority in granting a certificate for the removal of such fat animals might make such conditions as would ensure its slaughter within a very brief period?—Certainly they could.

12374. Would it not be necessary that they should do so?—Yes, I think so.

12375. Would you be willing to have store animals removed from an infected place?—No, I would not.

12376. Not for a considerable period?—Not for a period longer than 30 days.

12377. You think it is not safe to remove them for a period of from two to three months?—I only know of one instance last year in which it broke out after the restricted time, but there may be more cases that I do not know of exactly.

12378. You think that a period of 30 days is not sufficient?—No. I think we were far better off under the old law, by which you could go back upon the man who sold an animal affected with pleuro-pneumonia, though it was two months or so after you had bought it.

12379. But the new law does not say so?—It was interpreted so with us.

12380. But the courts have not interpreted it so?—It was interpreted so with us after a certificate from an inspector had been given to remove the cattle from the market. If you had a certificate from an inspector that a beast had been clear from disease for 30 days, and he was allowed to take it into the market, you could not sue the man for selling that animal.

12381. That may be all true enough, but it does not prevent the buyer of the animal from having recourse upon the seller, provided he can show that the animal had the disease when the seller sold the animal?—But it is hard to prove that, if the beast was in a healthy state when it was shown. The law before was, that when a man had a healthy beast which died from pleuro-pneumonia, although the time was more than six weeks, you could come upon the seller.

12382. Have there been any decisions by courts in your district bearing out the view which you express?—Not that I am aware of.

12383. With regard to the transit of animals—of course you have had a very great deal of experience in this matter—what do you think as to its present condition?—It depends very much upon yourself. The railway companies allow you to load seven fat beasts upon a small waggon, and they charge you for a small waggon; you can only put in six if you please, or eight. There are three charges: there is the small waggon, and the medium waggon, and the large waggon, and in the 17 feet or 18 feet waggon you can put in ten beasts, and you pay so much for it. You put seven in a medium waggon, and you pay so much for

for it; and you can put in six in a small one, and you have to pay the same as if you put in seven.

12384. Do you think that you have much to complain of in the transit?—I have not much to complain of; I think the worst grievance is that there is not a uniform rate of speed in getting them on to their destination.

12385. What suggestion would you make for improving the transit of animals?—I think that no animal should be conveyed at a less speed, if they have to go a distance of 200 or 300 miles, than 10 miles an hour.

12386. What experience have you had in that respect?—I had 60 beasts brought from near Broughbridge to Broughty Ferry; the animals were 43 hours in the waggons; it was rather less than five miles an hour.

12387. Did they suffer much apparently?—No, I do not think so. I saw them after they came out, they seemed quite fresh, and my brother saw them.

12388. Do you think the animals had permanently suffered by the length of their fast?—I could not say; if you come to say that it is a decided loss, it is hard to prove. I would rather they should be a shorter time in the cattle waggons, but I have never experienced very much bad effect from it.

12389. The improvement you would like to see in the transit of cattle, is more directed to the speed at which the trains bring them than to an improved structure of the waggon?—Yes, we are able to pay much more expense, and if they alter the waggons and alter the system, it entails more expense than we are very well able to pay.

12390. You think that the present margin which the cattle dealer has will not allow him to pay more for the transit of the cattle?—No; and I do not think that the cattle would be much better; I do not know that they would be any.

12391. If the cattle were brought up in such an improved truck as that of which you see a model on the table, do you not think that the cattle would arrive in so much better condition that they would bring you at least some shillings more per head?—I do not know. I have never seen it tried.

12392. If you had the option of choosing between two trucks, one of the ordinary kind and one of the improved description, such as is before you, and were informed that the improved truck would cost you from 3s. to 4s. a head more for carriage, would you be disposed to pay 3s. more, and take the improved truck?—I scarcely would, I think. I would take the present trucks, and load the beasts carefully.

12393. Do you find the cattle trucks usually in pretty fair condition and order with reference to cleanliness?—In a great many cases they are, so far as we can expect them.

12394. Are there certain cases in which they are not properly cleaned?—Yes, in a large market, when they have been unloaded, and you want to load them again, they have not time sometimes to clean them; that is the only exception.

12395. What length of time would there be between unloading and loading again?—I have seen a thousand cattle standing waiting to be loaded before the trucks were unloaded, and when the cattle were taken to the trucks they were just loaded again.

0.58.

12396. The trucks were wanted to be re-loaded as soon as the cattle could be got out of them?—Yes; they tried to give the trucks a sort of clean, but there was not time for it; but that is not often the case.

12397. Then as regards transit, I understand you to think that the great desideratum is an increased and continuous speed for the delivery of cattle?—Yes.

12398. And you, as a cattle-dealer, would be satisfied if you were insured a minimum of not less than 10 miles an hour, including stoppages?—I should be perfectly satisfied.

12399. Have you had an opportunity of knowing about the Glasgow lairs for cattle?—Yes, I see them every week.

12400. Are those lairs for fat cattle and store cattle?—For both.

12401. Are both the store and fat cattle mixed indiscriminately in those lairs?—Not exactly mixed, but the fat cattle are taken out in the morning for the fat market; then the beasts come in from Ireland, and the cattle from the boats come into the lairs immediately after the others have been taken out.

12402. So that if any fat animal has been affected with disease, there is great risk of the store cattle coming in immediately after taking the disease?—Yes; the store beasts come into the same pens.

12403. If a farmer has a doubtful animal which he is rather suspicious of being affected with disease, is it likely to find its way to these market lairs in Glasgow?—If a farmer has a beast he is doubtful of, he always sends him to the fat market the first opportunity.

12404. What provision would you make for remedying that state of matters?—If there was a possibility of getting sufficient lairage not in the fat market at all, but for lean beasts; if you could get it somewhere near to the railway station or wharfage, or some other place other than the lairage in the fat market, that would meet the case.

12405. Would the farmers or dealers take their store animals to that market?—Certainly they would; there is no question they would do that.

12406. Would you have a store market in connection with it?—No, there is no need for store cattle at Glasgow.

12407. How do the store cattle come to be in those lairs?—They bring them there to feed them before bringing them on the railway, because they go into Perthshire, and sometimes to Morayshire.

12408. I understand you would want a special lair as a depot for store cattle upon transit from Ireland to the north of Scotland?—Yes, exactly.

12409. Do you think that would be a very considerable advantage to dealers and farmers in these Irish cattle?—I think it ought to be, considering that if cattle have any disease about them they are likely to find their way to a fat market, and it is an advantage not to have lean store cattle following that bad beast.

12410. Would that give additional confidence to farmers in England and Scotland?—I presume it would.

12411. And I presume it would not necessarily involve any extra expense?—No.

3 n 3

12412. What

Mr. Smith.

3 July 1873.

Mr. Smith.

3 July 1873.

12412. What do you pay for resting the Irish cattle in these Glasgow lairs at present?—We pay for going in with fat cattle before eight o'clock at night 1*s.* a head; and if they go in after that, it is 8*d.* a head.

12413. What do they get for that?—They get water and they get a little hay; it cannot be a very great deal that they get.

12414. Have you had foot-and-mouth disease upon your farms?—Yes, I have had it.

12415. What loss do you consider is incurred to store cattle by foot-and-mouth disease, upon the average?—If you keep them from 9 to 12 months it is very ill to say what it is; if you have them for a shorter period you count a little upon the risk in buying fat beasts, but I do not think much of it.

12416. You think that if a man is going to keep his store cattle for six or nine months after they are diseased, he will have very little loss at the end of nine months from foot-and-mouth disease?—That is my opinion.

12417. Mr. *Clare Read.*] You do not think it of any consequence losing a month's keep?—You do not lose it; we keep about 200 beasts, and if you are careful you do not lose it.

12418. *Chairman.*] Does not the beast go back during the time that he is ill?—Very little; during the four or five days that the fever is upon him he does, but you have only got to keep him well littered and dry, and give him a little cake, and so on.

12419. But take the case of milch cows?—There is sometimes bother with them by the loss of the udder.

12420. Mr. *Berkeley.*] Do you think that the loss upon milch cows is over-estimated at 2*l.* a head upon the average?—I should not believe that it could be over-estimated at 2*l.* a head; when they are calving they lose rather more.

12421. What is the loss upon fat cattle?—I had a lot; I do not think they lost much; they were large beasts, and the beasts got rather dear; it was about the latter end of November, and I made about 1*l.* a piece more on them.

12422. The markets helped you in that case?—Yes.

12423. And it was not a very severe attack?—No, but it is not generally very severe; cattle which have been long travelling take it more severely than if they have been kept quietly upon a farm.

12424. *Chairman.*] How many days does a beast go back; suppose you had a beast which would be ready for market in two months, and he took foot-and-mouth disease, how many days would be added to the necessity of keeping him?—The animal would have the fever for four or five days, and he would be some days before he would eat well again; he would be back a fortnight altogether.

12425. Mr. *Clare Read.*] You mean to say that a bullock, at the end of a fortnight, is as good as he was before he had the disease?—Some of them are.

12426. But as a rule?—I would not say, if they are newly-driven beasts, that they are as good.

12427. Mr. *Pell.*] Do their feet ever get right in a fortnight?—A great many of them never have had feet.

12428. Mr. *Berkeley.*] Sometimes among cattle upon a farm, if they are reasonably attended to,

the disease does not manifest any very strong external symptoms, does it?—No, it does not.

12429. In some cases it is so mild as to be somewhat difficult to determine?—I have seen cases of it; it depends upon the weather; if it is cold, wet weather, and they lie upon the lair, they suffer very much; but if you divide the cattle and keep them under shelter, and give them proper litter and a little better attendance and food, you will scarcely know anything of the difference in those.

12430. Has foot-and-mouth disease attacked sheep in Forfarshire?—Yes.

12431. To any large extent?—Some seasons it has.

12432. Were the cases among sheep generally severe?—Answered what we call black-faced sheep; that is to say, horned black-faced three or four year old wethers or ewes, I have seen it injure them very much when they have been feeding on the turnips, but with young hogs it has done very little injury.

12433. Has it attacked pigs in Forfarshire?—Yes, it has.

12434. Does the disease attack them badly?—I only keep three, but they took it, and I think I had one that died from it.

12435. Mr. *Pell.*] Are your beasts ever attacked only in the month, and not at all in the foot?—They are attacked a little in the foot, but if they are well littered in clean, dry straw, and kept loose, the feet very soon recover, although the cattle will salve a good deal at the month, yet generally when we have good beasts we try to give them a little corn, and do the best we can with them.

12436. You nurse them?—Yes.

12437. Have you done anything to their feet?—Yes, I tried last year to poultice them, and I found that it made them far worse than if we had let them be.

12438. Have your cattle had foot-and-mouth disease twice in any instance?—I am not aware of any that have had foot-and-mouth disease twice.

12439. Is that the case with Forfarshire generally, that cattle have not had the disease twice within twelve months?—I have heard different people say that they have had their cattle attacked twice.

12440. *Chairman.*] Did I understand you to say that you were in favour of removing all restrictions with regard to foot-and-mouth disease?—I would not allow cattle to be shown in a market had with the foot-and-mouth disease.

12441. And you would not allow them to be moved along the roads?—I would have that done as little as possible.

12442. One of the restrictions which exist at present is that the owner of cattle with foot-and-mouth disease is not allowed to move them about; would you be in favour of removing that restriction?—I would rather be in favour of removing it than of keeping on the restriction that we have.

12443. What is the restriction which you have?—The restriction which we have is that if you have cattle lying in a field, you cannot remove them to give them shelter.

12444. That is not a statutory order, but a regulation made by the local authority; do you desire that the statutory restriction of moving beasts along public roads should be removed?—

I would

I would rather it was removed; the restrictions in Forfarshire, I am safe in saying, did not in the least check the disease last year.

12445. Was that because the restrictions were not properly carried out?—I believe the restrictions were perfectly well carried out, but the disease was over the whole county.

12446. Do the farmers in Forfarshire give notice to the authorities when the disease breaks out upon their farms?—I think, as a rule, they do.

12447. If they give notice, and therefore the animals are prevented from moving along a public road, does that not tend to check the spread of disease?—It made no difference last year, and it was a most extraordinary case that amongst cattle which were at a distance of a mile from any disease, the disease broke out, and there

could not have been any contact with diseased animals.

12448. Do you think the disease is indigeneous, and that it is not propagated by infection?—I do not know about that, but there are some seasons which are much worse for it than others.

12449. That is to say, that the infection spreads more rapidly in some seasons than in others, but you do not imagine, if you had a house in Forfarshire which was never in contact with disease, that disease would break out spontaneously in him?—I do not know that, there have been some very strange cases in Forfarshire.

12450. It is upon that understanding that you are in favour of the removal of the restrictions?—Quite so.

Mr. Smith.

3 July 1873.

Monday, 7th July 1873.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mr. James Barclay.
Mr. Jacob Bright.
Mr. Clay.
Mr. Dent.
Mr. Dodson.
Mr. William Edward Forster.

Mr. Kavanagh.
Mr. Mossell.
Mr. O'Connor.
Mr. Clare Read.
Mr. Ridley.
Mr. Tipping.

THE RIGHT HONOURABLE WILLIAM EDWARD FORSTER, IN THE CHAIR.

Mr. HERBERT MURRAY, called in; and Examined.

Mr.
H. Murray.
7 July 1873

12451. *Chairman.*] You hold an office in Ireland, I believe?—I do.

12452. What office do you hold?—I am Treasury Remembrancer.

12453. Will you tell the Committee what that means?—I represent the Treasury there.

12454. How long have you been there?—About two years and a half.

12455. Being Treasury Remembrancer, I suppose means that you constantly remind the Treasury, and call their attention to the expenses in Ireland?—Yes, if they refer to me, I make inquiries for them.

12456. You have read Professor Ferguson's evidence, have you not?—I have.

12457. Have you any remark that you wish to make upon that evidence?—Yes; there are some points I wish to refer to.

12458. At Question 5273, Professor Ferguson was asked, "Have you a secretary in that department?" and he replied, "It is not allowed;" have you any remark to make upon that?—Yes; when the staff of the department was paid out of the Cattle Plague Fund, Professor Ferguson's staff consisted of himself at three guineas a day, a secretary at 7s. 6d. a day, a clerk at 3s. 6d., the constable at 5s., two messengers, and a butcher. When I inquired into the matter, he proposed as the staff, one veterinary surgeon, one secretary, two clerks, one accounting clerk, one caretaker, two messengers, and one office cleaner. The Treasury appointed him as head of the department; in place of the secretary a second veterinary surgeon at 12s. 6d. a day, two police clerks, and one boy, waiter and messenger. The secretary was cut out, and a second veterinary surgeon put in at 12s. 6d. a day.

12459. Mr. Mossell.] He says, "There are five clerks in the office, and a veterinary surgeon, whose time is partially devoted to it?"—Yes, that was changed. Professor Ferguson stated that he could not get a competent surgeon at 12s. 6d., and he was authorised to employ one at a guinea a day; at a later date he came to me and asked if he might employ two veterinary surgeons in two different directions at half a guinea a day, and the Treasury acceded to that request.

12460. Professor Ferguson said, "There are

five clerks at present engaged, but the Treasury wanted to reduce the number to two, and now after a great deal of difficulty they have allowed me one extra;" does that mean that the Treasury allowed six clerks?—There are three established clerks; the third was given without any difficulty at all; the whole thing did not occupy a month.

12461. Professor Ferguson says, "I however keep the five on at my own risk and expense"—They are paid out of the Veterinary Vote.

12462. What does Professor Ferguson mean by saying that, "I however keep the five on at my own risk and expense"?—Professor Ferguson has sometimes advanced money for the pay of his clerks, instead of paying them in the regular way.

12463. Does it mean that Professor Ferguson does not get the money back?—No, he gets the money back.

12464. How many clerks, as a matter of fact, are there now employed in the office?—Five; three permanent and two temporary clerks.

12465. And these five are paid by the Treasury, are they not?—Yes, but the salary of the two last still requires Treasury sanction.

12466. *Chairman.*] Professor Ferguson says, that after a good deal of difficulty he was allowed one extra clerk?—I have the correspondence here.

12467. Was it a long correspondence?—No; I will give you the dates. Professor Ferguson wrote to the Irish Government upon the 19th of February; the Irish Government wrote to the Treasury upon the 7th of March, and the Treasury referred it to me upon the 17th of March. I reported upon the 1st of April, and the Treasury sanctioned it upon the 4th of April.

12468. I see in answer to Question 5382, Professor Ferguson says that the permanent staff was only three clerks; I thought you stated that it was five?—It consists of three permanent and two temporary clerks.

12469. What is the reason it is not five permanent clerks?—Because the work differs so much in the summer months from what it does in the winter. In the winter months there are as many as 4,500 restricted farms, and at the present moment there are only 147.

12470. With

12470. With regard to the 55,785 papers registered, is it your opinion that the "registered" should be merely "stamped"?—I think that Professor Ferguson makes a confusion between registration and stamping.

12471. Mr. Monseil.] You do not apply that to the whole of that number?—No, many of those papers are registered, but a very large number are only stamped.

12472. In answer to Question 5293, Professor Ferguson states that his salary has been reduced "from very nearly 1,400 l. a year to 750 l., although the work is nearly 15 times as much, and my time is fully occupied by it"?—When Professor Ferguson was paid from the county rates his salary was three guineas a day.

12473. Was he employed the whole year?—He was employed, I think, from the 1st of January 1866, or sometime in 1866, to the end of 1867; that was two years.

12474. It was 1,400 l. a year at that time?—It was 1,500 l.; then in January 1868 the department was abolished by the Irish Government. Professor Ferguson previously to that wrote to the Irish Government to be "permitted to retain, as an honorary appointment, my professional position under the Privy Council Office, receiving remuneration only for such professional services as the Government may hereafter officially direct me to undertake." Professor Ferguson wrote that letter in 1867. From the time the old department was abolished up to October 1869, Professor Ferguson appears to have been occasionally consulted by the Irish Government when Orders in Council were issued, and during that time I think there were 14 of those, but when I came to inquire I found that there had been no official directions given upon the subject to him.

12475. Chairman.] What is his present salary?—£ 750, with private practice.

12476. Was Professor Ferguson in private practice when he got his three guineas a day?—There was no restriction upon him.

12477. Then the statement is true, is it not, that his salary is reduced from 1,400 l. a year to 750 l.?—Not from 1,400 l. but from 1,500 l.

12478. Do you wish to make any remark with reference to Professor Ferguson's answer to Question 5302?—The office is in a very small house; it is not a very large house. Then as regards the last part of his answer, he says he had only 7 s. a week given him for a person to reside in the house to keep the fire, clean up &c.; the proposal was to remove him from that office, which was his own house, to a house near the Castle; one of the police constables was to live in the upper part of the house, and to have an allowance of 7 s. a week for a charwoman.

12479. I see that I asked Professor Ferguson at the end of that day's evidence the following question: "I think you stated that you got no salary for two years; is that so?" to which he replied, "I do not think I was paid from 1867 to 1869;" what is the explanation of that?—When I came to inquire I found there was no basis upon which to pay him, because there were no directions given by the Irish Government to him according to his application that he should receive directions, and I accordingly said that we would pay him upon the income tax return he had made for the two previous years; but he said that that was unfair, because he had made no return, and had only been assessed upon 300 l. a year. He proposed that he should receive three guineas

a day from October 1869 to the time when I was inquiring, including Sundays. I objected to the Sundays, but proposed that he should receive the three guineas a day for six days in the week; that was to cover any remuneration which was due to him between 1867 and October 1869.

12480. How long did he receive those three guineas?—From October 1869 to June 1871.

12481. You overpaid him from 1869 to 1871, in order to make up for his not being paid from 1867 to 1869?—Quite so, there being no basis upon which to pay him for the period from 1st January 1868 to 30th September 1869.

12482. Are there any demands which he made in the interests of the Veterinary Department which you have been, and are now refusing?—No.

12483. Mr. Monseil.] His present staff, you say, is five clerks?—His present staff consists of three permanent and two temporary clerks.

12484. The two temporary clerks are policemen, I suppose?—They are.

12485. Are the other three clerks policemen also?—Yes, they are all policemen.

12486. How much does the whole annual expense of his department amount to?—I see he puts it at 1,500 l. I think it is 1,800 l. in the Estimate.

12487. That is the whole cost?—The whole cost of the head-quarter's staff.

12488. Including everything?—Including everything.

12489. I see that in England it is 12,962 l. 10 s. 7 d., including rent of office and everything; there seems to be a good deal of difference in the two sums?—There is a great difference between the working of the two systems. In Ireland the brunt of the work of the department is done by the constabulary in the country.

12490. You get police clerks more cheaply than clerks?—Yes, we get them more cheaply.

12491. You have satisfied yourself, I presume, by inquiry that the present staff is sufficient to discharge the duties which are imposed upon the department?—I have.

12492. I believe you are of opinion there should be one alteration?—Yes, as regards the holidays; the only permanent addition I should propose would be as regards the holidays; that was an oversight of mine; but with the staff they have now it is ample, the sergeant said, for any holidays they want.

12493. Therefore all you think it necessary to do is to give one more clerk, and give more holidays?—One or two more is ample.

12494. It has been the case for two months, has it not, that vessels embarking animals from Ireland for England are inspected?—Yes, by the constabulary.

12495. Out of what fund is that inspection paid for?—That at present is liable to be paid for from the Irish local rates.

12496. Do you consider that to be just?—No.

12497. Chairman.] Is that so?—Yes.

12498. Mr. Monseil.] Out of what fund do you think that inspection should be paid?—I think that inspection ought to be paid from the public moneys; the inspection is in view of the English interest.

12499. You think that that certainly ought not to be paid by Ireland?—Yes, but in saying that I speak as an individual, not as a Treasury officer.

Mr. 12500. Mr. Monell.] Will you explain to the Committee what the Irish local rate is?—The original Act said that the rate should not exceed, I think, a farthing in the pound, and that was levied, and 14,000 £. was collected.

12501. It might be a penny, might it not?—No, I think not, because if levied again, they must levy the same amount, and 14,000 £. is too much. Half that amount was repaid to the counties when the Veterinary Department was broken up. It was refunded to them, and there is a balance of about 1,700 £. in the hands of the department now.

12502. It is not that any rate is levied now; it is only the balance of the old rate?—That is so; there has been no rate levied since 1867 or 1866.

12503. In order to meet this charge, if it were necessary to continue the expense, it would be necessary to impose a rate?—Yes, in a year or two it would.

12504. (Chairman.) You say you think inspection at the Irish ports should be paid for out of the Imperial funds?—Yes, I think so.

12505. But the object of it is to avoid the Irish animals coming over diseased to English ports, is it not?—Yes.

12506. I suppose you are aware that if those diseased animals were to continue to come over, there would be very strong pressure to have the same very severe restrictions, or something very like them upon the Irish import, as there are upon the foreign import?—Yes, there would be.

12507. I suppose you would not be surprised to hear that that would be considered a very great disadvantage by Irish exporters?—No doubt it would be.

12508. Is there not ground for saying that it is to the advantage of the Irish exporter himself, that he should only export healthy animals?—Yes, that seems to be true.

12509. Mr. Monell.] Do you think that this inspection is of any use?—I cannot give an opinion upon that point.

12510. Mr. Clere Read.] Do you say that this inspection is now paid for by the local rate of the town or port in which the animals are unladen?—No, out of the general local rate.

12511. When was Professor Ferguson first employed by the Irish Government?—In 1866.

12512. And from 1867 to 1869 Professor Ferguson did not get any salary at all?—He was employed at his own request as a kind of honorary consulting physician, and the Treasury knew nothing at all about it.

12513. Why was the old department, whatever that might be, abolished?—The Irish Government abolished it; I cannot say why.

12514. What was it called; "The Cattle Plague Department"?—They called it the Veterinary Department; it was a department of the Irish Government, paid altogether at first from the local rates, and then later the Treasury agreed to pay the cost of the head-quarter staff in London, but that ceased at the end of 1867.

12515. Then in consequence of his having had no salary for two years, you agreed for 18 months to pay him the extra salary?—Yes, we settled it in that way. I saw Professor Ferguson very often, and it was compromised at that rate.

12516. You paid him at the rate of about 900 £. a year?—Yes, something like that, and we paid the rent of his house, and he gained sundry other advantages by the arrangement.

12517. He had 1,800 £. for four years' salary?—No, we did not recognise any salary as due, except from October 1869, from which date he said he had given almost his entire services.

12518. Was that at the commencement of the Cattle Diseases Act which applied to Ireland?—I think it was the following year that the next Act was passed. The disease came into the country again, and the department became active once more.

12519. What disease are you referring to as having come into the country?—The foot and mouth disease became more prevalent then.

12520. You say that the department cost 1,800 £. a year, and that Professor Ferguson's salary was 750 £.?—Yes.

12521. What was the other 1,050 £. expended upon?—The other clerks, and travelling expenses, and the rent of his premises; he received 100 £. a year for the rent of his premises and a small yard.

12522. Is that a quarantine yard?—That is what it is nominally used for.

12523. Those clerks are all police-officers as well?—They are.

12524. Do they get salaries as police-officers as well as for being clerks?—They get their pay as police clerks, and also extra pay for extra hours.

12525. How much do they receive under the Veterinary Vote?—They get their whole pay out of that.

12526. Then the whole cost of the office is under 1,800 £., and not 1,500 £., as Professor Ferguson says?—No, the whole cost of the head-quarters staff is 1,800 £. a year; he was speaking from memory.

12527. If you say he was speaking from memory, will you give the Committee some figures with reference to this 1,500 £.?—The actual figures are 1,850 £.

12528. What is that made up of?—Salaries and wages, 1,407 £.; wages and taxes, 136 £.; travelling, 100 £.; and other items.

12529. Then Professor Ferguson, I suppose, referred to salaries and wages, and rates and taxes, and did not give the travelling and incidental expenses?—I think he must have forgotten the two or three lower items.

12530. There is recent increase apparently, because in the year 1872 the estimate was only 1,200 £.?—I do not think the whole of it was expressed in the estimate of the preceding year.

12531. There is an increase of 650 £. in this last year?—Yes, but that was not the increase of the year. There has been a very slight increase this year.

12532. What other expenses are there to carry out the orders of the Veterinary Department in other parts of Ireland; are they all charged to the police force?—The reports are all made by the constabulary; there is no separate charge made in the Constabulary Vote on account of the services they contribute to the Veterinary Department.

12533. Is there an increase of the Vote in consequence?—No, there is not.

12534. So that really the whole cost to the Imperial Exchequer of carrying out the Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act for Ireland is about 1,800 £. a year?—That hardly represents the facts of the case, because the imperial officers all over Ireland are also working for the department.

12535. Are you not aware that almost all the expenses

Mr.
H. Murray.
7 July 1873.

expenses under the Act throughout the country are paid by the local authorities in England and Scotland, and not any of them by the Imperial Exchequer?—I believe so, but I have not inquired into the English Acts at all.

12536. So that whatever extra work may be put upon the Irish Constabulary, there is a very large expense in working the Act in the provinces, which is borne by the local authorities in England?—I have not seen the figures given by the English Department.

12537. What are the duties of the Veterinary Department in Ireland; do they advise the Lord Lieutenant and the Irish Government as to what steps should be taken to eradicate and stop disease?—Yes.

12538. They have the whole responsibility thrown upon them?—Yes.

12539. In the same way, I suppose, as the English Department advise the Privy Council here?—I do not know anything about the English Veterinary Department.

12540. Do you think that there is a great difference between 12,000 *l.* a year and 1,800 *l.* for working an Act of Parliament?—Yes, no doubt, there is.

12541. I suppose the Irish officials would look upon that as an Irish grievance?—They might do so.

12542. Where does stationery come in in the Irish Vote?—There is no charge for stationery made in the Irish Vote.

12543. Mr. Mowat.] Is not that charged under "Incidental Expenses"?—No.

12544. Then that is to be added, whatever it is?—Yes.

12545. Mr. Clave Read.] You do not know why the great increase of nearly 700 *l.* has been made in the last year?—That is not an increase; it must have been paid out of some other Vote before that. I think it was because the pay of the police, up to last year, was paid out of the Police Vote, and this year it has been added to pay the whole out of the Veterinary Vote.

12546. Is Professor Ferguson considered to be the head of the Veterinary Department?—He is considered the head of it; the exact title he asked for, and by which he was appointed by Lord Wodehouse, was "Inspector."

12547. He had a secretary as well, had he not?—He had a secretary at 7 *s.* 6 *d.* a day.

12548. We have, in the English Department, two inspectors, whose whole time is devoted to the work of the office, and a chief clerk, with a salary of 600 *l.*, and a secretary at 1,000 *l.* a year?—The staff which was considered sufficient in Ireland, at the time when it was paid out of the local rates, consisted of Professor Ferguson, a secretary at 7 *s.* 6 *d.*, a clerk at 3 *s.*, a constable at 5 *s.*, two constables at 2 *s.* 6 *d.*, and a butcher at 5 *s.*

12549. But as you had no Act of Parliament in force in Ireland, except as regards cattle plague, there was not very much to do, I suppose?—I cannot say that.

12550. Chairman.] The honourable Member for Norfolk asked you with reference to the expense of the Irish Department, as compared with the English; I suppose I am right in saying that there is very little import of cattle into Ireland?—There is scarcely any, except from Spain. There are also a considerable number of calves brought from England.

058.

12551. Therefore, there is no large population in Ireland who would be immediately affected by orders with regard to the import of cattle?—No, there is not.

12552. Mr. Clave Read.] I suppose the chief wealth of Ireland is its cattle, is it not?—Yes.

12553. Mr. Tipping.] If you go into a shop, as a general rule, the seller has the greater interest in endeavouring to please the buyer, than the buyer to please the seller; as a general rule, the seller is the more polite party of the two?—Yes, in some cases, but not always.

12554. Is not that the position of Ireland with regard to the cattle trade; that is to say, they are sellers, and we are buyers; I was referring to that upon the question of rates, that it is to the interest of the party who sells, to sell healthy merchandise, and that logically the expense should fall upon him; you seem to think that it should fall the other way?—I think that anything which checks the import of cattle from Ireland is a great inconvenience to the cattle owner.

12555. Of course it is, because it spoils his market?—It is so.

12556. Mr. Kavenagh.] In saying that 1,800 *l.* a year does not cover the expenses of the Veterinary Department, do you mean that there is extra money paid to the police in the country?—No; I mean to say that if you had not a constabulary employed as a veterinary force, you would have to establish officers all through Ireland to collect information.

12557. Do they get extra pay for what they do?—No.

12558. Therefore, if the Veterinary Department were done away with, you would have no saving?—No.

12559. You stated that a good deal of money which was levied for the cattle plague rate was returned to the counties; do you know whether it was upon the poor law unions that that levy was made?—I could not say. I was not in Ireland at the time.

12560. Did not Professor Ferguson of his own accord ask to be employed as an honorary official, that is to say, without pay?—Yes, his wording was this: "Understanding that in consequence of the winding up of the Cattle Plague Department Account, payment of my salary from Government will cease on the 16th proximo," that is to say, the 16th January 1868, "I trust that in consideration of the successful services I have rendered to the Government, I shall be permitted to retain, as an honorary appointment, my present official position under the Privy Council Office, receiving remuneration only for such professional services as the Government may hereafter officially direct me to render."

12561. His reason for making that application was, that he did not wish to draw more money out of the Cattle Plague Fund?—I think Professor Ferguson had it in his mind at that time that he was paid from the Cattle Plague Fund, and he did not know that he was paid from voted services.

12562. Did you not say that he was paid from the Cattle Plague Fund?—He was at first, and then the Treasury recouped the fund the expense of the head quarter staff.

12563. Have you not officially looked into the matter of his pay and the work he has done?—Yes, I reported upon that.

12564. Do you consider that, so far as you have

Mr. H. Murray. have been able to judge, Professor Ferguson has carried on the business of his office satisfactorily?—Very well indeed.

7 July 1873.

12565. Do you think that his pay of 750*l.* a year, which is what it is now, is sufficient?—Yes, with his private practice.

12566-7. Is it true that the Lord Lieutenant or the Chief Secretary ever recommended an increase of salary?—Yes.

12568. When was that?—That was in the autumn of 1871; they proposed that he should have 1,000*l.* a year as a personal allowance.

12569. That was refused by the Treasury, was it not?—It was.

12570. Mr. *Clare Read*.] What do those extra veterinary surgeons do; are they inspectors who are sent about the country?—Professor Ferguson can send them anywhere he likes.

12571. He remains himself generally at the office, does he not?—Yes, at head quarters; it is quite at his discretion. If he thinks that there is something going on in the country in which his office should be employed instead of the local inspector, he can send him down.

12572. Does he ever go himself into the country?—I think I recollect him doing so, but very rarely.

12573. In his absence one of his clerks would take his place, would he not?—I should think the veterinary surgeon he employs should take

his place then; the extra allowance was given with that intention.

12574. If Professor Ferguson were called away to some important place in the country, in his absence the sub-inspector would take his place in the office?—Yes.

12575. *Chairman*.] Has he been often so called away?—I think not.

12576. Mr. *Kearney*.] You say that the imports of cattle into Ireland are almost nothing?—I refer to the foreign imports; I think the only imports from abroad are from Spain.

12577. I thought you stated that there were importations from England as well?—There are some calves which come from England.

12578. Mr. *Jacob Bright*.] Do you know the extent to which you import cattle from England to Ireland?—I cannot say; I have seen the Return, but I cannot call it to mind.

12579. Does it principally consist of calves?—Yes.

12580. Mr. *O'Connor*.] They are principally for breeding purposes, are they not?—No, they are principally for feeding purposes; they come into Ireland, and they are there fed, and then go back again.

12581. *Chairman*.] Do you happen to have how the information as regards the existence of disease abroad reaches the Veterinary Department in Ireland?—That I fancy would come from the English Veterinary Department.

Mr. ABRAHAM HODGETTS, called in; and Examined.

Mr. A. Hodgetts.

12582. Mr. *Jacob Bright*.] WHAT is your occupation?—I am a butcher and cattle dealer.

12583. Living at West Bromwich?—Yes.

12584. Are you a large butcher?—Yes.

12585. How long have you been there?—Twenty-five years.

12586. In the same place?—Yes.

12587. In that case you have had great experience?—I have.

12588. There have been great fluctuations in the price of meat at West Bromwich during those years, have there not?—Yes, there have.

12589. Is it your opinion that meat is dearer in West Bromwich when the foreign cattle are compulsorily slaughtered at the ports than otherwise?—Yes, certainly.

12590. Is that clearly so?—It is dearer at West Bromwich than it is here. I come to the London market to supply our district every week; I get supplied from London now.

12591. But you have long noticed that the compulsory slaughter of German cattle, instead of their being admitted free, makes it more difficult for you to obtain your supplies?—Yes, certainly.

12592. Have you ever had any business in the port of entry, where the cattle are compulsorily slaughtered?—Yes.

12593. What have you done there?—I have slaughtered perhaps 500 sheep a week, and 50 beasts.

12594. Have you had a slaughterhouse yourself at the port of entry?—Yes.

12595. What port was that?—At Mr. Odams' wharf in London.

12596. Have you killed many cattle there?—I tried it for a month, or five weeks perhaps, but I could not continue it.

12597. Have you only tried that once?—I

tried it twice; I tried it once some three years ago, and I could not make anything of it then.

12598. How long a trial did you give to it?—About three weeks, about three years ago.

12599. What time of the year was that?—In February.

12600. When was the next time?—That would be February, about a year ago; I have not the dates.

12601. Did you kill the cattle there and the sheep too?—Yes.

12602. Did you kill them in order to send the meat to West Bromwich?—Yes, and to Birmingham and Wolverhampton.

12603. Did you send all the meat that you killed into the interior of the country?—Yes.

12604. On both occasions when you tried it, it was all done in the winter?—It was.

12605. You did not try it in the summer?—I dared not.

12606. Why not?—Because the meat would perish before it got to its destination; it would depreciate in value 3*d.* per pound; if there were thunder and lightning during the night it would go through the trucks and taint the meat very likely.

12607. Do you mean to say that if you killed meat at Deptford in the summer time you could not convey that meat to West Bromwich in good condition?—I should not like to try.

12608. You did try it in winter?—Yes, I did.

12609. With what result?—I lost money; I was obliged to do away with it.

12610. What was the reason of your losing money?—I could not make the best of the offal, and in the conveyance of it it got damaged and knocked about too much; in fact I could not continue it.

12611. You mean that when the meat got to West

West Bromwich it was not so good as it ought to be?—It was not. I do not buy the best quality of meat. I come out of the Black Country, where the people want something cheap.

12612. At the time when you were sending dead meat from Deptford to West Bromwich, were you also taking in any foreign cattle to West Bromwich alive?—No.

12613. Thus supposing you had taken that cattle to West Bromwich and killed it there, what would have been the difference in the price, do you suppose, of the meat which you sold?—It would have been worth a 1d. to 1½d. a pound more to me alive than dead at any time, even in the winter. I could give 1d. a pound more in Islington than I could at Deptford; we have not got to kill them at Islington.

12614. Do I understand that the foreigners who sold the cattle would get a less price for them in consequence of their having to be killed at Deptford?—Just so.

12615. Is that so?—That would be so if the man was to deal with me. I could afford to give a 1d. a pound more at the Islington market than I could at Deptford, on account of having to kill the animals at Deptford and convey the meat dead.

12616. That is to say, that if you bought cattle at Deptford, with the power of taking them alive into the interior of the country, you could give from a 1d. to 1½d. a pound more than if you had to take them down dead?—That is so.

12617. That being so, a person sending cattle to this country must have a great interest in being able to send them alive to the interior of the country?—Yes, that is my opinion.

12618. You think that the importation of cattle would be checked by compulsory slaughter?—That is my opinion.

12619. Have you any figures which you can produce upon that subject?—I have not.

12620. Your cattle which are slaughtered at Deptford are in a worse condition for slaughter, owing to the fact that they have just had a voyage and a long journey, are they not?—They are better for having a few days' rest, say, from two to three days, but that is neither here nor there.

12621. Do you know from your conversation with others engaged in your business whether they have had a similar experience to your own?—I do not know anyone who ever tried it besides myself, except one man, and he is dead; he died just after the market was opened again.

12622. You stated that you had difficulty with reference to the offal?—Yes, you cannot make the best of it; you must take what they choose to give you for it. I refer to the heart, the head, and the liver, which make a lot of money, and which the poor people can do very well with; a heart for instance will make a very good dinner for a family.

12623. Have you no means of disposing of the offal at Deptford?—I should only get about half; not more than half what I could get for it at Birmingham; that is a serious item.

12624. You are not likely to try the same experiment again?—No.

12625. Have you anything more to say upon the subject?—No, I do not know that I have.

12626. You are aware that some witnesses have recommended to this Committee that all foreign cattle should be slaughtered at the port of entry; would you think that that would be a disadvantage?—I think that would be a very great mistake.

0.58.

12627. Do you think it would be felt very much in the interior of the country?—Yes, it would increase the price of meat very much; it is dear enough now.

12628. You have a strong opinion upon that subject?—Yes; in bad weather it would be impossible to move it.

12629. Has nobody killed meat in summer weather at Deptford, and taken it to the interior of the country?—No.

12630. You believe not?—I believe not; I am sure not.

12631. Would you say the same thing with regard to Odams' wharf?—Not even from Odams'; I never sent any.

12632. They have not killed meat there and taken it into the interior?—Not to my knowledge.

12633. But you are aware that they kill meat in the north of Scotland and bring it to this market?—That is certain portions of meat, they do not send the whole beast; they would send the hind quarters, and it is packed in straw with ice under it; it is the best beef, such beef as the London people like, I suppose.

12634. Have you seen that beef coming into the market?—I have.

12635. Do they keep it in a satisfactory state?—I should not think so; they would not like it in our country. No matter how you pack meat, after it has been tossed about in a cart, and then into the trucks, and then taken out again, it is not so agreeable or so nice.

12636. I think I have heard it alleged by some that meat is cheaper at Deptford than it would be anywhere else away from the port of slaughter, and others say that it is not; what is your experience at the present time?—I really cannot answer that question.

12637. What has been your experience at any time when you have had means of knowing?—I cannot really answer that. If you mean the price in the butchers' shops, I could not answer the question; it would not come under my notice.

12638. [Chairman.] You stated that you had tried buying foreign cattle at Odams' wharf; had you ever bought foreign cattle before?—Yes.

12639. Where?—In London, at the Smithfield Market.

12640. Before the cordon was put round London?—Yes.

12641. Did you buy foreign cattle largely at that time?—Yes, I did.

12642. What portion of your purchases would be foreign cattle?—Sometimes I would buy 1,000 sheep a week on the Monday; sometimes 500 or 600, or 700.

12643. Were they chiefly sheep that you bought?—Yes, and beasts in proportion.

12644. How many beasts would you buy?—Fifty or 60; it just depends upon the price.

12645. What number of sheep do you kill in the week?—I have a retail shop, and I supply country shops as well. I am in the wholesale trade.

12646. How many do you dispose of in a week?—Seven hundred or 800 sheep a week.

12647. What I want to get at is this: when you bought your foreign sheep in the London market at Islington, what proportion would that bear to your whole consumption?—I have bought 500 or 600, or sometimes 1,000. I have bought as many as 2,100 on a Monday.

12648. What proportion would that bear to what

Mr.
A. Hodgkin.
7 July 1873

Mr.
A. Hodges.
7 July 1873.

what you disposed of in the week; were you buying any English sheep at that time?—No.

12648. Then, in fact, at that time your trade was chiefly in foreign animals?—Yes, and it is now.

12650. Where do you buy them now?—At Islington.

12651. You buy the foreign animals which come in from the unscheduled countries?—Yes.

12652. What are they generally?—Merino sheep.

12653. Where do they come from?—From Germany.

12654. Do you buy any cattle?—Yes.

12655. Where do they come from?—From Tonnage.

12656. Have you bought any recently?—Yes, I bought some to-day from Teasing.

12657. Do you buy Dutch cattle at all?—Yes, and Spanish.

12658. You say it does not answer your purpose to buy a slaughtered animal at Deptford?—That is so.

12659. How much more would you be willing to give for an animal at the Islington market than you would be willing to give for that animal slaughtered at Deptford?—£ 2.

12660. Mr. Deat.] For a 35 l. beast?—Yes, I would give two sovereigns more for it.

12661. Chairman.] Do you think that the price at Deptford is 2 l. lower?—Yes, I do.

12662. Then if it sells at that 2 l. lower, why does it not answer your purpose to buy it?—It may not always be 2 l. lower; it may range according to the trade; sometimes they may make us pay a long price at Deptford; sometimes they may go for 3 l.; I have known beasts at Odams' Wharf go for 7 l. or 8 l. a piece.

12663. You do not find that you can buy cattle at Deptford at that depreciation, which pays you for not getting the benefit of the offal and for the depreciation of the meat during the journey?—I dare not buy them at all; a day like this I could not buy a sheep to take into the country. I might do it in winter or in March.

12664. This time of the year you are obliged to rely upon live animals entirely, are you not?—Yes.

12665. Then when you are told that it has been stated that we could replace the live animal import by dead meat, you do not believe that that would do for your district at all?—Not at all.

12666. Mr. Deat.] In your district they are very large consumers of meat, are they not?—Yes.

12667. What is your kill for your own retail consumption per week?—I am not in a very large way in the retail line. I supply the country districts, such as Walsall, Dudley, and Wolverhampton, and some parts of Birmingham and Oldbury, and the surrounding districts. I supply the butchers.

12668. With carcases?—No, with the live animals.

12669. You are more a dealer than a buteher then?—Yes, I am.

12670. You deal entirely in foreign stock?—I deal entirely in foreign stock.

12671. You get them from Islington market now, do you not?—Yes.

12672. Do you ever get them from Liverpool?—No; I have not done anything with Liverpool for years.

12673. You find it cheaper to buy in London?—Yes; the foreign stock is cheaper.

12674. Do you find the stock you buy diseased or not?—No; I find them very healthy and sound.

12675. In the Dutch cattle, when they have been slaughtered, do you find the lungs at all show symptoms of pleuro-pneumonia?—I never saw one in my life, to my knowledge.

12676. You say your sheep are Merino?—Yes.

12677. Have you found any traces of sheep-pox in those sheep?—No.

12678. As I understand, you did at one time try the sending of carcasses from Odams' Wharf to the country?—I did.

12679. It did not answer?—It did not answer.

12680. There has been a steady rise in the price of meat for some years now, has there not?—Yes; there has been.

12681. Do you attribute that rise in price to the increase in the consumption, or do you attribute it at all to the restrictions which have been put upon the trade?—I suppose it is a little owing to the increase of consumption.

12682. Chairman.] Only a little owing to that, do you think?—I say, that I have not a doubt that it is a little owing to that.

12683. Mr. Deat.] Wages have increased very largely, have they not, in your part of the world?—Yes, they have.

12684. In consequence of that increase, do you find a much greater consumption of meat?—Yes.

12685. Has your sale of cattle and sheep increased numerically?—Yes, it has.

12686. Chairman.] Do you not think that it is largely owing to the increased consumption?—I maintain that it is a goodish bit owing to the increased consumption, but there is a goodish bit owing to the restrictions which have been put upon cattle during the last few years.

12687. Mr. Deat.] You deal entirely in foreign cattle?—I deal also in cattle from Scotland.

12688. Do you get that alive or dead?—Alive.

12689. Do you get any dead meat from Scotland?—No.

12690. Mr. Oliver Read.] Do you think that the rise in the price of meat in any way results from the outbreak of foot and mouth disease that we had last year?—I could not say that.

12691. Diseases, generally, I suppose have very little to do with the rise in the prices of meat?—I could not answer that question. They must interfere a little, no doubt; if you lose a lot of beasts they are lost; there was a loss of beasts in the time of the rinderpest some years ago, which made the supply shorter, no doubt.

12692. But you do not think that a non-fatal disease is of much consequence to the consumers of meat?—Yes, it is; all the beasts that we lose are of course a national loss.

12693. I am not talking of beasts that die, but those that suffer from disease and are depreciated in value and are kept back from the market; do you not think that that helps to keep up the price of meat?—There is no doubt of it.

12694. I think the market at Odams' Wharf lasted 11 months; did you go there the chief part of those 11 months?—I only went there five or six weeks; I would not be certain as to the dates.

12695. What

12695. What did you do with the meat that you sent into your district; did you use it for your own shops, or did you sell it to other people?—I distributed it about to my customers; a truck load to one and a truck load to another; some to Birmingham, some to Wolverhampton, and some to Dudley; but it came in very bad condition, and they would not have it.

12696. You had been in the habit of sending live animals, and they did not like dead meat?—That is so.

12697. I suppose that butchers do not like dead meat in your district?—They do not like dead meat.

12698. Have you ever noticed that where there is a good dead-meat market the price of meat is always lower?—We have a good meat market in Birmingham.

12699. Where is the price of meat cheaper, in London or in Birmingham?—In London.

12700. That would be in consequence of the large dead meat supply which London has; you are aware that more meat comes to London than to all other towns in England put together?—That I cannot say; I am not aware of that.

12701. Although these bullocks in Deptford market are not worth so much by 2*l.* a head to you, I suppose the same depreciation would not apply to a butcher in the east end of London?—It will make a severe difference to him; I do not care what part of London he lives in.

12702. Why is that?—He would lose something; he could not make the best of the offal; and then there would be the carriage, and you have to pay a man extra for dressing and all that sort of thing; there are all sorts of expenses.

12703. There is no rail into the market, so that it would be a very considerable inconvenience for anyone at a distance, such as yourself, to go there; it would be worse for you than when you went to Odams' wharf where there was a railway?—If they could not do it at Odams' wharf they could not do it at Deptford; we had a rail right into the slaughter-houses and we could hang the sheep up hot in the trucks.

12704. How long do you rest your cattle before you kill them?—Two days.

12705. You are aware that you can rest them 10 days at Deptford, if you think proper?—I am aware of that.

12706. Do you generally come up to London in the spring to buy your cattle, or do you come up every Monday?—I mostly attend the London market every Monday.

12707. You buy more in the spring and early summer in London than you do at other times, do you not?—Yes.

12708. How many miles is West Bromwich from London?—One hundred and eighteen miles.

12709. You know, do you not, that they send a good deal of dead meat from Aberdeen, which is 560 miles from London?—Yes, that would be the best Scotch bullocks, that class of meat

carries better than the class of meat I buy; I do not deal in the first-class quality, I buy the foreign meat; foreign meat does not look so well when it has been tanned about. Moreover, they kill the Scotch beasts at their homes; they have not been driven about; they are killed where they have been fed; they keep better, and the meat holds itself together better than the middle class of meat.

12710. But I suppose the journey to West Bromwich, and then being sent by you to some other slaughter-house, does not improve the beast?—Certainly not.

12711. So that if it happened to be killed in London the beast would undergo a less amount of suffering and fatigue than if you took him to West Bromwich?—No doubt he would, but I cannot see any advantage in it.

12712. Mr. Tipping.] Why do the butchers about you object to the dead meat trade; is it on account of the loss from their not having the offal?—It is a great inconvenience to them not having the offal, because they could do well with the offal.

12713. By inconvenience you mean loss, because they could sell it at a profit?—Yes, no doubt.

12714. The great objection to dead meat upon the part of the butcher, is that it deprives him of part of the profit of his trade?—Yes, that is so.

12715. Being more than the difference of quality between the two meats?—Yes, it is in this way, they do not have the offal or they cannot make the best of the offal; if I had the offal I could make twice as much of it in the country as I could at Deptford; then somebody must lose.

12716. I suppose that in the case of the rise of wages in your district, the two things which the rise of wages goes to are butcher's meat and drink?—Those are the two leading articles with us.

12717. What is the price of the meat that you sell in your retail shop; what are you selling your beef at per pound?—Sevenpence, 8*d.*, and 9*d.* for the best brisket.

12718. What do you give at Islington market?—We buy the best to-day at 5*s.*, that is 7½*d.* per pound.

12719. What does it cost you to get that animal home?—Six shillings.

12720. Can you give the Committee a comparison of what would be the cost as between live and dead meat?—Carried dead it would come to 15*s.*

12721. Then there is the difference between 6*s.* and 15*s.* upon an average beast?—Yes, that would be 9*s.* lost.

12722. Producing how many pounds of saleable meat?—It would depend upon the weight of the animal; we would say that a bullock worth 25*l.* would be 7 cwt.

12723. There would be about 9*s.* difference upon 7 cwt.?—Yes.

MR. HERMANN GEBHARDT, called in; and Examined.

12724. Mr. Jacob Bright.] What is your business?—I am a cattle salesman.

12725. Have you been a long time in that occupation?—I have been for 24 years in England.

Q.58.

12726. Selling cattle, both foreign and bone?—No, only foreign cattle.

12727. Where do you sell the cattle?—In London.

12728. Have you imported cattle from almost every

Mr.
A. Haggitt,
7 July 1873.

Mr. H.
Gebhardt.

Mr. H. G. G. every country?—I have imported principally from Germany, that is to say the cattle are consigned to me from Germany, Spain, and Denmark.

7 July 1873.

12729. Have you imported them every year in large numbers?—Yes, in very large numbers.

12730. What is the largest number in any year which you have imported?—The largest number is 15,441; that was in 1865.

12731. What were those, cattle and sheep?—No, beasts alone.

12732. What was the number of sheep?—One hundred and twenty five thousand seven hundred and eighty seven; that was in the same year, 1865.

12733. You are of opinion, are you not, that our supplies are lessened by compulsory slaughter at the ports?—Yes, I am sorry to say that I have proof of it in my own case.

12734. What is the proof which you wish to give the Committee?—I am reduced now from the number I have just given from 15,400, in the year 1865, to last year, when the number was 6,311 oxen.

12735. What was it the year before?—Ten thousand eight hundred.

12736. What was it the year before that?—Eleven thousand six hundred and ten.

12737. What was it the year before that?—Fourteen thousand four hundred and twenty five; the best years were 1865 and 1866, they all ran about 14,000 or 15,000, and then all at once, from 1871, we go down to less than half.

12738. Do you mean to say that that diminution in your case is owing to the fact of compulsory slaughter?—Yes, entirely.

12739. I suppose if you took the general figures of import which you would get from the department, you would not find a difference like that?—Yes, I do; I see by the statement of the Veterinary Department to Parliament, that there is a diminution from 1871 to 1872, of about 75,000 animals, that is to say that there were about 75,000 less animals imported from abroad in 1872, than in 1871.

12740. What was the total number imported in 1871?—The total number imported in 1871 was 247,426, against 171,996, in 1872.

12741. How do you connect that with compulsory slaughter at the ports; what were the changes with regard to countries scheduled and unscheduled during those two years?—The countries whose cattle had to be compulsorily slaughtered at Deptford, did not send cattle; there are whole countries which have left off sending.

12742. In the beginning of 1872 Germany was scheduled, was it not?—From the 1st January 1872, all cattle coming from scheduled countries had to be slaughtered at Deptford.

12743. Mr. Oliver Reed.] We had them slaughtered at the ports before that, did we not?—Before that we could send them to the Islington market.

12744. Mr. Jacob Bright.] In 1872 Germany was scheduled, while it was unscheduled in 1871, was it not?—Yes.

12745. Was there any other country scheduled in 1872, which was free in 1871?—I do not know about that, but we got the beasts into the Islington market in 1871.

12746. (Alderman.) But you could not get them out of the metropolis?—No, but we got them into the market.

12747. Mr. Jacob Bright.] I do not see how you can connect that diminution of import with any change which has been made with regard to foreign countries?—The result is here, that they have not come.

12748. It may arise from other causes, may it not?—No, because our price of meat has risen more than a penny a pound in the last 12 months; the importation of sheep has increased from abroad, and that of beasts has diminished, because the sheep are free.

12749. And what has been the increase in the imports of sheep?—Speaking of Germany, we increased from 265,343 in 1869, to 491,327 in 1871, which is 226,000 more.

12750. There has been a continuous increase in the importation of sheep along with a diminution of the import of cattle for several years?—Yes; cattle used to increase; the numbers up to 1871, if you follow this Table are these: in 1869 we imported 216,415; in 1870, on account of the German war, we did not import quite so many, 201,793, and in 1871 we came to 217,476, so that we increased about 40,000 in one year.

12751. You have given us the figures of your own trade, have you any other figures?—In order that my figures might not stand isolated, I took the figures of three large salesmen in the market, I expected to be examined before, so that I have only taken it for the first five months. I can show here that these three salesmen sold in 1869, in the first five months of that year, 25,000 beasts, which could go to the Islington market. They sold last year in the Deptford market, in the corresponding five months, only 1,062; from 25,000 we go down to 1,000; in fact, the importation into Deptford is very small indeed.

12752. Is it your opinion that it is more difficult to carry dead than live meat from the part of entry into the country owing to the conditions in which the cattle are slaughtered, having just arrived from abroad?—Yes, it is very bad; particularly in the summer, in respect to grass-fed cattle. At Deptford the diminution in value has been something frightful, because the grass-fed beasts are obliged to be put into close sheds tied up, and they will actually waste from day to day; they never get out of the feverish state they arrive in. I have sold beasts myself upon a Monday, and in some cases where the trade has been contrary, and the butchers have been unable to kill them until the Friday or Saturday, these beasts were not worth so much by 2½ a piece as they were upon the Monday. It is against nature to have these grass-fed beasts put there, because they must be killed in 10 days, but very often they are kept alive for six or eight days if the trade is bad, and they waste away, whereas if they had not been grass-fed they would not waste so much.

12753. If these cattle were taken into the interior of the country and killed there, I suppose what you now say would apply to the slaughter there, would it not?—No; if they were taken into the country a man could put them in his fold for a while, and kill them properly; any animal after it has had a journey should have fair rest, and then be killed; that is what we should do to get it out of the feverish state.

12754. In fact, you mean that the meat is bad because the cattle are killed in an improper state?—Yes, I think so.

12755. What special knowledge have you upon that

that point?—I have known cattle arrive all sound and well; but foot and mouth disease is a disease which you cannot legislate for the prevention of, and as these lairs are never free, in a few days these cattle have foot and mouth disease, and they cannot eat any more, so they waste away; I have seen lots of animals wasting away. We have only one place to take them to, and if the meat market is bad, and the butcher cannot kill the animal, he would rather see it waste by disease than slaughter it at once to have the meat spoiled.

12756. Would you have the whole cargo slaughtered if any animals were found to be suffering from foot and mouth disease?—I would not.

12757. But if an animal was suffering from other diseases?—If an animal was suffering from cattle plague, or from small-pox, I would have the whole cargo slaughtered.

12758. Or from pleuro-pneumonia?—I am not quite certain in my own mind if I would recommend it in that case; but I would not see great danger if it were recommended, because if a man sends over an animal affected with pleuro-pneumonia, he generally knows it before it starts, as the disease does not arise so quickly but that he knows it, and I would have such a punishment for it as to prevent it being done again. I should rather not have it done, but I think it would not do half the harm with pleuro-pneumonia as with carpox in which foot and mouth disease occurred.

12759. Are you of opinion that store cattle should be imported along with fat cattle?—No, we import very few store cattle from Germany; it is only at certain seasons that we import them, and when they come in large lots it would pay to send special steamers for them, and the same with milch cows; they might go in special steamers.

12760. Could you practically work the trade in that way?—Yes, there have been times in which a great many stores have been imported when they have been short of keep abroad.

12761. Why would you separate the fat cattle from the others?—Because if they are short of keep abroad they send us the store animals, and I think there is much more likelihood of disease arising amongst them as amongst fat cattle, and a few stores might be the cause of a whole cargo being killed, which otherwise would have been free. If the trade in stores is at all worth doing let it be done in a wholesale way, because it is not after all such a great thing to find a steamer for 200 cattle.

12762. What is your opinion with regard to foot and mouth disease; do you think it is an English disease as well as a foreign disease?—Decidedly.

12763. You would not expect to get rid of that disease by shutting out foreign animals?—No, I do not think so; it is a disease which is certainly contagious, but it is a disease which breaks out where there is no contagion at all, of which I have had my own experience.

12764. What is your own experience in that respect?—I had a farm with some valuable pedigree stock, which were intended for sale. I never allowed anyone to go upon the farm, and in spite of that, a few days before the sale, the cattle got foot and mouth disease.

12765. Have you studied the history of foot and mouth disease in this country?—I have seen it as long as I have been in this country, 58.

and I believe there has been plenty of proof brought forward that it had been in this country long before any cattle were introduced.

12766. You are of opinion, are you not, that compulsory slaughter at the ports interferes with a good many traders, and throws business into different hands?—First of all it prevents us from selling any live stock to go into the country. The country manufacturing towns are our best customers.

12767. Are the merchants and salesmen generally of opinion that it is injurious to them to have compulsory slaughter?—Yes, they are; everyone thinks so who has his own interest at heart.

12768. Is meat cheaper at the port of slaughter than in the country?—Yes.

12769. What knowledge have you of that?—Because I sell some every week in both places.

12770. Is meat upon the average cheaper at Deptford than it is in the interior of the country?—It is cheaper at Deptford.

12771. How much cheaper is it?—That is a very difficult question to answer. At Deptford at certain times of the year, when the supply has been very short, we might say we should have the price as high as in the Islington market, but the moment we get a glut, which we had last autumn, then the price reduces so quickly as to be uncontrollable, and the loss sustained by the senders is so enormous as to prevent them from sending again, as I can show by figures.

12772. Will you show that to the Committee?—I said that we were reduced from 25,000 in five months of one year to 1,000 in the corresponding five months of last year.

12773. Fluctuation in price is greater at Deptford, is it not, than anywhere else?—Yes.

12774. Of course, there are rapid changes?—Yes, because we rely upon a few buyers; if they are overdone in the London market upon the Saturday, it is known everywhere; it affects the supply for Monday, and the telegraph informs the people in Wales, and Manchester, and Birmingham, and those buyers come up, so we have never a very strong drop, because the additional buyers release us from the surplus that we have.

12775. Do you know of any experiments which have been tried in the carriage of dead meat from the port of landing into the interior of the country?—Yes, I know it well.

12776. Have you had anything to do with any such experiments?—No; only that I sold live stock to those buyers.

12777. Have they carried meat, for example, by special trucks, fitted up with proper appliances, the meat being hung up upon hooks, so as to ensure good ventilation?—Yes, that has been tried.

12778. Has it been tried both winter and summer?—I think it never was tried in summer; but there was a sudden outbreak of cattle plague in 1868, and then again in 1870, when the German and French War was; it was tried in the autumn.

12779. Was it tried in the careful way which I have described?—Yes, it was.

12780. What was the result of the experiment?—We thought that if animals were sold at such a sacrifice at Odams' Wharf, it might be worth while to try it; sometimes we could not sell them, and we sent for those country people, and we told them that the prices were very low, and

Mr. H. Galsworthy.

7 July 1873.

Mr. H.
Giblett.
—
7 July 1873.

and that they should come and slaughter them there, but only two men tried it, one of them died; I think he lost a lot of money by it; he never left a shilling, and the other man gave it up; he kept it up for some time, but he said if he kept on, it would ruin him.

12781. Is Germany a scheduled country now? —Yes.

12782. Is that, in your opinion, an unnecessary precaution upon our part?—I think so, altogether.

12783. Why?—Because there is only danger to this country from cattle plague; and as Germany has excluded all Russian cattle, and great precautions are taken in Germany, I think there is no risk of taking any disease from Germany.

12784. Does Germany take precautions in that respect?—Yes, they had cattle plague there last year; since then, a law has been made to prevent the risk in future.

12785. Have you any special knowledge of what precautions Germany takes with regard to Russia?—I had it from the lips of the minister in London; I know that every precaution is taken which can be taken; they are very strict, and very severe about it; and I believe since that law has been in force, there has been no outbreak of cattle plague in Germany.

12786. Do you know when they had the last cases of cattle plague in Germany?—I do not know how late it extended. I know that there was an outbreak in 1870, but I could not say when it was extinguished.

12787. It is your opinion, that the restrictions with regard to Germany are unnecessary now?—I believe that Germany ought to be an unscheduled country after the guarantees which the Prussian Government have given, and which I understand from the minister in London, are quite sufficient, and the Germans are surprised why they are not considered sufficient. I cannot understand why Germany should be so treated, which being so large a sheep-producing country, we do not derive from her to so great an extent the good meat which might come here, because we have had a great falling here in one year; my own case is very strong. I fell off in five months of one year from 7,521 to 561 in another five months in 1872.

12788. What year is that?—The one is 1839, the other is 1872.

12789. Those were German beasts?—They were all from those parts of Germany where we do not get a bullock from now.

12790. Would you admit that there might be some other cause producing that great change?—No, I think not; because you might say, if the meat got dearer in Germany, it has got dearer here as well, and then people were obliged to have their beasts sacrificed in 1868, being compelled to be slaughtered at the wharves, and they got alarmed; formerly, many thousand beasts were fattened for this country, which has been discontinued.

12791. We are not importing cattle from France now, are we?—No.

12792. Where did you import cattle from in France?—I never imported any, but I am told that we should get now, if we imported them, the Norman beasts, which are too good for the French markets.

12793. Have you not heard that there have been cases, in which the French have recently imported cattle from this country?—I have not

heard so, except upon hearsay the other day; but in some parts of France they may be dearer than in others. In many countries that is the case, although it is not to my knowledge. I know that from Normandy we could, at the present prices, bring a great many beasts over; they are ready to come to the market.

12794. Why do they not come?—Because they cannot come to the market; these beasts which are worth about 40 *l* a piece, they would not send to Deptford, because the class of people to buy them would not go there.

12795. Are those French cattle superior to any class of cattle which are imported into this country?—I think the Normandy cattle are quite as good, and some of them better, than the best German beasts, because they are English bred; they have English bulls over there, and are very fine beasts.

12796. They have not succeeded in introducing those?—They tried it last year. I did not go into the statistics, but they were very few.

12797. What time of the year was that?—In the summer.

12798. Do you know whether there is any difference in price between last year and this year?—We are much dearer this year; we are at least a penny a pound dearer all through.

12799. They tried it last year, and now when they are a penny a pound dearer, they are so discouraged that they will never try it again?—They will not try it again, if they are compelled to go to Deptford; and I was told this very morning by Mr. Giblett, who sold 9,000 French beasts in the year, which averaged 27 *l* a beast, that this year he has not sold one, and he is in a position to say that if they could go to the Islington Market they would come at once.

12800. Who are you quoting?—He is a very large salesman and very much respected in our market; Mr. John Giblett.

12801. You do not regret the exclusion of Russian cattle from the market, do you?—I do not. I would never let them come again; they have done mischief enough.

12802. Is there any marked difference between the Russian cattle and any others which we import?—Yes, they are quite a different breed. I think from my experience of Russian cattle that it is not worth while to import them, for we should only get a very few of them. This year I had an application from a man who asked if we could sell cattle from Russia, and I asked him how many there would be; he replied he thought he could get together 1,500, and I thought that it would not be worth while to ask permission to bring them even to Deptford.

12803. I understand from your evidence generally, that you would be very strict at the post with regard, of course, to rinderpest, pleuro-pneumonia, and small-pox?—Yes.

12804. You would slaughter every cargo which had anything of that kind in it?—I would not be so positive with reference to pleuro-pneumonia, because it is not so dangerous.

12805. You would not slaughter in the case of an animal affected with foot and mouth disease?—No, I think that it would be cruelty. I have had beasts which fetched 34 *l* and 35 *l*, and they must have been first-rate beasts when they left home, and when they got here they have shown signs of foot and mouth disease; the examination is very severe and minute of their mouths on entry, and if there is any sign

Mr. H.
Guthrie.
7 July 1874.

of disease the whole cargo is slaughtered. If they are intended for slaughter, I cannot see the harm that they can do.

12806. It is the general cry of this country that every continental country should be unscheduled if it is free from rinderpest, and if it gives security as regards its import from foreign countries?—I think so.

12807. You think it would be desirable to throw the trade much more open than it is at present in such cases?—I think that every animal should go to a free market, so as to extend the competition for trade.

12808. So far as your own trade is concerned you have lost that very much by the restrictions which have been in force?—Yes, I have lost more than half my trade.

12809. Do you think that you get less business and the consumers in this country get less food?—Yes; I believe that if these things continue, we shall get a higher price very soon; my opinion is, that if trade were steady, it would pay to breed sheep and cattle, but as it is, if a country is left alone for a year, then you have an Order in Council coming down, and you have the whole trade disturbed; we had countries sending cattle which do not send any now; we had Oldenburg, which used to export a great many beasts to this country, but they cannot send them now, and all those good beasts have disappeared from coming here. The number sold by salmon here in five months was reduced from 25,000 cattle to 1,000, and they were very good beasts.

12810. With regard to the difficulties of taking food meat from the ports to the interior of the country, are those difficulties increased by the irregularity of the railway trains?—I believe that has a great deal to do with it; if the meat does not come at the proper time and a man loses his market, he cannot sell his meat.

12811. Are you aware that there is great irregularity in the delivery of meat?—I believe that in one case a man lost a lot of money, the train broke down and the meat was almost valueless, it being that sort of muggy weather which is so detrimental to meat; it is just the same in the Metropolitan Meat Market; if they send up meat from the country, and it does not arrive in the morning, but comes the next day, it either gets spoiled or it looks worse, and loses in value. It is quite a different thing to send meat from Aberdeen; you must understand that from Aberdeen they send very little in the summer, and everybody knows that the atmosphere is much colder there; the beasts are not in a feverish state, and they send as small a quantity of meat as they like; in the winter they send a lot, they are very carefully packed; they can go to some expense about it and still make it answer, but at Deptford you have a number of beasts all huddled up together; the result is that it cannot be done, it has been tried.

12812. You mean to say that in Aberdeen they kill their cattle under the most favourable condition possible?—Yes.

12813. Whereas at Deptford, they are killed under very unfavourable conditions?—Yes; quite so.

12814. *Chairman.* You think that Germany is quite free from any cattle plague?—I believe so, as far as Prussia is concerned. North Germany is free.

12815. I think you stated that cattle plague broke out in 1870?—Yes.

12816. Are you not aware that there was an outbreak of cattle plague last year?—Yes; that was the reason why we had to go to Deptford.

12817. You lost sight of the fact, that last year was the first year that we had cattle plague since we imported cattle from Germany?—I forgot it for the moment; I said particularly that I did not know when it ceased; but I mentioned it before, in my answer to the honourable Member for Manchester, that there was cattle plague last year in Germany.

12818. You stated that you were confident that there would be no danger in importing these animals?—Yes.

12819. Are you not aware now that there was danger?—Yes; but the law has been altered.

12820. Are you not aware that we were informed by the German Government that we might import safely from Schleswig-Holstein and from Hamburg, because they take great precautions with regard to Russian cattle?—I believe the Prussian Government had taken every precaution upon the frontier, but some beasts came from Russia to Lubek, which is not Prussian proper, and they were got through without the knowledge of the Prussian Government.

12821. The real fact was, that notwithstanding all their precautions, they were first informed of the danger of cattle plague in the neighbourhood of Hamburg from England?—I am not aware of that; this is the first time I heard of it.

12822. You stated that you believe the import from Russia into Germany is prohibited now?—Yes; I state that upon good authority.

12823. The import from Austria is not prohibited?—I hardly know how far that goes; I believe they admit beasts from Bohemia into Prussia, but where the line is drawn I could not say.

12824. Are you aware that there is a good deal of cattle plague in the Austrian dominions?—Sometimes there is in the eastern parts of the Austrian dominions.

12825. With regard to pleuro-pneumonia I understood you to say that you thought that animals should be slaughtered for pleuro-pneumonia, because the exporter ought to guard against sending an animal affected with pleuro-pneumonia?—Yes.

12826. Are you then of opinion that pleuro-pneumonia soon shows itself?—Yes.

12827. You think that those veterinary surgeons, who think it is sometimes many days or a week before pleuro-pneumonia shows itself, are mistaken?—I do not say so; but I think that the graniers of cattle will find it out sooner than anybody else, because when the cattle show signs of pleuro-pneumonia they will not feed. It may be a long time before the heavy breathing commences; I could not say how long, but it is some time.

12828. How long does the exporter generally buy cattle before he sends them off?—He sends them off as soon he can, as a rule.

12829. But you are quite clear that there ought to be no slaughter of animals in the case of animals herded with foot and mouth disease, except those animals that have it?—That is my opinion.

12830. Have you in many cases had a cargo, in which you were interested, slaughtered?—Yes; very often.

12831. When was the last?—I could not recollect the last, because we have now for 18 months

Mr. H.
Gebbards.

7 July 1873.

months had all our best killed; they come from the scheduled countries to Deptford.

12832. I thought you stated that you imported considerably from Denmark?—Yes; I have had none slaughtered from there.

12833. Do you not consider that since there has been that order, there have been fewer cases of carcases with foot and mouth disease in them than there were before?—I do not think so, because the countries through which they are now allowed to bring them into the market, were particularly free countries up to 1868.

12834. Do you not think that there are fewer carcases coming with it?—Amongst those coming from Schleswig-Holstein we have not had one single case.

12835. But Schleswig-Holstein, until this last week or two, has been scheduled, and the cattle have been slaughtered when they arrived?—Yes; but when they arrived at Deptford they were declared sound, except one or two steamers which had a bad passage, and in consequence the animals on board showing signs of foot and mouth disease.

12836. Are you engaged in the store trade?—Very little.

12837. Therefore, as a matter of trade, it does not matter to you what restrictions there are upon store cattle?—I think that is as much matter to me as to anybody else, because if there were a store trade I should get my share.

12838. At present the trade is a very small one?—Yes.

12839. Is not the Dutch cattle trade a very large trade?—It used to be some years ago, when they had a very dry summer.

12840. Did you import any then?—No.

12841. Then you consider that the import of fat cattle to the market is very much diminished, do you not?—Yes.

12842. The diminution from 1871 to 1872 of the cattle imported is between 75,000 and 76,000?—75,000 according to this statement.

12843. Are you aware that, out of that 75,000, close upon 48,000 is the diminution in Dutch cattle?—I do not remember what diminution there is without seeing the statement.

12844. Do not you think that that diminution from 105,000 in 1871 to 58,000 in 1872, is very much due to the Dutch store cattle?—I do not think it is in the majority of cases.

12845. Was not 1871 a very large increase over 1870?—Yes, there were 46,000 more.

12846. But the restrictions existed in 1870, did they not?—In 1870 they did, for part of the year; before that they were free.

12847. What do you mean by their being free?—They could be taken to the Metropolitan market.

12848. But they could not be taken out of it?—They could not be taken out of the metropolitan district.

12849. Was not it believed that the existence of the cordon had a very considerable effect in interfering with the trade?—No; because we could get the beasts to the Islington market, and they could be sold to all the London butchers.

12850. But they could not be sold to consumers out of London?—No.

12851. Do you at all remember the price you were paying for cattle in Germany at the port of Tonnage for example in 1868, when you imported so many?—I do not recollect the price per stone.

12852. What are you paying now at Tonnage?—The expenses are 2*l*.; we could easily reckon it.

12853. I want to know what the price at Tonnage is; you do not know the actual price; you are only making a guess at it, deducting the expenses?—That is all.

12854. That is not allowing for profit?—The profit is very uncertain, because the beasts that we get from Tonnage are not job beasts; they are beasts grazed by farmers.

12855. What would it be about?—From 5*s*. to 5*s*. 4*d*. per stone.

12856. Was not that very much more than it was in 1866?—Yes, a great deal.

12857. Has not the price of meat risen very considerably upon the continent, especially in Germany of late?—Yes.

12858. Do not you think that the great demand for meat at home may, to some extent, have diminished the export here?—Yes, there is no doubt about that, to some extent.

12859. But I understood you not to make any allowance for that, in answer to the honourable Member for Manchester?—I answered, that the people over there have not increased the breeding of cattle as they have done for sheep, knowing that they labour under disadvantageous circumstances.

12860. Does not a very much larger number of cattle reared in Germany go to the German market than comes here?—Yes.

12861. If there has been a very great rise in wages in Germany, has not that been a great temptation to them to feed and breed?—Yes; but as they have not got the benefit of the rise here, so they go to an unfavourable market, they do not come here.

12862. But I understand you to say, that they have not set to work rearing and breeding cattle because of the restrictions here; I ask you to tell me why they have not done that, when there is so very large an increase of price in Germany itself?—The more demand there is for a thing, if there is a limited supply, the more the price will increase. If they have not bred so much as they would have done otherwise, by consequence the price will be higher.

12863. But surely the great increase of price in Germany would be as strong an inducement to them as any you could give them at present to increase the trade?—Yes, but as hulloes cannot be grown upon demand, it requires three or four years, and when the trade is settled they will do so.

12864. But do not you think that the rise in price in Germany itself is a greater stimulus to them to increase their production than the mere difference between the Deptford and Islington Market?—No, I do not think so, because Deptford Market is an unfair market to take as a criterion; it is an uncertain market; you may find the difference there between one market and another of 8*l*. a hulloek, whereas there would never be that variation at the Islington Market.

12865. What would be the difference between the markets?—I would say that a beast is sold at 2*l*. less in the one market than the other.

12866. Upon a beast of what value?—About 25*l*.

12867. That is 8*l*. per cent.; would not the rise in Germany be very much more than that; my sole reason for asking this question is, because you stated that they were not rearing cattle on account of those restrictions; then I ask you how do

do you account for their not rearing cattle in order to meet the very considerable increase of price in Germany itself?—To which I answered, that they could not grow beasts in so short a time.

12843. Could they grow beasts in so short a time on account of our taking off our restrictions?—They knew that two years ago; they knew that that Act was passed.

12849. You were speaking with reference to the French import; a French animal is about of the same value as a good Schleswig-Holstein animal, is it not?—They are larger.

12870. How much larger?—The Schleswig-Holstein beasts are an entirely different sort; the one is reared in Jutland, and the other in Schleswig-Holstein, and is what is called a half English beast.

12871. Which are best?—Those worth most are those reared in Schleswig-Holstein.

12872. What are they worth?—I sold some to-day at about 35 l., but you might put them down upon an average at 25 l.; a Jutland bullock you might put down at about 20 l.

12873. Norman animals are a better quality, are they not?—I have seen Norman animals sold here, even when the price was not so high, at 40 l.

12874. You have no Russian trade, have you?—I had some Russian trade, and I could have had 1,500 l. if I could have got them here this year, and have sold the beast which had cattle plague, or at least my partner did.

12875. You would not import Russian cattle under any circumstances, I believe?—I would not import them until you could show that it was worth while, and until you could get large supplies; but unless you got large quantities I think there would be more danger of importing the plague than the import was worth.

12876. Mr. Dent.] The diminution of the importation of Portuguese cattle between 1872 and 1871 was quite as striking as the import of German cattle; it fell from 20,300 to 15,600?—Yes.

12877. And there was no restriction placed in the way of slaughter upon those cattle?—But you will find this year that they have wonderfully increased.

12878. You are comparing 1872 with 1871; the import of Portuguese cattle had increased from 8,568 to 20,700 in 1871, and then they fell suddenly to 15,600 in 1872; how would you account for that, seeing there were no restrictions upon them?—I cannot account for it.

12879. Do you know what the price of meat is in Berlin?—I really do not know.

12880. Do you ever go to Germany to buy?—I do not buy. I sell for other people; but I have got some beasts here, which my partner is selling now to-day from Berlin; they are at Deptford.

12881. Your partner sells upon commission as well as yourself?—Yes.

12882. Is it not really the case, that at this present time there is competition in price between Berlin and Paris and England?—Yes, very much so, I think.

12883. Have not the prices in foreign countries increased quite in proportion to the prices in England?—I believe they have.

12884. Does not that go rather against the prospect of any increased importation of foreign cattle into England?—No; because from the countries which are not scheduled, the imports

tion has not been diminished, except in one or two cases, and I believe in this report you will find it very much increased.

12885. This year there has been an enormous increase in the price of stock?—There has.

12886. The increase in the price of English cattle is something extraordinary, is it not?—Yes, I believe in a great many instances it has been 1 s. a stone, 1 d. a pound.

12887. That was quite sufficient to draw cattle from abroad, I suppose?—Yes, so it has been; there have been an immense number of cattle imported this year from non-scheduled countries.

12888. That shows that when the price in England is sufficiently over the price abroad, it will bring cattle here?—It will bring cattle here.

12889. But when there is not a sufficient margin, whether they are scheduled or unscheduled countries, they must stay at home?—Except the very large supply from Schleswig-Holstein which would naturally come here, and last year they went to Deptford; they have no other market to go to, they are like an isolated corner in Germany, and they could not find for their large bulk of cattle any other outlet for the moment. They actually brought to this market about 2,000 beasts weekly because they were compelled to come here; but last Michaelmas, when the bad trade began, those people found other channels for their trade; and I can show that all the principal salesmen got less from that country than they used to do in former years.

12890. But I understand that this year, whether there be restrictions or not, the import has increased considerably?—I believe that from Denmark, Portugal, and Sweden there has been a great increase, but I have not got the return to speak from.

12891. All of which decreased last year?—Yes, that was so.

12892. I have a return placed in my hands, showing that the German increase appears to have been a large one also; in fact, generally, the increase in the importation of foreign cattle this year has been very considerable?—Except from Germany. I am speaking now not upon statistics, but I know that the importation from Portugal, Denmark, and Sweden has increased.

12893. There has been a very great increase in the value of foreign stock which is imported, although there has been a diminution in the quantity, has there not?—Yes, there has.

12894. You would attribute that, I presume, to the improvement of the breeds, and the greater care which has been taken to fit the animals for the English market?—The price is generally higher; and if one stock is higher, the other stock goes higher.

12895. Has the quality of the stock improved in proportion to the price?—They go on improving every year, and they are improving now; I have orders now to send some very superior bulls and Southdown sheep and Oxford rams abroad.

12896. You are a considerable exporter of well-bred stock, are you not?—I am a considerable exporter of well-bred stock, and I have given very large prices to the breeders of Southdown sheep, such as the Duke of Richmond, Mr. Jonas Webb, and such people.

12897. Do you think there is any prospect of considerable increase in the foreign importation of cattle into this country?—I believe the present price of meat is so high that it would encourage largely the increase of breeding.

3 T 8

12897^a. Where

Mr. H. Gifford.

7 July 1873.

Mr. H.
Goldharst.
7 July 1873.

12897*. Where do you think that any increased production of foreign stock could take place for the English market?—I think the largest scope is Germany; because you have got South Germany for stall-fed animals, because you have got most arable land there; and you have the north, such as Schleswig-Holstein and Oldenburg, for grass cattle; they have the finest land in the world there.

12898. Has there not been a considerable increase of stock in Schleswig-Holstein?—Yes, because it pays them very much better to grow cattle than to grow corn, being heavy land; and every year, I believe, it is more and more laid down for grass.

12899. Is South Germany it is arable land?—Yes, it is a great deal arable land; it is done in a different form. In Wurtemberg, Bavaria, and Baden-Baden they rear the cattle, and then, when they come to a certain age, they go to what we may call the midland counties of Germany (such as Prussia and Magdeburg); and these cattle are used for labour and then fattened, particularly at the large factories of beetroot sugar, and then we get them here. They come here as very fine big cattle.

12900. Where are you to derive your supplies of store cattle from for England?—From the south of Germany.

12901. But I thought you stated it was arable land in the south of Germany?—But that does not prevent your growing cattle just as you do in England; you rear cattle in one part of England and fatten them in another.

12902. I took it from your own evidence, that the south of Germany was principally arable, and that you could not feed bullocks there; according to our experience you cannot either rear or feed on arable land?—They have grass land to rear cattle on, but not to fatten them. If you have ever travelled in Germany you do not find herds of cattle grazing; they bring the young things up and cut the grass for them; and the small farmers rear the bullocks and break them in to the plough, and when they are two or three years old they sell them.

12903. I want to know whether, when the restrictions are removed, you look forward to any considerable increase of the import of cattle into this country?—I do.

12904. Where from?—From Germany, and not only from Germany but I look to other countries, particularly Denmark and Sweden, which in former times (especially Sweden) did not export a bullock, and now they come from there very largely.

12905. They have no disease in Sweden, have they?—We never had any cattle arrive from Sweden with disease, I believe.

12906. It is not scheduled?—It is not scheduled.

12907. There is nothing to check the increase there?—No; I believe Sweden from 1869 to this last year has doubled, namely, from 3,300 to 7,000.

12908. Do you anticipate that there is any prospect of an increase in the import of Spanish and Portuguese cattle?—I believe the Spanish cattle have decreased this last year, but I am told that the great cause of that is that a good many beasts have gone to France on account of the war which drained that country of beasts, so that there have been exceptional circumstances which apply to Germany, France and Spain, all owing to the war.

12909. I was going to ask you whether the same remark did not apply last year to the German, French, and Dutch imports owing to the war, which naturally diminished the imports into this country?—Of course it did.

12910. Mr. *Clare Read*. Does not Germany import a considerable quantity of store cattle from Austria and other countries?—No, they do not; they may in some provinces have a considerable quantity of store cattle, but I do not think they bring many from there, even for adjoining districts.

12911. Then the statement that was made to the Veterinary Congress at Vienna, that Germany imported as many cattle as she exported, was not correct?—I believe not.

12912. Are you aware that that statement was made upon what was considered to be good authority?—I know nothing about the authority, but from my experience of the cattle trade I do not believe it.

12913. Is your authority your own opinion, or whose?—My opinion and my experience.

12914. The decrease in the import of Spanish cattle was just 5,000 last year, and there was no alteration in the restrictions?—No.

12915. There are no country buyers come to Deptford, there being no rail there?—None.

12916. They did when the market was at Odams' Wharf?—They tried it for a short time, but they gave it up soon.

12917. We have had it stated here that a very considerable quantity of dead meat was sent into the provinces?—That was a wrong statement whoever made it.

12918. It was made by Mr. Odams?—There were only two men tried it; one has been examined here to-day and the other is dead. If my statement and Mr. Odams' are at loggerheads, we could apply to the railway companies to see how long they carried meat from the market to the provincial towns.

12919. But there is no chance of country people coming to Deptford, as there is no rail there?—They would not go if there was a rail; they would not go to Odams' Wharf when there was a rail. I invited men from Birmingham and from Manchester to come there. I and we are selling things so low, but they said that they would be under such disadvantages that it would not be worth trying.

12920. The greatest import you had was in 1866, was it not?—The greatest number of head of cattle I had was in 1866.

12921. When the cattle plague restrictions were in force, and when all the cattle were killed at the ports at which they were landed, were they not?—No; they were not killed at the ports at which they were landed.

12922. Do not you know that the cattle plague restrictions commenced in February 1866?—I do not know that they commenced then, but we were not obliged to kill them on landing. There was a cordon drawn round London; I could not speak positively as to where it commenced and where it ended, but we did not kill them at the landing place.

12923. But you killed them at the port?—If you call London the port, but we had all London for it; the foreign cattle could go to the market.

12924. That is to say, they went into the Islington Market; they could not go out of London?—No; we had a 20 mile radius, and that is quite enough to sell them in. We had the

the country buyers, and we had competition for all the supply for 4,000,000 people.

12925. There was an Order issued on the 20th February 1866, in which it said that no cattle should be removed alive from such town or place, except by sea, during its continuance, and that year you had the greatest import of stock?—Yes, because in England there was the cattle plague, which killed a great many beasts. We could bring them into the port, and take them into the market, but could not take them out of the Metropolitan district.

12926. What do you say is the average price of a foreign bullock now, such as you sell; about from 22*l.* to 23*l.*, do you suppose?—I should say about that.

12927. What are the expenses in the market altogether?—I think there are 5*s.* 9*d.* expenses, and then there is the driving, which is 6*d.*

12928. What is the 5*s.* 9*d.* for?—The 5*s.* 9*d.* is the commission and market expenses and banking, including all charges except driving and keep. Of course the keep depends upon how long the animals have been in.

12929. The 5*s.* 9*d.* includes commission, bankers' charges, and market dues?—Yes.

12930. What is about the average freight?—I should say the freight (except from Spain, which is higher) you might put down at 1*l.*

12931. Does that include the wharfage and dues?—No, there is wharfage and rail to the market, because they are railed up to Maidenhead. I believe the charge for that is—

12932. What is the difference between the expenses at Deptford and at the Metropolitan Market; are they more or less?—I think they are the same. I believe at Deptford we charge 4*s.* commission, and at the other market 5*s.* 9*d.*

12933. The 5*s.* 9*d.* is commission?—Yes, including all expenses, commission and market dues.

12934. Is there not some railway carriage from the wharf, either Thames Haven or Brown's Wharf, or wherever they are landed, up to the Metropolitan Market?—Yes, there is 4*s.* 6*d.* for landing and railway.

12935. Do they save that now at the Deptford Market?—No, the market charge is a similar charge to what there is in the Islington Market for market dues. The charges at Deptford are 6*d.* more for landing, wharfage, and lirage.

12936. Mr. Barclay.] Do you in that take into account the railway carriage from Thames Haven to the Metropolitan Market?—Yes, both charges are compared one to the other.

12937. Does that include the slaughter of animals at Deptford?—No, it does not include the slaughter; we only say now that we will bring the cattle to the Deptford Market to be sold, or to the Islington Market to be sold; the other expenses about the slaughter is a matter for the butchers.

12938. Mr. Clare Read.] Would you give the Committee the exact charges of the two markets?—

12939. Are you aware that there is a very considerable increase in the importation of dead meat from abroad?—Only at a certain time of the year.

12940. Are you aware that there was double the quantity imported in 1872 than there was in 1871?—I am not aware of it. I did not keep any record of it.

12941. But, if that was the case, would it not 0.5*l.*

in a measure compensate for the loss of the live animals of which you have so loudly complained?—If that amounted to the same amount of weight, of course it would compensate, but it does not.

12942. I see that in 1870 there were 334,000 cwt.; in 1872 there were 636,900 cwt. of fresh meat imported, so that the quantity was nearly doubled in the two years?—That is very likely; but then you see when the hot weather comes, you get none.

12943. But it was just as hot in 1870 as it was in 1872?—Supposing it could be done on a large scale, you would get a supply in cold weather, and in hot weather you could not get it.

12944. I see of pork, bacon, and hams the supply in 1871 was 1,388,000 cwt., and in 1872 2,215,000 cwt., being nearly doubled in one year?—That of course is quite out of my knowledge.

12945. Still it is animal food?—That would have nothing to do with this question, because it has nothing to do with restriction.

12946. I see that the live pigs have fallen off considerably, and that the dead pigs have increased?—That is so.

12947. Are there not a greater number of salesmen of live cattle now than there used to be?—Yes, there are a few more.

12948. That may in a measure account for the falling away of your trade, may it not?—I put my trade in merely incidentally, but I go by the whole; I show that the whole import is 75,000 less, and that from Germany alone we were 27,000 less last year than we were in 1869.

12949. I see that the total increase of the importations from abroad for the 12 weeks of the spring quarter was 19,622, as against the 13 weeks of last year; I find that out of this number there is a great increase of 11,622 from Denmark and Germany, where the restrictions prevail?—In Denmark the restrictions do not prevail.

12950. In Schleswig-Holstein then?—We do not get any in the spring time; we only commenced importing from Schleswig-Holstein on the 1st of July, and this is only the second week they have come; that trade commences on the 1st of July, and lasts until November.

12951. Is not it very early for the Tousing trade to begin in the first week of July?—No, they always begin this week, but this year they were short of grass, so they began last Monday, which is a week sooner than they generally do.

12952. The scarcity of grass may account for the large importation which we have had during the last two weeks?—Yes, but to-day the supply was a great deal less, and the price was 1*l.* to 2*l.* dearer than it was last Monday, because they have had rain, and they can keep the beasts.

12953. I suppose that is the case frequently in England?—Yes, our prices are ruled by supply, just the same as in any other market in the world.

12954. Are you aware that the price of beef in France is just as high as it is here?—That depends upon whether you are talking of France or of Paris.

12955. Take Paris for instance?—In Paris there is a duty upon it, but from certain parts of France

Mr. H. Gebhardt.

7 July 1873.

Mr. H.
Goldsmith.

7 July 1873.

Peace you get sheep every week, and you could get beasts from Normandy if you would let them come to the Metropolitan Market.

12956. How many cattle go to the Deptford Market now?—I have got that from the Customs; that is the largest information we have had this year. Last month I believe the number was 1,405. This is a Return of all the sheep and cattle landed at Deptford from the 3rd of June to the 30th of June. Oxen and bulls, 1,405; cows, mil, sheep and lambs, mil, swine and hogs, 55. That is the Customs Return, and previous to that, according to my books which I kept, in the first five months of this year there were 4,315 into Deptford.

12957. Does that last number include Schleswig-Holstein cattle?—They do not go there; we have not had any Schleswig-Holstein cattle at Deptford; they are coming by an Order in Council to the Islington Market. We have had none at Deptford but German beasts proper. Last month the number increased to 1,405, but you will always see that May and June are the principal times when stall-fed cattle come from Germany, because that is the time when they must get rid of them; they generally get rid of their stall-fed cattle when the grass-fed cattle begin, just as any other country would do.

12958. What you complain of is the uncertainty of the market, and that the Orders in Council change very much; that sometimes when you are in the swing of your trade, the animals might be confined to the Deptford Market?—They might.

12959. What would be the result if an Act of Parliament was passed that foreign cattle must be confined to the Deptford Market?—Then they would not come. When you have bought your cattle, if you have speculated for a market where you could get your competition, and then you are confined to a place where you must slaughter on the spot, and where the competition is more limited, you cannot prevent it then, but you can prevent it for the future, and that is the reason why the South Germans have not come. A man may go into a trap once, but he does not go there a second time if he can prevent it.

12960. But notwithstanding the uncertainty of these cattle going to Deptford, they have come here in larger quantities than they did?—But what is that; it is only about 400 beasts a week; what is that for a large country, it is only 1,400 beasts in four weeks.

12961. Mr. Dent.] Is that the whole German import at this time?—That is the whole German import at this time, except from Schleswig-Holstein; it is 350 beasts per week which we have received during this last month from Germany scheduled, and France does not send any.

12962. Mr. Clare Read.] I see that out of the 38,000 cattle which were imported last year, almost all of them went to the Metropolitan Cattle Market, and that 37,000 of them were Schleswig-Holstein?—Yes, they have no other market; the Order came upon them all of a sudden, and for three months they continued sending their supply as usual, and then they found other markets.

12963. Mr. Barclay.] They continued to send for three months under the restrictions?—Yes, they have continued all the season to send under the restrictions, because they had no other markets to go to.

12964. Mr. Ridley.] What other markets did they go to?—Some went to Berlin, where they never went before, and some went to the Rhine.

12965. Mr. Barclay.] You say those cattle are now finding their way to Berlin, where they never went before?—Last year when they had to go to Deptford, and the trade was very bad, they had to find different outlets.

12966. They sent them here for three months after the restrictions were put on, and then they stopped?—No, they did not stop, but they sent less.

12967. Then the supplies to Deptford began to decrease?—The supply to Deptford increased so much that we could not sell them, except at a disadvantage, and then the supply decreased; they went to other places.

12968. Such a state of things occasionally takes place with regard to home cattle, does not it?—I do not think you could call it the same state, because the home cattle are free to go where they like.

12969. Sometimes an over supply of home cattle is sent to the London market, and then for a week or two the farmers keep them back and feed them up, and do not send them to market?—Of course.

12970. Such motives influence the foreign trade as well, I suppose?—Ours was an exceptional case; the English farmer has an option, he can send where he likes.

12971. But I am asking for the facts just now, not about the explanation of them; the amount of supply will depend upon other circumstances besides simply price, will it not?—Yes.

12972. It will depend upon the supply of food which the farmer has for his cattle to a certain extent, will it not?—When a farmer has grass beasts he is bound to get rid of them before a certain time. He knows very well that if he keeps them longer than the middle or the end of November they will begin to waste, because a grass farmer has no convenience for them.

12973. Then the quantity which any country will send here would depend to a very considerable extent upon the amount of food which they have for their cattle at home, would it not, varying from month to month?—Yes.

12974. If the stock of cattle has been decreased in any country in one year, that would affect the supply from that country during the following year, would it not?—Yes, of course.

12975. And the supply of cattle to this country would also be influenced by the demand which there is from other countries upon the Continent; from France and from Germany, for example?—Yes.

12976. Did you formerly get cattle from Hanover?—Yes, we did.

12977. Is the price such as will allow you to import from Hanover now?—The animals did come every year as regularly as the other beasts came from Schleswig-Holstein; but when they had to be slaughtered at Deptford they would not come here because it would not pay, and they tried other sources where they could sell them; it is just the same with cattle as with goods. The people will go where they can get the best market.

12978. Then it is just coming to this point, that taking the price which can be fetched for these Hanoverian cattle, just now or recently, and the price which these cattle will fetch in the Deptford

Deptford Market, that is not a price sufficient to cover the expense of import and leave a profit?—That is so; they do not like a market where they do not get a fair value.

12979. Will they send their cattle to a market where they are sure of getting 10s. a head less than at Deptford, on account of that sentimental idea about fair value?—But they are not sure of that, because they know if they go to Deptford they go to the worst market.

12980. I do not know exactly what causes the difference of 1*l.*, or, as you say, 2*l.* per head, between the Deptford and the Metropolitan Market?—Because when you send them to the Metropolitan Market you have not got only all the London butchers to compete, but you have the country people to compete; but when you go to Deptford you only have a few large wholesale butchers to sell them to.

12981. Am I to understand that those wholesale butchers have from 1*l.* to 2*l.* per head more profit than those butchers who frequent the Metropolitan Market?—No, I do not say that, because I stated at the beginning of my evidence that a beast, particularly a grass-fed beast, being placed in a close shed, and kept in an unnatural state, will diminish in value, and in reality nobody gets the profit; it is a waste. A bullock which is sold upon the Monday for, say, 25*l.*, would not, I believe, be worth more than 23*l.* upon the Friday or Saturday, if the butcher could not dispose of him till then, so that in reality it is a waste to send cattle there.

12982. What is the necessity which prevents the bullock sold in Deptford Market on the Monday from being killed on the Tuesday or Wednesday?—Because most of the meat is sold at the end of the week. Many people in London do not get meat every day, but mostly everybody likes to have some meat on Sunday. In such weather as this, the butcher could not kill his beast before Friday, as the meat would not keep sound until Sunday, so that he is necessarily compelled to keep them alive in an atmosphere in which we are never free from foot and mouth disease, and where the animals are constantly sinking. I can get plenty of buyers to prove that they would sooner go and buy them in the Islington Market for 1*l.* a piece more than buy them here for 1*l.* a piece less.

12983. Supposing this foreign animal was sold in the Metropolitan Market, and had to be held over till Thursday or Friday, where would it be kept in the meantime?—Upon grass in the open air, where he would not sink but would recover from his journey.

12984. Are all the foreign cattle sent from the Monday to the Friday to the fields?—Yes; any butcher who can in any way find a field does not object to drive a horse miles to keep him in the open air. Many cattle go from the Metropolitan Market to Plaieston Marshes, and others go to Tottenham and Highgate.

12985. What took place at the time the cordon was in existence round London?—Then they took them off and did the best they could; they could not take them into the fields, except those fields which might lie within the cordon.

12986. Do the cattle suffer less in the butchers' own places than they do in the Deptford Market?—Now, if a butcher cannot get a field, he takes them to a place which is under his own care, and is not supposed to be so hot as when you put a great many beasts in one place, and he can look

after them; whereas when there are a lot of beasts crowded together, as they are at Deptford, it is impossible to do so.

12987. Do you complain of the Deptford sheds?—Yes, very much indeed.

12988. What is the matter with them?—I complain of them because they are not like cattle sheds; they are more like lathouses. When we had last year 2,000 or 3,000 beasts, and I do not know how many sheep at once, it was frightful.

12989. They are not sufficiently ventilated?—No, I do not think they are.

12990. That might be amended, might it not?—No, not when you keep a lot of animals in a small space. The animals are obliged to be tied up, and perhaps they are beasts which never had a rope round their necks.

12991. They are lofty sheds, are they not?—Yes, they are lofty, but if you should ever go down there when there are 2,000 or 3,000 beasts there, you would not find it very pleasant to be there half an hour; and I know that I have suffered so much when I have been there half a day that I have often declared that I would never go there any more.

12992. Is there any difference in the value of an animal kept at a butcher's own place until Thursday or Friday, and the same animal kept at the market until Thursday or Friday?—Yes, it would be in better condition if taken charge of in the butcher's private place; we were obliged to submit to that on account of the cattle plague. What we say is that we do not want any restrictions now.

12993. Are you assuming just now that all the butchers who buy at the Metropolitan Market have places of their own?—I should say that the majority of them have.

12994. Are you aware that the question of private slaughterhouses is under discussion with regard to being brought to a close?—That is a question for Parliament to decide. I say that it would be very injurious to the trade if private slaughterhouses were done away with; the loss would entirely fall upon the public, and I believe that that would be very injurious.

12995. Do you think that foot and mouth disease is injurious to cattle?—It is certainly objectionable.

12996. You are not in favour, I believe, of slaughtering animals which have been in the same cargo with animals affected with foot and mouth disease?—Certainly not; I think it is cruelty to kill the other beasts, because a few which are unsound have been in the same cargo.

12997. Is it cruelty to the animals?—It is cruelty to the owner in the destruction of his property.

12998. Was there a large market of foreign animals last week?—Yes, very large, I believe; I have not got the number.

12999. Did the prices fall considerably?—No; they did not fall considerably; we had a decline from a farthing to a halfpenny a pound from the week before, which was very dear.

13000. Is that 2*d.* per stone?—From 2*d.* to 4*d.* per 8*l*bs.

13001. What was the weight of those cattle which you sold this morning for 35*l.*?—I should say that they weighed very nearly 120 stone.

13002. That is 2*l.* a head at a difference of a halfpenny?—Yes, but we have recovered again. Last week the weather was against us; it is very rarely that we fluctuate in our market more than

Mr. H. Gublerd.

July 1873.

Mr. H.
Gickhardt.

7 July 1873

from 2 d. to 4 d. a cwt., because we have got the country buyers who take them away.

13003. Was there a fall in the Metropolitan Market?—Yes.

13004. There was difference of 2 l. a head in all cattle sold there?—Yes, from 1 l. to 2 l. per head.

13005. So that, in point of fact, you have as great fluctuations in the Metropolitan Market from week to week as there are occasionally in Deptford Market?—No, nothing like it.

13006. You told the Committee that there was a difference of 2 l. per head from week to week in the Deptford Market, and according to this case you say there are differences of 2 d. to 4 d. in the Metropolitan Market?—That is an exceptional case. I stated that it would be from 2 d. to 4 d., so that in many cases it would be only 10 s., but that is not so; I understand that in the Deptford Market they would always sell 2 l. less than in the Metropolitan Market.

13007. I understand you to say that every week in the Deptford Market they sell at 2 l. a head less than they do in the Metropolitan Market; assuming that an animal was going to be slaughtered on the Wednesday, and the butcher who buys that animal gets 2 l. more margin if he buys it in the Deptford Market than if he buys it in the Metropolitan Market?—Yes.

13008. Is that profit to him?—If he is lucky and kills the beast at once, and he is not overdone, I should say that the butcher makes the profit.

13009. If he can only kill the animal on the Wednesday?—Yes, if he can only kill it on the Wednesday. That is what I stated in the beginning of my examination; that butchers sometimes realise large profits, but at other times they cannot get a profit.

13010. Is not the dead meat trade an uncertain trade at this season of the year, under any circumstances?—Yes, no doubt.

13011. How long do the butchers keep the animals without anything before slaughtering them?—I must say that it would be a very silly butcher who did not feed the animals at once when he got them, and keep feeding them, so they would waste more than the food would cost.

13012. Do not the butchers keep the animals without food for a certain period before slaughtering them?—I am not aware that they do; I think they would be very silly if they did; I should not do so.

13013. Do you say that you would feed them up to the hour before they were slaughtered?—No; but if I were a butcher, and wanted to kill a beast to-morrow, I should certainly feed it to-night, and I believe you will find the majority of the butchers do so too.

13014. Your remarks about the difficulty with regard to Deptford Market apply especially to the hot weather, do they not?—No, they apply all the year round, because we have a confined trade; we can only sell our goods to go to a certain class of buyers.

13015. What buyers are they?—Only the carcass butchers in London; we miss the country buyers. Last Monday we sold 14,000 sheep in the market, and I guarantee that of that number 7,000 have been sold to go into the country.

13016. Are you aware that there is a quantity of dead meat coming from Aberdeen?—Yes, in cold weather.

13017. Is not there just now?—I think very little just now, and I doubt if there will be any if the weather continues like this.

13018. You stated that your remarks with regard to Deptford applied to it all the year round?—Yes.

13019. Would not the same disadvantage as applies to Deptford market in slaughtering and selling the carcasses apply to Aberdeen and the sending of the carcasses up here?—No, because a man in Aberdeen can choose his own time; if the weather is hot, he does not send, whereas now we have commenced the Schleswig-Holstein beast, we shall go on with about 1,500 to 2,000 beasts a week there, and it could not be done.

13020. I have taken your own statement that the same causes apply to Deptford all the year round?—I stated, that with regard to the buyers, it affects us all the year round.

13021. The point I wanted to bring out was this: that if there are Aberdeen butchers who kill their animals and send the carcasses up here, and that that trade is increasing as compared with sending up live animals to London, am I to infer from your statement that they lose from 1 l. to 2 l. as compared with sending them up alive?—You must not compare the two things, because it is colder at Aberdeen than it is here, and a man can choose his time; if it is hot weather he does not send the meat up at all.

13022. Where does he keep it?—He does not keep it; he sends it up alive.

13023. You told me that the same causes and effects applied all the year round?—I said that with regard to buyers; we have no country buyers, so that applies all the year round, and in summer we have an additional disadvantage; the meat will not keep, and it could not be sent away, so that we are in the hands of a certain class of men.

13024. I suppose those buyers would consider 10 s. a good profit all round?—I think they would be glad if they could get it.

13025. The disadvantage at Deptford is the killing of animals in hot weather, and that they will not keep over the Saturday night?—Yes, they must kill them at Deptford, whereas in a butcher's shop, the butcher kills his meat as late as he can for consumption; if he wants his meat for consumption on the Friday he kills it on the Thursday, and a great majority of the beasts are now killed on Friday for the Sunday's consumption.

13026. That applies to the summer, but take the case of earlier in the season or later in the season, do you say that a difference of from 1 l. to 2 l. per head exists between the Metropolitan and the Deptford Markets?—Yes.

13027. What is that due to?—That is due to the fact that we are in the hands of a certain class of buyers, and that therefore, not having competition, we cannot sell our beasts to the same advantage as we could sell the meat in a free market.

13028. You told me that from 10 s. to 1 l. a head was a handsome profit for a carcass butcher?—Yes.

13029. And that there was a profit of 1 l. to 2 l. a head in the Deptford Market; so that except in the hot weather, a butcher killing his cattle in the Deptford Market would make a profit of 2 l. per head, as compared with buying them at the Metropolitan Market?—Yes, because they would not have wasted so much if he killed them soon.

13030. If

Mr. H.
Guthardt.

7 Jul, 1873.

13030. If I bought animals on the Monday, and killed them on the following Wednesday, would they have wasted much?—No; the first two days they would not waste so much, but being confined in the market, and being kept in that place, they are subject to foot and mouth disease; I have found that when once an animal has been kept there for a long period, say from Monday to Friday, it gets foot and mouth disease, and wastes away to nothing.

13031. I am speaking of cattle killed upon the Wednesday; if they are killed before the summer season, or after it, on Wednesday, will they keep over till Saturday night?—In cold weather they would.

13032. Except in July and August there is a disadvantage in a man's buying his cattle in the Deptford Market; what is the disadvantage in the other seasons of the year?—The disadvantage is that there is not the same competition in the sale; there may be a class of animals which, if they were brought in a free market, another buyer would come and give more money for, whereas at this market a certain class of buyer exists, and the salesmen must submit to his price.

13033. I was asking what was the disadvantage to the buyer in the Deptford Market in the colder seasons of the year; if there is no disadvantage to the buyer at other seasons of the year, it follows that if he can make a profit of 1 l. to 2 l. a head at other seasons of the year, that profit must go into his pocket?—I believe I answered that question fully before, that if the market at Deptford is not overstocked, a man can dispose of his beasts, so that the buyer has the advantage; and, therefore, sometimes large profits are made by the buyers at Deptford, but the whole trade is so uncertain that very few men embark in it; if you say it is such a wonderfully fine business, why do not more butchers go there and buy.

13034. I suppose they are lively enough to find out where they can make an extra profit upon their animals?—Yes, but they did not know that before; if they knew that they could make 10 s. profit, they would soon come and buy.

13035. Will you explain to me any disadvantage which butchers buying at Deptford Market labour under, beyond what you have already stated, namely, that animals being kept there till Thursday or Friday lose so much per head?—Yes; the disadvantage is, that every butcher prefers to kill his beasts at his own slaughter-house; if all slaughter-houses are done away with, that advantage to butchers would cease, and it would be very injurious to the public; but, on the other hand, I believe the butcher is put to more inconvenience and expense, because he cannot rely upon a foreign supply; so he has to keep his own slaughter-house, and also to kill beasts at the public slaughter-house at Deptford, which he has to pay for. I believe the best proof of it is, that this system has been tried for 18 months now, and that it does not answer.

13036. The point of the examination is to ascertain where the difference of these 2 l. a head arises; what prejudices the animals to that extent?—I cannot explain it better than I have done.

13037. One disadvantage is that a butcher cannot take animals into his own slaughter-house, and the other is that the animals are liable to waste?—But you forget that our class of trade

is confined to a certain class of buyers; they are very suitable for the manufacturing class, and when we have a glut, we cannot sell them.

13038. I thought you made a remark that you had a very good market when you had the four millions of London to supply?—Yes; but under an existing misfortune like the cattle plague, we are very glad to submit to restrictions; but when there is no likelihood of cattle plague coming into the country, then I cannot see why the disadvantage should fall upon the consumers.

13039. You mentioned the disadvantages to the sellers; I want to know what are the disadvantages to the buyers, and why they cannot afford to give you as good a price at Deptford as they can in the Metropolitan Market?—I can give you no other reason than that beasts diminish in value more there than at any other place.

13040. If they are kept there till the Thursday?—But a man does not kill all his beasts upon one day; if a man shows a carcass for two or three days it gets hard and dry, and if a butcher buys a lot of beasts, even in cold weather, he only kills them from day to day as he requires them; he does not kill them all at once.

13041. Is there any other disadvantage which butchers labour under at Deptford in purchasing?—I do not know anything further than I have stated already; the butchers do not like to go there, they labour under those disadvantages. I believe very few butchers would like to have their animals killed at Deptford.

13042. But if you supposed that a carcass-broker could buy at from 10 s. to 1 l. a head cheaper at Deptford, he would be very glad to go there, would he not?—If he knew that he would be under no disadvantage, and that he would make the profit, he would go there; but then the disadvantage would be that if the sender found he could not get his price, he would not send the animals there; he would find other channels for them.

13043. What other channels would the animals be sent to, instead of being sent here?—To answer that question in a very general way, I should say that a great many beasts which used to come here are now consumed in different towns upon the Rhine; other beasts, perhaps, go to other parts of the country. I could not say where.

13044. What towns would they go to?—Cologne, Mayence, Cassel, Dusseldorf, and Berlin. Those beasts which would have come here from the southern countries they consume at home.

13045. I suppose you know that foot and mouth disease is a very infectious disease?—I know it is.

13046. And I suppose that if you had foot and mouth disease in a cargo amongst other animals, you would consider there was considerable risk of its spreading all over the cargo?—If they are kept in a place together, I suppose there would be a risk, but if they are disposed of at once, I do not see that there is any risk.

13047. You say that you want these cattle to go to the Metropolitan Market?—Yes, I do.

13048. And you want them to go to the Metropolitan Market in order that they may be sent to Flaxton Marshes, or some other places out of town?—If a butcher bought a beast with foot and mouth disease he would not send him to the marshes; he would kill it at once at his own house; and would sell it, as he would be doing

Mr. H.
Gibberd.

7 July 1873.

doing great injury to himself to keep that animal alive.

13049. The cattle come here and are landed and go to the market, do they not?—The animals go to the market, and if any of them show signs of foot and mouth disease, the inspector orders them to be slaughtered at the market slaughter-house.

13050. As regards the rest of the animals, what are they done with?—The rest of the animals are bought by butchers and taken to the various slaughter-houses in London, or if they go into the country they go by rail to the various butchers; they do not actually come in contact with other beasts.

13051. But I understood that one of the great advantages of selling in the Metropolitan Market was, that the butchers could send foreign cattle out into the fields in the country?—Yes.

13052. Now if part of the animals of this cargo are sent into the country, you would hardly deny that there is considerable risk of their taking the disease into the country?—But you are assuming a thing which happily is not the fact, because we do not get foot and mouth disease in those beasts which come from great countries; we have not had a single case this year, or even last year, and with regard to stalled beasts they are taken to sheds.

13053. If there is no foot and mouth disease in the cargo, are the animals slaughtered?—No, certainly not.

13054. Of what point is your answer to my question?—I do not exactly understand what you mean.

13055. I was assuming the case of a cargo of animals arriving here and some of them being affected with foot and mouth disease, and that you slaughtered some of those affected with the disease at Thames Haven, and sent the rest up at the Metropolitan Market: if there is another animal which happens to take the disease there it is taken away and slaughtered?—Yes.

13056. And the rest of the animals may be taken to butchers' slaughterhouses all over the country?—Yes.

13057. To any part of the country?—Yes, to any part near London where they have fields.

13058. Cannot they be sent to any part of the kingdom?—Yes, they can.

13059. Do you think there is any risk of the disease being spread by those animals taking the disease along with them?—I stated in the beginning of my examination that I wished that store cattle should not be brought with fat cattle; there is a law that fat cattle must be killed within 10 days, and it is not likely that a butcher would spread them over the country; he would take them to the slaughter-house and kill them.

13060. Are those animals which the butchers send out of London into the country in the neighbourhood of London kept carefully separated from other animals, milk cows, and some store animals?—I am not aware that there are many store cattle kept near London, but certainly a man who had store cattle would not allow a butcher to put his cattle among them; there is a general law that every person takes care of his own fence.

13061. Would a fence keep out foot and mouth disease?—If there is only a post and rail fence a bullock might lick over upon the other side and that fence would not keep out the disease, but where there are good hedges or dykes as there

are in the marshes I do not think it would be carried.

13062. But your proposal is to allow those cattle to go to the Metropolitan Market, and then let them be sent down to the country, would you have any control over those cattle when they are sent down into the country?—No, but my examination upon this point is quite useless, as I think that any legislation with regard to foot and mouth disease is quite unnecessary.

13063. Do you go so far as to say that the slaughter of those animals affected with foot and mouth disease at the wharf is useless?—No, I think not; I think that if an animal is in a state of disease he should be disposed of there and then, and the others should go free as they are only for slaughter, and each man for his own interest would dispose of them as soon as he could. Every man wants to turn his capital over; they are only bought for the supply of meat for the week; a man does not go to market generally to buy more than is wanted for one week's supply.

13064. I daresay you would be very glad to get the balance of a cargo wherein foot and mouth disease had existed off your hands upon the same day?—It would not matter to me very much, because I get the same commission whether the animals have foot and mouth disease or not.

13065. Is it no consequence to you what your consignee gets for his animals?—Yes; but as I am under the law I must submit to it.

13066. The question I started with was did you would be anxious to get those beasts off your hands that day?—Yes, we always do; we always sell them the same day.

13067. Would there be any chance of fat and mouth disease breaking out among those animals that day?—Yes, there might be.

13068. Mr. Tipping.] I believe you mean to imply that the reason of the great reduction of the import of Dutch and German cattle is that the price of cattle here discourages such export?—Yes.

13069. It answers the purpose of the Germans better to send to their own large towns than to submit to the one or two pounds' reduction of price, which you maintain is the result of sending to Deptford market?—That is so.

13070. You were saying that we got no Norman cattle now?—No, we do not.

13071. I suppose you will admit that out of England there is no better meat than the Norman meat?—I stated so before.

13072. I suppose London would compete with Paris at once, supposing that the Norman producers could send equally to London as they can to Paris, as regards restrictions; it is the difference of restrictions between London and Paris which stops the trade, and Paris has the advantage in that respect?—Yes, they would prefer England, I believe, because they are a class of animals more suitable for the English market than for the French.

13073. Being fatter?—Yes, being fatter.

13074. Is it not the fact, that the restrictions in France as against foreign cattle, any German for instance, are equally severe with our English laws?—I believe they are; I believe in France when there is disease in an adjoining country, they are very severe; but when the disease has disappeared, and when they get an assurance of that Government that they are free, the restrictions

7 July 1878

beasts are taken off. I believe there are no restrictions now upon the export of cattle from Germany to France.

13075. Mr. Jacob Bright.] When was Schleswig-Holstein unscheduled?—By the last Order in Council, we have been allowed to get those beasts in since last Monday.

13076. Until then Schleswig-Holstein was scheduled?—Yes.

13077. And the cattle coming from that country were compelled to be slaughtered at the port, were they not?—Yes.

13078. Has the removal of Schleswig-Holstein from the schedule had any consequences agreeable or disagreeable to people connected with the cattle trade?—Very satisfactory, because they have sent their cattle as usual, only, owing to the dry weather, they have sent more than they would have done otherwise.

13079. Is everybody connected with the trade pleased with the change that has taken place?—I have not seen anybody who is not highly pleased; the butchers particularly, and the graziers, I believe, only I have not seen any graziers on the subject; but I believe they are pleased, because they have a fair chance again. I have stated that I sold animals of the value of 35 l. each to-day; those were cows which I sent over as calves; they had been kept several years there breeding, and they went to-day to a butcher at Aylesbury; I would guarantee that 2 l. would not cover the difference of those cows at Deptford. I do not believe that they would have sold for more than 28 l. to any carcass-man at Deptford; it is in the very best meat that we suffer the most.

13080. Mr. Clare Read.] Is cow beef the best meat?—No; but they are the best class of meat, having been fattened, and being English bred.

13081. Mr. Jacob Bright.] There is very great satisfaction upon the part of everybody connected with the trade that those cattle are now admitted, is there not?—Yes; that is so.

13082. As a rule, people are only very much satisfied when something happens to their advantage?—Yes; that is so.

13083. Therefore, I must suppose that it is to the advantage of everybody connected with the trade that those cattle should be free?—Yes; I may say this, that when we sent a petition to Parliament sometime ago, to let the Schleswig-Holstein cattle come free again you would find that almost all the buyers who used to buy the beast at Deptford signed that petition to have them back again to the market.

13084. If Schleswig-Holstein had from any cause to be scheduled again, it would be regarded as a calamity by those people, would it not?—Yes; by the vendors and the butchers.

13085. Mr. Clare Read.] When were the Schleswig-Holstein cattle first admitted into the market; was it this day week?—Yes.

13086. In consequence of such large numbers going there, the price fell considerably; from 2 d. to 4 d. per 8 lbs., did it not?—We are always guided in the live market by the previous week's dead-meat market, and by the supply, and the weather. It happened that the meat market finished badly on Saturday, and the supply was larger than usual; and we had an immense number of Spanish beasts and Tenning beasts, and a day of rainy weather which caused a fall of a halfpenny a pound.

13087. This week you have not had so large a
0.58.

supply of foreign beasts by a good deal?—I believe there have been 500 less this week.

13088. Owing to their being 500 less, the prices have risen from 2 d. to 4 d. a stone?—I have not seen the figures, but I believe it was 500 less.

13089. So that having a large number of foreigners last week, and a smaller supply to-day, the prices have varied something like from 2 d. to 4 d. per stone?—Yes, they have.

13090. When you have a very large supply, you telegraph to the people not to send you for a week or two, do you not?—No, we leave them very much to themselves; because when they send to a place like London, it is impossible to say what the price will be any day.

13091. Do you send the prices to them?—No, only to the large dealers. I sell beasts belonging, perhaps, to 70 or 80 people; they are farmers; it is only when a man jobs largely, which is not done much in Schleswig-Holstein, that we telegraph the prices.

13092. What do the London butchers do with the cattle which they buy in the six months of the winter market?—Most butchers, who have private slaughterhouses, have a convenient shed adjoining to keep them in.

13093. Are not many kept in the lairs of the Metropolitan Market?—Yes, some of them are; but they are not very fond of it, because at some times of the year the place has been affected with foot and mouth disease, and if a butcher buys a healthy bullock, he is not very fond of putting it into a place where he thinks it will get the disease.

13094. If he takes a bullock into his own slaughterhouse and he shows any symptoms of disease he would kill him at once, would he not?—Yes, he buys him healthy and he likes to keep him healthy; the moment he gets foot and mouth disease the animal begins to waste.

13095. Why is foot and mouth disease always present at the Deptford Market?—Because the place is never clean; the beasts get foot and mouth disease by having to travel, and then they are kept in this place; why it is so I cannot tell you.

13096. But foreign cattle do not travel a yard in England, therefore the disease must be imported from abroad?—No, the animals come here sound, and then they get it while they are waiting there. If you sent your beasts from Norfolk and they are kept there from Monday to Thursday, they would have foot and mouth disease, a great many of them.

13097. I suppose the Norfolk cattle could not take the disease to the Deptford Market?—They could not get the disease there because they never went there.

13098. Where do they get the disease from?—I cannot tell. I do not know how it got to my farm, where I never had any imported cattle near; you cannot tell where it comes from in many cases.

13099. Have you ever known cases of foot and mouth disease breaking out when it has not been in the neighbourhood?—It was not in the neighbourhood of my farm. I had very valuable pedigree stock on it, and I took great precautions to prevent its coming there.

13100. Do not you think you might have brought the disease yourself from the foreign market?—I would not go there. I would not allow any of my drovers to go there, and I did not go there myself except a few days afterwards,
after

Mr. H.
Gibbard.

7 July 1873.

after I had changed my clothes, because I do not go home in my market clothes.

13101. Mr. Dent.] Do you import Dutch cattle?—No.

13102. The quantity is decreasing, is it not?—Yes, it is; but I am not well informed about Dutch cattle, so as to be able to say whether they breed less, or whether they sell larger quantities to Belgium, because Belgium sends no cattle at present. We had in former years some cattle from Belgium, but they came by transit, and they were entirely German cattle; a great number came from Germany, because Italy and Russia do not send any.

13103. I see that the high prices during the spring quarter this year have brought nearly 6,000 more German cattle to London this year in 12 weeks than in the 15 weeks of the spring quarter last year?—That does not agree with my figures; I have a statement this year of the cattle coming to Deptford.

13104. I am speaking of the last spring quarter, from April 5th to June 21st; I make the number 11,368, and last year 5,474, as the number of German cattle imported into the country; I am not speaking of the Deptford Market only; I am not speaking of the Depified Market only; if they are slaughtered they are slaughtered at other ports; that shows that in spite of the restrictions, the high price is bringing an increased import, and that it is more than double what it was in the corresponding period of last year?—Yes, that seems to be so.

13105. The number from Denmark is 12,543 this year as against 6,815 last year?—That is double.

13106. Then Germany has more than doubled,

therefore the same cause, the high price, has doubled the import in the case where there is restriction, as compared with the case where there was no restriction?—But you must bear in mind that Denmark has exported some. Denmark is a small country, but if Germany had the same freedom as Denmark the figures would be quite different.

13107. But I find that Holland, with a perfect freedom of import, is decreasing its import at the same time, in spite of the high prices, therefore may not the same causes draw the Germans as well as the Dutch cattle away from the English market?—I am not aware so well about the Dutch cattle, whether they breed less or not, because they have not quite recovered from the cattle plague.

13108. Is it not possible that they are sending into Belgium, and into France?—I do not know that; it has been stated that the French import cattle.

13109. Has France so far recovered from the ravages of the war as to be enabled to export fat cattle?—From certain provinces; from Normandy they export every year.

13110. Mr. Clare Read.] Is there any truth in the report that pleuro-pneumonia existed amongst the Teutonic cattle last week?—I have not heard that report.

13111. You have not heard that the lutechers have said some of the cattle were infected?—This is the first time I have heard it.

13112. Was there much foot and mouth disease in Germany in the spring of 1872?—I believe there was.

Thursday, 10th July 1873.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mr. James Bazelay.
Mr. Jacob Bright.
Mr. Cawley.
Mr. Clay.
Mr. Dent.
Mr. Kavanagh.

Mr. Leak.
Mr. Monseil.
Mr. O'Connor.
Mr. Pell.
Mr. Clare Read.
Mr. Tipping.

CLARE SEWELL READ, Esq., IN THE CHAIR.

Mr. GEORGE CHRISTOPHER ROBERTS, called in; and Examined.

13113. Mr. Clay.] ARE you the Town Clerk of Hull?—I am.

13114. How long have you held that office?—About two years and a half.

13115. In virtue of that office you are the clerk to the local authority?—I am.

13116. Before becoming the Town Clerk were you an active member of the corporation?—I was for some 10 years.

13117. And a member of the Cattle Plague Committee?—I was a member of the Cattle Plague Committee from its formation.

13118. What inspection is there at Hull of imported foreign cattle?—In the first place there is an inspector appointed by the Veterinary Department of the Privy Council, who inspects cattle previously to landing, and there is also a local inspector, for the local inspection of cattle.

13119. What lairs and sheds are provided at the port for the accommodation of the cattle?—There are lairs provided by the corporation for the scheduled cattle, and there are lairs provided by the Dock Company for unscheduled cattle.

13120. Were the lairs specially constructed to meet the requirements of the Privy Council?—Yes, those of the corporation; and subsequently those of the dock company.

13121. At what expense to the corporation?—The lairs of the corporation were built at an expense of about 9,000 £.

13122. Do you know what, or whereabouts, was the expense to the dock company of their lairs?—No; they being a private company, I have no means of stating the expense, but I can state the extent of their lairs.

13123. By whom was the position of the corporation lairs selected?—By the Lord Lieutenant; Lord Wenlock had some communication from the Privy Council, but whether it was in consequence of such communication or not I do not know, but certainly he came down to Hull with the view to making the selection of some place for foreign cattle. I was one of the deputation which accompanied him through the town, and he ultimately selected the site which is now in use as the site for the lairs for foreign cattle.

13124. Are these lairs suitable and quite sufficient?

13125. Of course they are within the defined area?—Yes.

13126. What accommodation is there for the slaughter of cattle?—The slaughter of the cattle takes place at slaughterhouses in part of the defined area which were not constructed solely with the view to the slaughter of foreign cattle, but being in the defined district they are now confined to such purposes, and there are 24 such slaughterhouses, very large and commodious, and suitable in every respect.

13127. Are they amply sufficient for that purpose?—Yes, they are amply sufficient.

13128. What is about the value of these slaughterhouses?—About 15,000 £ was the value of these slaughterhouses, and many of them have been greatly enlarged and improved in consequence of their being adapted for foreign cattle.

13129. Then, altogether, the value of the lairs and slaughterhouses is how much?—It would be in round figures about 25,000 £, that is exclusive of the sheds provided by the dock company.

13130. Are the sheds provided by the dock company also sufficient for their business?—Yes; I have never heard of a complaint since May 1871, with regard to the matter; and that complaint simply arose from the circumstance that it was a new dock. As you are aware the Albert Dock had not been opened very long, and these sheds had not been completed at the time that complaint was made.

13131. You never heard but one complaint?—No.

13132. Are you alluding to a complaint made by Mr. Freeman, the local inspector?—There were no complaints made by any one of the want of sufficient sheds.

13133. Was not there a complaint made by Mr. Freeman, the inspector?—That was the complaint I alluded to, in May 1871.

13134. What was that complaint, and how much foundation was there for it?—The complaint made by Freeman was this, "We are in a very awkward fix here; the defined part of the port

Mr. G. C. Roberts.

10 July 1873.

Mr. G.
C. Roberts.
10 July
1873.

port does not allow cattle to come away from the Albert Dock, after having been landed, except by trespassing over a score lines of rail, at great hazard of their lives; besides this, we have no place of landing for cattle coming out of Lincolnshire except in a defined part; consequently, the law is constantly being broken. Can anything be done in the way of alteration of the boundary, the pier taken out, and a road from it, and also a road from the Albert Dock to the English Cattle Market, Edward's-place?—Yours most obediently, James Freeman. It is addressed to Dr. Alexander Williams.—“P.S. We have no cover at the docks, rain, snow, or blow, for the 12 hours; nothing except a few pens, without any troughs being fixed for drinking; we must have some provision made. Six ships landed their cattle and sheep yesterday; not half convenience.”

13135. That was before the dock company were in a position to construct these lairs?—Before they had completed them. My answer to the complaint was this, if I may mention this to the Committee: “The cattle landed at the Albert Dock are cattle from the Netherlands, and from inquiries I have made I find that when landed they pass to the west end of the dock, and thence by a private entrance of the dock company to the public streets; but, in doing so, they do not touch, or in any way come near, or in contact, with the defined part of the borough; to pass, however, the cattle have to cross the North Eastern Railway, but for the purpose there exists no proper crossing. Under the Hull Dock Act, 1861, the dock company are required to make a road from the Albert Dock to Neptune-street, which would be the proper course for the cattle to travel; but questions have been raised between them and the railway company, as to who is to make and maintain the crossing over the company's railway, and this has brought the matter of the crossing to a dead lock. Mr. Alderman Bannister (the chairman of our Cattle Plague Committee) and myself yesterday waited on the secretary of the dock company, in reference to this matter, and I wrote to the railway company a letter, of which I enclose a copy. There is, doubtless, much inconvenience arising from want of a proper crossing over the railway; but it is no way involves any breach of the Orders of the Privy Council, and I trust you will see the local authority here is doing all they can to remove the inconveniences. I have to-day sent copy of your letter to the secretaries of the dock company and railway company. With reference to the transit of English cattle between the East Riding and Lincolnshire, you are aware it has already received the attention of the local authority here, as I wrote you thereon on the 25th ultimo, and urged an alteration of the defined limit in the borough; but I regret the Lords of the Privy Council were unable to comply with the request. The local authority here are anxious to do all in their power at once to facilitate trade and to comply with the Orders in Council. To meet the complaints made some change must be effected, and, as it appears to our committee, this may be best effected if a Government Inspector were sent down to examine and report to you on the matter; I have to request you will be good enough to depute an inspector to visit Hull for that purpose, and, if such course is necessary, our committee will bear the expense attending

the inspection. I shall be glad to find that you will sanction this course, and shall feel obliged if you will inform us when the inspector may be expected here.”

13136. You made an offer to the Department to pay for any expenses of the inspector, if they thought it right to send an inspector down?—Yes.

13137. Did they do so?—No, they declined to send an inspector down.

13138. Was your natural inference from that that they were satisfied with the explanation which your letter had given?—Yes, I never heard anything more of that complaint.

13139. There was another somewhat serious complaint made by Professor Brown. In answer to Question 1913, he said, “I made an inspection of the cattle market, which is outside the defined area, and I saw there some fifty German cattle, with broad arrows marked upon their quarters in the usual way. I inquired as to the cause of this, and I was told by an officer of the local authority, that it was the custom, when there was no room for the animals in the defined part, to take them to the cattle market, in order that they might be kept until there was room, or until the butcher came to fetch them.” Can you give the Committee any explanation of that?—Professor Brown came to Hull upon the 18th of June 1871, and I think he has an imperfect recollection of what occurred. The facts were these, that as it was his first inspection after my being appointed as town clerk, I accompanied him round the defined area, and at the cattle market there formerly was a part considered the foreign cattle market, and a part considered the English cattle market; the foreign cattle market was not at that time to any extent used, and it appears that the officer of the Customs and our own local inspector were under the impression that the foreign cattle part might be used for foreign cattle which had been kept for a limited time, and were to be taken away for slaughter; there were about half-a-dozen of them. The Professor is in error in saying that there were about 50, and when that was pointed out to me, I gave strict injunctions that nothing of the kind should occur again, and nothing of the kind has occurred since.

13140. Do you know whether it had occurred upon several occasions before, or was it only upon this occasion?—I think it had occurred before; the officers were under the impression that this was still a part of the defined area; I believe they were under some mistake about it.

13141. Nothing of the kind has occurred for two years past?—Nothing of the kind.

13142. When was the defined part first settled?—By an Order in Council, on the 1st of August 1869.

13143. And by whom was it selected?—I believe the area was determined on by Professor Brown, and recommended by him to the Privy Council.

13144. Have you got any plans with you which will show that?—Yes, I have (*producing the same*).

13145. This was the original area (*pointing to the plan*)?—Yes.

13146. And there have been several alterations since?—Yes.

13147. How many alterations have there been?—There have been three alterations since.

13148. Have

18148. Have all these alterations been in the sense of diminishing the area?—Yes.

18149. Chiefly with the view of having it more properly guarded?—Yes.

18150. How often have the limits of the area been altered since?—Three times, on the 15th February 1870, on the 5th August 1871, and on the 20th December 1871.

18151. In this area (the first defined area) the cattle market in Edward-street was included, was it not?—In the area as first defined it was.

18152. At that time cattle plague was prevalent in the country?—The cattle plague was prevalent then.

18153. During that time, where was the cattle market held?—In a field called the Corporation Field. (The same was pointed out.)

18154. That was for English cattle only?—Yes, for English cattle only; there was no foreign cattle market at that time.

18155. When was the next alteration made; I think it was in February 1870 you said?—In February 1870. The farmers attending the market to the number of about 500 presented a memorial to the local authority, with the view of having the market altered, in consequence of the great inconvenience arising from its then situation; that memorial was communicated to the Privy Council, and in consequence the area was altered so as to exclude the cattle market from the defined area.

18156. But at the time when that memorial was forwarded to the Privy Council, did they not make some objection to the alteration which was proposed, unless there was some further alteration of the defined area?—No, not at that time, I think.

18157. When was that?—That was in 1871; in consequence of the complaint which Mr. Freeman had made in May 1871, we requested that some alteration might be made, so as to allow cattle to be transhipped between Lincolnshire and the East Riding, and upon that the department wrote to say that they could not sanction any such alteration, and the only remedy appeared to be to reduce the area of the defined part.

18158. Then that reduction of the area first originated with the department?—That reduction certainly did. I subsequently saw Dr. Williams in town, and had some conversation with him, and he very strongly urged upon me the reduction of the area, going so far as to say, that unless something was done in that direction the importation of cattle into Hull would cease. I brought that under the attention of the local committee, and they directed me to take steps with the view to give effect to that suggestion, and accordingly a reduced defined area was submitted to the Privy Council.

18159. Then all the alterations made in the defined area were at the suggestion of the department, and not at the suggestion of the local authority?—The one I first referred to was merely at the instance of people frequenting the market; the farmers, and others. It was submitted to the department, and they approved of it. This reduction was at the suggestion of the department.

18160. No one of the alterations had been suggested by the local authority?—They did not originate with the local authority.

18161. But the alterations have been carried out with the sanction of the department?—When

the alteration of the defined area in 1871 was submitted to the Privy Council, the department wrote saying that they recognised the fact that the local authority had done what they possibly could to meet the matter; but they then suggested that the area should be entirely changed, and that instead of its being in this part of the town, it should be taken eastward to this spot (pointing to the Plans).

18162. Were there any objections to that?—Most serious objections. First of all, it would have involved the sacrifice of the money which had already been laid out to meet the exigencies of the trade, and would have entailed upon the town, even if the land could have been procured, a very large expense indeed in building new lairs and slaughterhouses upon the new defined area; and when we applied to the Commissioners of Woods and Forests, who were the owners of that land, to purchase it, they asked us a sum of 6 £ a yard. We wanted six acres, and in addition to that, for the purposes of landing, it would have been necessary to have had a pier taken out into the river, and I am satisfied that that would have been strongly objected to, on account of its interference with the navigation.

18163. Did you convince the department that this scheme was practically impossible?—I wrote very fully upon the subject, and came up and saw Dr. Williams, and subsequently we had an interview with the Lord President, and the matter was then fully discussed, and the project was entirely abandoned. We then reverted to the proposition of reducing the area, and the area which was suggested was submitted to the Vice-President for consideration, and was ultimately adopted, subject to our submitting to certain pledges and guarantees, with a view to properly guarding it.

18164. Can you tell me what these pledges and guarantees were?—Yes; perhaps the Committee will excuse me if I read from a letter the exact pledge which was given; it is not very long.

18165. Mr. Cawley.] It was a matter of difference between you and the department as to arrangement?—Yes.

18166. Chairman.] It appears that you rectified all you possibly could?—I am only anxious to have it clear upon the notes, as there are very strong statements upon the notes already.

18167. Mr. Clay.] You entered into certain guarantees; do not read them at length, but tell us what they were?—The guarantees were that we would appoint certain policemen to guard the place day and night, and that certain barriers should be erected for the purpose of preventing the cattle passing in certain places from the defined to the undefined parts.

18168. Have those guarantees been faithfully observed?—Yes; they were accepted as satisfactory by the Department and have been strictly observed.

18169. Have you prosecuted any persons for attempts to evade the Orders of Council or the provisions of the Act?—I represented to the local committee what had taken place between the Lord President and myself, and the other gentlemen who accompanied me upon that occasion, and stated that we had given a pledge that the regulations should be strictly enforced in Hull, and they gave me *carte blanche* to act upon that occasion; and up to this time, wherever a

Mr. G.
C. Roberts.
—
10 July
1873.

Mr. G.
C. Roberts.
10 July
1873.

case justified an information, an information has been laid, and the parties prosecuted, but I should state that no case has occurred of passing foreign cattle beyond the defined area; the cases which have arisen have been cases of English cattle being driven through and attempted to be taken out of the defined area, but there have been no cases of foreign cattle being taken out of it.

13170. Professor Brown says that the defined part is not bounded by any positive line, but by merely imaginary lines drawn along the streets, and that the animals are obliged to travel a long distance, and so on; is there anything different in the defined area in Hull from the defined areas in other ports?—I have inspected all the Orders in Council as to the defined parts in other ports where foreign cattle are imported, and I see no difference; the boundaries are in most cases streets, and these are well defined parts.

13171. Liverpool, Newcastle, Dover, Leith, and Middlesbrough, for example?—Yes, these are all defined by streets.

13172. *Chairman.* Are you not aware that the Privy Council have from time to time complained of all those ports?—I am not aware; we have had no complaint ourselves, except the complaints which I have mentioned.

13173. Mr. Clay.] Is the area at Hull now, at any rate, so well defined that it can be effectually guarded?—I think, generally, it is thoroughly guarded; physically of course you cannot absolutely guard a place, but it is guarded as well as a place so defined can be.

13174. Professor Brown stated that he should like to go back to the first defined area upon the map; is it your opinion that that would be desirable?—I think it would be very undesirable indeed, for the boundary of that area as first defined is about 4,500 yards long; the present area, as the Committee will see, is much smaller; it is not 2,000 yards long, and therefore is more easy to watch and guard; and then, in addition to that, all the cattle from Holderness and that district, going to the market, would pass along the two sides of the defined area as there defined; now they do not go near it except in passing to the market.

13175. Professor Brown, at Question 3222, suggests that a now defined area might be provided at one end of the promenade; that is in the Albert Dock; that is what you were speaking of just now?—The Albert Dock is to the west of the town, and extends to the western boundary of the town, so that, first of all, there is this place interlocked with railways and other things, which would make it very inconvenient; but our simple answer would be, that we should have no objection to it, as it would relieve us by taking the affair outside the boundary of the borough, and we should have no control whatever over it; it would be in the East Riding.

13176. Now, will you describe to me the present cattle market, because it has been said that it is not sufficiently isolated; what is the distance between the two markets, it was put as 200 yards?—I think as the crow flies, it is about 300 yards, but the actual distance you have to travel is about 500 yards.

13177. As a temporary expedient, the English cattle market was held in the Corporation Field?—It was.

13178. Is there any objection, and what, to its being a permanent market?—The situation ren-

ders it very undesirable that the field should be used; and you have the fact, that when it was used, the parties using it complained of it. But in addition to that, there are various public institutions in the immediate vicinity; there is the College, the Sailors' Orphan Home, and two Volunteer Barracks; and there are large railway extensions in that direction, so that it could not be looked to as at all affording a prospect of a permanent market there, and considerable residential property would be deteriorated by holding the market there.

13179. Do you suppose that if there was any reasonable apprehension of an outbreak of cattle plague, as a temporary expedient the Corporation would agree for a market to be held in the Corporation Field?—I can only say this, that judging from past experience, the Corporation have always shown an extreme willingness to do anything which has been suggested by the department, and I have no reason to suppose that they would not meet the wishes of the department as far as practicable in the future.

13180. Mr. Jenkins, in his evidence, says, that the market is only separated from the defined part by a comparatively narrow street; is that so?—It is a street about 50 feet wide, but Mr. Jenkins himself suggests as a remedy, that there should be a well-defined wall. Now, at the place he speaks of, there does exist such a wall, and no communication could take place from outside the defined area with the market from that quarter.

13181. What is the height of this wall?—The ground is uneven, and upon the market side it is from four to six feet lower than upon the dock side of the wall. Upon the dock side, I should think it would be from about five to six feet, so that it is about from 10 to 12 feet upon the market side, but if there is the slightest objection to that, I think it can easily be remedied by taking all this part (*pointing to the Plan*) out of the defined area, and there would be no difficulty in doing so.

13182. There would be no risk on account of its proximity?—It would remove that objection by the distance by which the defined area would be reduced, namely, about 500 or 600 yards.

13183. It has been stated that the foreign hirs are within about 100 yards of the Cattle Market; is that so?—I have already explained that.

13184. Mr. Cowley.] It is 200 yards in a direct line, and the way you would have to travel would be about 260 to 300 yards?—I went through it roughly the other day, and I think it would be about 300 to 400 yards by the way you would have to traverse.

13185. Mr. Clay.] I will ask you a few questions with regard to the arrival of the "Joseph Somes;" when did you first hear of her arrival at Hull?—I first heard of her arrival on Saturday, the 27th of June.

13186. When did she arrive?—She had arrived on Wednesday, the 24th of June.

13187. Had you any knowledge, official or unofficial, that diseased cattle were on board the "Joseph Somes" before the 27th?—None whatever, until, on the morning of the 27th, I accidentally saw Professor Brown at the railway station; he has explained the matter to the Committee, and we agree substantially with reference to what occurred; he mentioned the matter to me and said the local authority would have to do something, and I asked him how it

was

was he had not let me know about it before; he said that Mr. Freeman, the inspector, knew of it. I have since inquired, and found that Professor Brown was mistaken about that, and then I told him that whatever Mr. Freeman could legally do would be carried out, but the arrangements with regard to the "Joseph Somes" were made by the department, and carried out by our local inspector under their directions.

13188. When does the operation of the local authority begin?—Not until after the cattle are landed.

13189. And until that time with whom does it rest?—With the Customs authority; and if the Customs had exercised the power given them by the 19th Article of the Order, no difficulty ought to have arisen. The 19th Article is, "Where it appears to the principal officer of Her Majesty's Customs at a port, with respect to any foreign animal (including a horse or other animal not within the definition of animals in the Act of 1869), or any hay, straw, fodder, or other article brought by sea to the port, that contagion or infection may be thereby conveyed to animals, he may seize and detain the same; and he shall forthwith report the facts to the Commissioners of Her Majesty's Customs, who may give such directions as they think fit, either for the slaughter or destruction or the further detention thereof, or for the restoration thereof to the owner, on such conditions, if any (including payment by the owner of expenses incurred by them in respect of detention thereof), as they think fit." If that order had been enforced by the Customs, certainly no question could have arisen with reference to whether the contagion had been spread by that cargo or not.

13190. Who is responsible for the vessel having come into the docks at all with infected cattle on board?—The Customs. I believe the veterinary inspector's duty does not begin until the cattle are landed. I refer to the inspector of the department, but the Customs authorities had full power to deal with the matter.

13191. How could this have been prevented?—So far as the local authorities are concerned, they were perfectly powerless. They could not have interfered with a vessel in the roads of the river.

13192. Supposing the vessel had been boarded in the river?—The Customs officers board the vessels in the river; and, as the sanitary authority, whenever we have any apprehension of cholera or other contagious disease arriving, our medical officer does the same.

13193. Is it the case, that formerly the inspector boarded the vessel before it entered the docks?—My impression is, I cannot speak positively to the fact, that when Mr. Freeman was the local inspector, and also inspector for the department, he used to board the vessel in the roads.

13194. Mr. Mossell.] That is my impression?—That is my impression, but as a member of the committee I always understood that that was done.

13195. In your opinion, that would be a prudent course to pursue?—No doubt it would be an extra precaution against infection.

13196. Mr. Clay.] If you had had immediate notice from the officers of the department of the existence of disease amongst the cattle on board the "Joseph Somes," and he had asked your

advice or assistance, should you have been able to give him any advice or assistance which would have been valuable?—I should immediately have called the committee together, and have asked the inspector to meet the committee, and I am quite sure that whatever the committee could have done to assist the inspector in disposing of these cattle would have been done by them.

13197. What course do you believe they would have advised?—The cattle plague orders determine how infected cattle are to be dealt with, and I should have seen no difficulty in the cattle of the "Joseph Somes" having been so dealt with. One of the witnesses has stated before this Committee that there was no land available for disposing of such cattle, but we have a hundred acres ourselves upon the foreshore of the Hamber within the borough.

13198. Then would you have recommended instead of the plan which was adopted, and which did miscarry, that the beasts should have been landed upon this corporation land upon the foreshore, and there slaughtered and burnt?—I very much doubt whether I should have taken upon myself to have suggested any course whatever, but inasmuch as the cattle plague orders point out the course which might have been adopted, I should have recommended that course to be adopted.

13199. But you had no opportunity of giving that advice, because you were not consulted?—I never heard anything about it until I was going out of town one day, and Professor Brown met me upon the railway platform.

13200. Was the existence of the diseased cattle on board the "Joseph Somes" generally known in the town, or to the members of the corporation?—I held a public position, and mix with the people of Hull as much as most men, and I had never heard of it until the Saturday morning. I therefore infer that it was not generally known.

13201. The vessel belonged to a member of the corporation, Mr. Alderman Atkinson, did it not?—His firm were the owners of the vessel, Messrs. Brown, Atkinson, & Co., but Mr. Atkinson, at that time a member of the corporation, was, I believe, out of town. Professor Brown has referred to a Mr. Atkinson, that would be his brother, I think.

13202. His brother is not a member of the corporation?—No.

13203. Professor Brown, I suppose, saw Mr. Freeman immediately after his interview with you?—I believe so.

13204. And gave instructions for the destruction of the cattle by sending them out in barges, and sinking them?—Yes; in fact, Professor Brown mentioned to me that that was what he contemplated doing when he saw me.

13205. Professor Simonds has mentioned that he thought the disease was communicated from the "Joseph Somes," by parties going to the Hull market; were the officers of the local authority properly disinfected?—Yes, whilst the vessel was lying in the dock with the cattle on board we had no control over the vessel; the Customs ought to have procured something like a quarantine over the vessel. We had nothing to do with it; but our own officers, who were engaged under the officers of the department in dealing with these cattle, were properly disinfected afterwards; at least, Mr. Freeman came to me

Mr. G.
C. Roberts.
—
10 July
1873.

Mr. G.
C. Roberts.
10 July
1873.

to pay for the disinfectants which had been used. I was not personally present, but so far as my investigation of the matter goes, I should say they were properly disinfected.

13206. All you know of the matter is, that you had to pay for the disinfectants?—And I had the representation of the inspector, so that I had no reason to doubt that they were properly disinfected.

13207. You had no reason to believe "that nobody and nothing was disinfected" passing between the vessel and the shore?—I think Professor Brown's observation referred rather to the condition of things existing for two or three days while the cattle were on board the ship, than to anything relating to the officers of the local authority, but certainly the officers of the local authority were properly disinfected.

13208. A large claim has been made for the expenses of that operation; upon whom was it made?—Originally, I believe it was made upon the department, and it was referred to the local authority.

13209. What did the local authority say?—That they had nothing to do with it; they have persisted in that ever since, and they intend to persist.

13210. Is it your opinion that Hull should be bound to pay for diseased cattle brought to the port?—Seeing that Hull has no particular interest in it, but is simply a port where cattle arrive, and that the cattle are imported as food for the nation, I think it would be most unreasonable if Hull were to be taxed for the purpose of paying for diseased cattle sent from a foreign country, with which we have nothing to do.

13211. Mr. Cowley.] This is a matter of legal obligation which is in dispute. I understand you to state that claims have been made which you have resisted, and which you intend to resist, therefore it is not as yet decided as a matter of law?—No; but I am not putting it as a legal question now, I am putting it as a question of policy. The Committee are investigating with a view to report, and I feel bound to say that it would be a case of great hardship upon the town of Hull, and would perhaps offer a premium to people who had diseased cattle, actually to ship them there, if they knew that when they arrived at Hull they could get at least one-half the value, and I submit that it would be a great hardship upon the town of Hull, if we were bound to pay for the cattle so imported.

13212. Chairman.] You can refuse to take the cattle; you can shut the market up?—We cannot prevent the port being freely used by anybody who chooses to use it.

13213. Surely if you did not have a defined port, as ordered by the Privy Council, that would be tantamount to shutting up the market, therefore it rests with you?—It would be a great inconvenience if that were done, but if there were no defined port that would certainly be a prohibition upon the importation of cattle into Hull.

13214. You take it with all the risk of the trade?—We offer facilities for the trade of the country.

13215. Mr. Clay.] The local authority would have power to shut up the market; supposing there was a reasonable alarm of another outbreak of the cattle plague, should you recommend the local authority to shut up the present market?—

That would have to be done under an Order of the Privy Council, but if there was any cause for that I should at once communicate with the Privy Council with a view to that being done, and in case of any temporary delay, we would take upon ourselves, as we have done in past times, to shut up the market.

13216. The local authority would have no objection to take that step?—No, certainly not; in fact, during the latter part of last year the markets were closed, although in a legal sense the Order did not apply to Hull, and I called the attention of the Department to it, nevertheless we enforced the Order.

13217. It seems to have been taken for granted that the outbreak of the cattle plague in the East Riding arose from the disease having been communicated from the Hull market; is it your opinion that that is so?—All I can say is, that the local circumstances do not warrant such a conclusion, the fact being established by the evidence of scientific witnesses that the disease did not arise from the carcasses being washed ashore. We had nothing like cattle plague in the immediate vicinity of Hull, and there were no cattle affected in the Hull market for some time after this occurred. In Professor Brown's report he states, "In commencing this account it is necessary to assume that the virus of cattle plague was in some manner conveyed to animals in Hull market on July 29th, from the Russian beasts which were removed from the 'Joseph Simes' on July 27th. With this assumption, the introduction of the disease into the three districts referred to," and then he builds up the superstructure on that assumption. Of course if the whole of the premises are assumed, namely, that it arose from that, there would be little answer to the conclusions which have been arrived at; but I venture to say that there is nothing in the local circumstances which would justify such a conclusion.

13218. Dr. Williams in his evidence, at Question 244, stated that the local authority at Hull would not carry out the suggestions of the department; are you aware of any ground for that statement?—Dr. Williams must have been speaking in ignorance of the fact, or under grave misapprehension, for there is not the semblance of truth in the statement.

13219. You speak with certainty, of course, in reference to the time during which you yourself have been town clerk?—I do.

13220. Do you at all know what was the case in the time of your predecessor; is there any justification for that statement?—No; any communications from the department would have been brought before the Cattle Plague Committee, and I should, as a member of that committee, have heard of them. In addition to that, Dr. Williams has told me that he did not communicate any complaint to the committee. He represented to me that complaints had been made to him, and I remonstrated that those complaints had not been communicated to the local authority that they might have been investigated.

13221. Dr. Williams is asked at Question 245, "It is true, is it not, that we constantly recommended, and in fact ordered, certain things to be done at Hull?" and he states, "Yes; we have done so. (Q.) And without success? (A.) Without success." Are you aware of that?—I am not aware of the slightest ground for such a statement.

ment. In fact, I have the whole of the correspondence which has passed since I held the office I now hold, and so far from our resisting the desire of the department, we have always professed an anxious willingness to carry out any suggestions which they might make, and have done so.

13222. Then do you state as clerk to the local authority that they are anxious to do all in their power to give effect to the provisions of the Orders of the Privy Council?—Most certainly.

13223. Mr. Cowley.] I think you mentioned that there were 24 slaughterhouses in which foreign cattle infected or ordered to be slaughtered were slaughtered?—Not infected cattle, but cattle from scheduled countries.

13224. Cattle from scheduled countries not affected, and apart from any question of whether there were infected cattle on board?—I do not know that we have ever had an instance except the "Joseph Somes."

13225. Whether you have or not, the question I want to put is this: is the slaughtering in those slaughterhouses confined to cattle coming from the scheduled countries entirely, those cattle being free from disease?—Yes.

13226. Supposing that a vessel came in from any other country which had infection on board, would those cattle be slaughtered in the same slaughterhouses?—No, certainly not.

13227. I do not mean the infected cattle, but the other cattle?—If there were infected cattle on board a vessel, I should think that the Privy Council, or the Customs, would, in all probability, order the whole of the animals to be slaughtered, and in that case they would be slaughtered in the ship, and disposed of according to the Privy Council Orders.

13228. You say "slaughtered in the ship?"—Yes; the same as the "Joseph Somes" cattle were.

13229. Does that apply to foot and mouth disease and pleuro-pneumonia, or only to rinderpest?—That would apply to any cattle which required to be slaughtered. In the "Joseph Somes" there were only 18 or 20 cattle affected, out of the 56 cattle on board, and the whole were slaughtered, and slaughtered on board the ship, and I take it that the same course would be pursued with regard to anything which the law required to be slaughtered.

13230. Is it your impression that if a vessel arrived with one beast pronounced to be suffering from foot and mouth disease, the whole cargo would be slaughtered on board the vessel?—No.

13231. What would be done?—In that case the cattle would be taken for their term of quarantine in the lairs, and if they developed any disease they would be killed there and then.

13232. If the animals did not develop the disease, would they be slaughtered at Hull, or would they be removed and sold?—No, being from scheduled countries they must be slaughtered at the port.

13233. You do not quite apprehend my question; I referred to cattle from other than prohibited countries, when disease was found on board?—I take it that the cattle landing in that case would be under the inspection or the inspector of the department.

13234. Is it the case that, as a matter of fact, you are not sure whether those cattle would be

slaughtered at those particular slaughterhouses?—I have no reason to suppose they would, because I think they would not be moved.

13235. Are those slaughterhouses the property of the corporation?—No, they are the property of private individuals, and they are all pretty well in one small street.

13236. What street are they in?—Finkle-street.

13237. That is within the defined area?—Yes.

13238. Are the 24 all in the street?—With the exception that there are two in Dagger-lane.

13239. There are 22 in Finkle-street?—Yes, 22 in Finkle-street, and the immediate neighbourhood there, in the courts and alleys there; I may say that the two in Dagger-lane were the last alteration.

13240. Are those slaughterhouses open to any person who chooses to take his cattle there?—Only for slaughter.

13241. Those 24 are the only slaughterhouses available for the imported cattle from scheduled countries?—Yes.

13242. Of course those cattle dealers have the right to slaughter their cattle, as you say, at those slaughterhouses?—Yes.

13243. Are the owners of the slaughterhouses subject to stringent regulations by the corporation?—They are subjected to sanitary regulations.

13244. What do you include under the term "sanitary regulations"?—There is no special regulation with regard to cattle, but only general sanitary precautions.

13245. Is it at all times found that these slaughterhouses are sufficient for the slaughter within a reasonable time of the cattle so imported?—I believe so; I have never heard the slightest suggestion to the contrary.

13246. Do you know, of your own knowledge, whether they are or not?—No, I do not in any way inspect or superintend the slaughtering of cattle; I do not know it of my own knowledge; I can only speak of it in a general way.

13247. In your previous answers you said that you had very commodious slaughterhouses, valued at 15,000 £, which were sufficient for the purpose?—So far as my official investigation and my official connection with this matter enables me to speak to it, I state that as a fact.

13248. There is a wide difference between a conclusion and a fact, you know; I want to get the value of the statement, because there may be other parties who differ from you; I want you also to state whether you are prepared to say that the meat slaughtered in those slaughterhouses is in as good a state, and is always sent away from Hull in as good a state as it would be if sent away from private slaughterhouses or from public abattoirs?—I know that at the time when all the cattle coming to Hull were slaughtered, there were very large meetings held in Yorkshire and in Lancashire also, complaining that the meat was not received wholesome when forwarded in that state; and there was some association formed, and meetings held in most of the large towns in the West Riding, and in Lancashire, with regard to that matter.

13249. Are you prepared to state that their complaints were groundless?—No, I should be disposed to think they were not; I should think it a very likely thing at the present time of year,

3 x 3

Mr. G.
C. Roberts.

10 July
1873.

Mr. G.
C. Roberts.
16 July
1873.

with the weather as it is, that meat being pecked and sent away immediately, would in all probability become bad.

13230. Are you prepared to say that no part of that injury was due to the position of the slaughterhouses, and the mode in which the cattle were there killed?—I have certainly no reason to suppose that anything was attributable to the slaughterhouses.

13231. Are you prepared, as representing Hull, to say that no part was due to the slaughterhouses?—As representing Hull, yes, because the term "representing Hull," implies that I cannot speak to every minute detail of my own knowledge, but I never heard any complaint of the kind, and occupying a position where complaints must come, if any are made, I must infer that no complaints exist.

13232. You are a professional man, a lawyer, and I want to get the facts as far as you can speak to them; I understand you to come here to represent Hull?—I do.

13233. Therefore, I assume you came with a knowledge of the facts which are necessary; I only want to get it on the notes whether you are prepared to say that is so; you have admitted that great complaints were made in the towns of Lancashire and Yorkshire?—Not simply with regard to Hull, but with regard to the prohibition generally.

13234. But with regard to the state of the meat coming from Hull?—The complaints were general with regard to the prohibition and slaughter at the outports.

13235. The fact, that such complaints were made being admitted, I want to know whether your evidence having been to the effect that Hull was perfectly managed, there were any grounds for these complaints arising from the slaughterhouses, or from the mode in which the cattle were killed?—Certainly not arising from the slaughterhouses.

13236. Then whatever complaint arose, must have arisen after the meat left Hull?—No; the meat being pecked and sent away, it is not an uncommon circumstance that under these circumstances it will become bad. I am not speaking of any particular circumstances, but of the natural course of things.

13237. Are those slaughterhouses in this street and the courts adjoining well ventilated?—Yes; we are very strict with regard to licensing slaughterhouses.

13238. Is the neighbourhood one which would generally admit of good ventilation?—The neighbourhood is close.

13239. Most parts of Hull are low?—If you are speaking of the position of the town of Hull, Hull is a complete flat.

13240. But they are in a very crowded part, are they not?—They are in a very crowded part of the old town.

13241. And not very far from some of the docks?—No, and not very far from some of the docks; in fact, the dock is necessary for the purpose of discharging the cattle.

13242. There is one point which I did not get clearly from you in the correspondence which you read; I understand that the complaint made had reference to having to drive the cattle across a number of lines of railway?—Yes.

13243. Does that state of things exist now, or does it not?—It does to some extent, but it has

been considerably modified, because at the time when that complaint was made the dock was newly opened, and things were not got into proper working order; but the corporation opposed the North Eastern Company in a Bill which they had before Parliament until they got from them in an Act, which has been passed, a provision for making a railway to that dock, and that is now in course of construction.

13244. Has any part of the objection to the crossing been actually removed, or is it only the works which are in progress which will remove it?—The inconvenience has been considerably reduced by the circumstance of the dock and its approaches being brought into better condition, but the actual removal of the inconvenience is now only in the course of progress.

13245. I suppose you allude to the crossing of the railway near Bath-place; where are the cattle from unscheduled countries landed?—The unscheduled cattle are landed in the Humber Dock.

13246. With regard to the Lincolnshire cattle, where are they landed?—At the Corporation Pier, and the foreign cattle are sometimes landed by the Customs at the Minerva Pier, or in the Humber dock.

13247. *Chairman.* What distance is there between these two piers?—There is a barrier there, a post. One of the guarantees which we gave with regard to the defined area was the providing of additional posts and chains, which the Customs officers might put up upon the landing of foreign cattle.

13248. *Mr. Coady.* What do you mean by the putting up of posts?—They are posts dividing the landing place from the Corporation Pier.

13249. But the actual distance of vessels from the landing place might be very slight indeed?—I think you will find it would be a hundred yards.

13250. Not from the end of the Corporation Pier?—Cattle are never landed at the end of the Corporation Pier; there is no slope there for it.

13251. What is the actual distance between the two piers; the distance between the two piers is not 50 yards, is it?—That is so.

13252. Then I apprehend that a vessel in coming round might come as near as vessels dare come, and might come in contact, in fact?—No, pardon me; no vessel passes between the Minerva pier and the Corporation pier; that is a ferry-boat dock, and simply small river boats pass there.

13253. The two piers upon the river side are in a line with each other, are they not?—Yes, they are in a line with each other.

13254. Then am I not right in saying that a vessel going up to the Corporation pier, and turning round to draw alongside the Corporation pier, might actually come within a few feet of the Minerva pier?—According to her draught of water she would have to pass the pier.

13255. And if she had to go up to the Corporation pier she might have to pass the end of the Minerva pier, at a very short distance?—Yes.

13256. Then, with regard to the question of the defined area upon which some questions were put to you, that really was a question whether the "defined area," or an "enclosed area," should

Mr. G.
C. Roberts.
10 July
1873.

should be read as synonymous terms?—That
YES NO.

13277. There was no doubt about being able to define the boundary; it is not necessarily an enclosed boundary?—No; it is the distinction between an open and an enclosed boundary.

13278. Mr. Clay.] With regard to that inconvenience which arises, and which is now in course of being remedied by a tunnel, is it not intended also to construct a bridge over the railway to prevent the inconvenience of the level crossing?—That is so; that is at a Bath place.

13279. Is that in course of construction?—That is in course of construction.

13280. Mr. Kinnear.] Is there much importation of store cattle into Hull?—I do not know what particular cattle come there myself, because I have nothing to do with the inspection of cattle. I have here the returns of the number of cattle from unscheduled and scheduled countries in 1869 and 1870, but not later.

13281. Is there any difference of opinion between you and the officials in the Veterinary Department of the Privy Council with reference to the duties which the local authorities in Hull have to carry out?—None whatever, that I am aware of.

13282. Mr. Barclay.] I suppose the steamers carry on their business for the benefit of the trade of Hull as well as for themselves, do they not?—Any trade which comes to the port must, in a degree, benefit the town.

13283. Do you think the expense of slaughtering any cattle imported by these steamers should be paid by the Imperial Exchequer?—Yes.

13284. Because it is for the benefit of the country?—Yes; a particular shipowner may have an interest in the amount of freight he may get for the carriage of the cattle, but however that Hull is not benefitted, because the cattle are for consumption throughout the country.

13285. Is the trade of Hull at all benefitted by the importation of those cattle?—Yes, to a certain degree, but not by any means sufficiently to compensate for the amount of the risk incurred by those cattle being brought to the port.

13286. Do you think that a hazardous trade, if the import of cattle is a hazardous trade, should be allowed to be carried on at Hull without reasonable precautions being taken at Hull?—Certainly not; but I am under the impression that reasonable precautions are taken at Hull.

13287. Supposing those measures are taken to have cattle slaughtered in which rinderpest appeared prior to landing, what would you say in that case?—The duty is cast upon the Imperial Government, and the cost ought to accompany the duty, in my opinion.

13288. Do you think the importer should run that risk?—Possibly the man is a mere agent for the consignee of the cattle, and the consignee being in a foreign country, cannot be reached.

13289. You were speaking just now not of the value of the cattle, but of the expense of dealing with the cattle?—Of course, the expense of slaughtering cattle involves not only the actual expense of slaughter, but half the value of the cattle.

13290. Have you paid half the value of the cattle to the owner of diseased cattle?—No, we have refused to do so; we have said, with regard to the "Joseph Somers," that it was not done
0.32.

under our authority, and that those who ordered it must pay.

13291. Have any proceedings been taken in the matter?—We have been threatened with legal proceedings, but those proceedings have not been taken yet.

13292. Are you aware of what was done at Leith under the same circumstances?—I do not know what has been done?—I have read Professor Brown's report with regard to the occurrences at Leith.

13293. Are you not aware that they paid nothing to the importer there?—I am not aware of that, but in that case they are very much in the same position as we are at Hull.

13294. Chairmen.] You think that any compensation which is paid should be paid out of the Imperial Exchequer, and not out of the rates of Hull?—I think so; I think Hull should bear its fair proportion just the same as any other part of the country should, in the case of rinderpest arising in the country, but in the case of cattle over which we have no control, the importation of them being for the general benefit of the country, I think it would be most unreasonable if any compensation should be paid (and it is a question whether any should be paid under such circumstances), that it should be a charge upon the local rates of Hull.

13295. You do not think that any compensation which is paid for diseased foreign cattle should be a charge upon the local rates of Hull?—Certainly not diseased foreign cattle which are destroyed to prevent their importing disease into the country.

13296. It is a certain advantage to the town of Hull to import them, or else else would stop them. Now, in the case of the country, it is a dead loss to the farmer to have foreign cattle imported; he occasionally gets the cattle plague amongst his stock by that means?—No doubt.

13297. Do you think it right that the local rates of the East Riding of Yorkshire should pay for that compensation, which is necessary for the extirpation of cattle plague?—So far as that goes I do not think the rates should be upon the East Riding of Yorkshire. If you take the general taxation of the country the whole nation has to contribute to the general taxes. Manchester, and all the large towns of the West Riding are the people for whose benefit the cattle are imported through Hull.

13298. How far is Manchester from Hull?—About 166 miles.

13299. You think that great losses would of necessity be entailed by the transit of dead meat from Hull to Manchester?—No, I do not, but I say that it was represented at the time that in hot weather like this (one can believe it) meat will go bad in a night.

13300. I suppose you are aware that dead meat comes 500 miles from Scotland?—But there are periods of the year when it must be attended with loss.

13301. Notwithstanding that loss it comes in the hottest weather?—No doubt. I am only saying that in the manufacturing districts there were complaints with reference to the cattle being slaughtered at the outports. I am not referring to Hull particularly.

13302. But Hull is the great port of import for the north, is it not?—Yes, it is.

13303. It imports more than any other port upon
3 x 4

Mr. G.
C. Roberts.
10 July
1875.

upon the east coast, except London?—Yes, except London, and there is also this peculiarity. In one letter which I had from Dr. Williams, he stated that 70 per cent. of the import of cattle was from unscheduled countries. Now the larger proportion of the import at Hull is that from scheduled countries.

13304. Are there many Lincolnshire beasts landed at the Corporation Pier?—There are some, but not a very large number; but I may state that the railway, to avoid the ferry and the danger of cattle jumping overboard, which is not an unfrequent occurrence, send the cattle from most parts of Lincolnshire round by Doncaster and Goole, and that way to Yorkshire, but there is not a large interchange of cattle between the East Riding of Yorkshire and Lincolnshire through Hull.

13305. Mr. Crowley.] Does that apply to the Manchester, Sheffield, and Lincolnshire Railway Company, as well as to the Great Northern Company?—No, to the Manchester, Sheffield, and Lincolnshire Company only.

13306. Do they send their cattle round over the North Eastern Company's line, into Hull?—From many parts of Lincolnshire I think they do.

13307. I thought the North Eastern Company were said to throw difficulties in the way of the traffic coming there?—No; unfortunately for Hull, there is a contest going on in another Committee-room at the present moment. I am sorry to say that the arrangement on the part of the Manchester, Sheffield, and Lincolnshire Company is, not to do the work, but to participate in the profits.

13308. Mr. Cley.] With regard to these complaints from the large towns, that the dead meat arrived in a bad condition, I understand that the chief cause of that was, that at Hull you are obliged to slaughter at once, and to peck immediately, whereas the cattle coming from Scotland the cattle owners can slaughter when they like?—No, there is no distinction of that kind. What I wished to convey, by referring to the complaint was, not that complaints were made of or to Hull, but simply that large meetings were held in various large towns in Lancashire and Yorkshire, passing resolutions, and making representations to Government, requesting that the restrictions requiring the slaughter of cattle might be taken off. I am speaking of it as a general fact.

13309. Is it not evident that there is an advantage to the Scotchman who can slaughter when he likes, and who naturally does not select very hot weather for doing so, whereas at Hull you are obliged to slaughter when the animals arrive?—You are obliged to slaughter within a limited time.

13310. Chairman.] You are not obliged to slaughter under 10 days, are you?—That is quite true; I did not quite follow the honourable Member's suggestion.

13311. Mr. Tizard.] If I am not mistaken the complaints of the large towns arose from the dislike to receiving slaughtered meat as all, that is to say, they preferred receiving live stock; it was not a particular complaint against the bad slaughtering of Hull?—There was no complaint against Hull in that respect; it was a complaint against receiving slaughtered in place of live meat.

13312. That complaint came from the butchers more than from the people, did it not?—No

doubt the butchers got up the meetings, but it resulted in large meetings being held, and speeches being made, and resolutions sent to the Government.

13313. Mr. Crowley.] I understand that you are now speaking of complaints of which you heard from the usual channels of information and which you saw in the newspapers, and that as special complaint was made of Hull?—No, I am speaking of matters of public notoriety.

13314. Mr. J. Bryant.] We have been told that the cattle need not be slaughtered for 10 days?—That is so.

13315. Do you know that they sometimes go 10 days without being slaughtered?—Yes.

13316. What is done with them during that time?—They are kept in the lairs at Hull.

13317. Do you know whether they improve during that time?—That is a question which I could not answer.

13318. You would not suppose that anybody in Manchester would expect his meat to be improved by having it slaughtered at Hull?—No, I should not imagine that a beast tied up in a lair for 10 days was likely to improve much.

13319. You would not expect to hear of a meeting at Manchester to ask that meat might be killed at Hull instead of Manchester, especially in the hot weather?—I should be very much surprised to hear of such a meeting being held.

13320. Chairman.] Are you aware of many large families in London who have their meat supplied from Devonshire?—I am aware that many families have their meat from the country, and all their produce.

13321. With regard to this plan which you have put in, I can understand it with regard to the foreign market, but how does it come to pass that the country cattle market is in the situation that it is, irrespective of the foreign cattle market?—The country cattle market has existed there for years and years, but the foreign lairs were selected, as I have already told you, by Lord Wenslock; they were built in consequence of his having selected that place.

13322. I am not speaking of the position of the foreign cattle market; but it seems to be a stranger, in glancing at the plan, to be the most stupid and improper place for a cattle market that I ever saw; you cannot get to the English market apparently without travelling through the whole of Hull, can you?—Yes, you can; and not only that, but that cattle market was established when much of that district, which we call the "Pottery," was unbuilt upon; all that district has been built upon during the last 25 years.

13323. But as a rule cattle markets are held rather outside a town than right in the middle of it, are they not?—That was so when that cattle market was established.

13324. Do you get many cattle now into the port of Hull from scheduled countries?—Yes, I believe there are a large number now.

13325. The number does not diminish?—The returns of the actual importation are not made to me; the Customs are the parties who have those returns; but I regret that I did not complete this return which I brought with me.

13326. You have heard no complaint of a decrease in the quantity imported within the last few months?—I have not.

13327. Mr. Pell.] Can you tell the Committee how long it is since the foreign lairs were established?

blished?—As soon as the first Act of Parliament was passed; not the Consolidation Act of 1869, but the previous Act relating to foreign cattle, which I should think would be six or seven years ago.

13328. We believe it to have been in 1866?—

Yes.

13329. Into those foreign lairs, do you admit that foreign cattle with infectious diseases are likely to go?—Of course if cattle are landed, and afterwards develop the disease, they would be found in those lairs.

13330. That was hardly an answer to my question; I asked you whether diseased foreign cattle (you being a Hull official, and likely to speak from a personal knowledge of it), are likely to find their way into those lairs which are prepared for foreign cattle?—Not with a knowledge that they are diseased, certainly.

13331. Supposing a cargo of foreign cattle is brought alongside the pier where they are landed, and are found to have infectious disease upon them; what is done with them at Hull?—We have never had any instance but the "Joseph Somers," which has been already referred to, and in that case the cattle were slaughtered on board the steamer and taken out to sea.

13332. You have had no cases of pleuropneumonia?—No.

13333. And none of foot and mouth disease?—No, none have been reported to me.

13334. Would it be proper that they should be reported to you?—Yes, because our local inspector would be compelled to report to the local authority.

13335. Does it occur to you that the character of the cargoes arriving at Hull is strangely different from those which arrive at other ports, as to which the Committee have had evidence that foot and mouth disease and other diseases are frequently arriving?—I can only speak from my knowledge.

13336. Would you not admit that yours was a most singular visitation at Hull; that you should only have had one case of disease imported, and that of the most terrible description?—I can speak of no other case; you must remember that these cases are not reported to the local authority.

13337. Have you ever thought it within your province to examine the Appendix to the Report of the Veterinary Department for 1872, with the view of seeing what condition the cattle are in which have arrived at your port?—I have referred to Professor Brown's Report.

13338. Would you kindly take that report in your hand, and look at page 72; in the first column you find the port of Hull; and tell me if it is not the case that thousands of animals suffering from infectious diseases have been landed at your port; not hundreds, but thousands?—By this report it appears that a large number of cattle have been so landed.

13339. I said thousands; would you kindly see whether I have overestimated it?—The total is 1,271 from Hamburg, and there is 102 and 106, and other numbers, from other places.

13340. Therefore, if this statement is a correct one, we may say that there have been thousands of animals so imported?—Even with these figures, I could hardly say thousands.

13341. But between one and two thousand?—There has been a very large number.

13342. I think you told the Committee just

0.58.

now that the introduction of these diseased animals ought to have been reported to you, and would, as a matter of practice in the borough, have been reported to you?—No; I misapprehended the question if I said anything of the kind. I should have said these things were not reported to me.

13343. If so landed, they would be reported to the local authority, would they not?—The Privy Council Inspector is the person who deals with these things on landing.

13344. Are you aware that these diseased animals would be reported to the Government Inspector?—I take it that they would; but I may say that, so far as the Government Inspector goes, although I have been two years and a-half town clerk, I do not know him by sight; so little has he communicated with the local authority in any way.

13345. You say, "so little has he communicated with the local authority"; is it not the duty of the Government Inspector to report to your inspector?—I am not aware of any such duty. He has certain power himself, but I do not know any duty which there is upon him to report to the local authority.

13346. Let me call your attention to the instructions in the Veterinary Inspector's Report?—Of which I know nothing whatever; this ("The Handbook of Laws and Regulations as to Infectious Diseases among Animals; prepared and issued by the Department of the Privy Council") is the only document which has been furnished me by the department.

13347. But one object of the Committee would be to ascertain whether this gentleman had neglected his duty, because we have this in evidence, that you were not aware that anything like a thousand head of infected foreign animals had been landed at Hull?—Decidedly; the details of a thing of that kind are not within my department.

13348. I wish to call your attention to this Order of the Privy Council, dated 29th December 1871, containing instructions to the Veterinary Inspectors at the ports; under Section 10, this is ordered: "Where an inspector finds any contagious or infectious disease in any animal or animals under his charge, he is to give notice to the police, in order that the inspector of the local authority may be informed of it?"—I am not aware of any such Order.

13349. Will you venture to state that that is not the instruction which is issued?—No, certainly not; but up to the present moment, I have never heard of any such order.

13350. Then how do you attempt to explain the fact of these diseased animals having come to the port, and the information not having reached the local authority?—All I can say is, that our inspector is bound to make weekly returns to the department, and also to the local authority, and such returns as those have never come under my notice; whether it is the default of the Privy Council inspector, or of the local inspector, I could not say, but it is a matter which I will inquire into on my return.

13351. You are clerk to the local authority?—I am town clerk to the borough, and therefore clerk to the local authority.

13352. The only explanation which you can give is, that the Government inspector has not reported?—I do not offer any explanation, because

3 Y

Mr. G.
C. Roberts.
—
10 July
1873.

the

Mr. G.
C. Roberts.
10 July
1878.

the facts are not within my knowledge. I should not like even inferentially to cast blame upon an officer without feeling that I was justified in doing so.

13353. You abide by the statement, which I understood you to make at the commencement of your evidence, that no information has reached you as the official of the local authority, of the existence of these diseased cattle in your port?—Nothing like the extent that there appears in these returns. There are reports made to me, but most of them are as to foot and mouth disease, and so on.

13354. Mr. Chasley.] Are these reports made to you verbally, or in writing, by the local inspector?—In writing.

13355. Therefore, they are in existence?—Yes.

13356. Mr. Pull.] You would wish to modify your previous answer; you would not wish to state that there have been no cases of infectious disease in the port of Hull, except the one you referred to on board the "Joseph Somers"?—According to the returns which you have called my attention to here, I am inaccurate in that statement.

13357. Supposing these returns to be true (and you will not, I presume, deny their accuracy), do not you think there is considerable danger to the cattle in the district, if this number of between 1,000 and 2,000 animals which you have seen would be landed at the port, were taken into the town and driven in such close proximity to the English market?—I do not see the connection between the lairs and the market; there is no necessary connection between the two.

13358. With regard to the matter of distance?—That is rather a matter of scientific knowledge as to how disease may be propagated, and I am not able to express an opinion upon that point.

13359. How far are they apart?—The exact distance by the scale is 200 yards as the crow flies.

13360. There is nothing whatever to prevent the English animals running down the Commercial-road, and so mixing with the foreign animals at Bath-place; there are no barriers?—There are no barriers.

13361. An animal which had a will of its own might run down and mix with the foreign cattle?—Such a thing is possible.

13362. Then what is done with the cattle which are marketed at the English market; are they obliged to be killed?—No; they may go anywhere they like.

13363. After having run this great risk of contact with infected foreign animals, which have been brought in in such numbers to Hull?—I simply say they may go anywhere they like, without saying anything of the risk of coming in contact with infected foreign animals.

13364. Does the corporation receive any tolls for the marketing and selling of English animals in the market?—We have a revenue from the markets, but whether a charge is made for the cattle or not I cannot tell; it is not in my department; I should think probably that we should do so.

13365. Is there a charge made by the corporation for lirage for foreign cattle?—Yes, I know that that is so; they charge for that just the same as a person would charge for warehousing goods.

13366. You could not say whether it is an open and free market at Hull, or whether there are dues paid by those who market the cattle there?—I could not tell that, but I could ascertain it in a few minutes; I should say it is probable that there is a charge made.

13367. Then if there are tolls taken for marketing these English cattle in the same way that tolls are taken for marketing cattle, in this metropolis, do you not think that that money might be well expended in putting the market in a more convenient and, I may say, reasonable place for these English cattle than in such close proximity to diseased foreign cattle?—I am quite sure that no tolls which we receive from cattle would at all compensate for the establishment of a new market in a new part of the town if it is to be a money question, but I do not think that it should be a money question; there ought to be other considerations.

13368. When you say "compensate," what do you mean by that?—I mean compensate the corporation for the outlay; but I have just now made the observation that there are other considerations besides those of a mere pecuniary character. I think there is a duty which is imposed upon all public bodies of doing their best for the general interest.

13369. But public bodies, in our experience, are not always guided by patriotic motives?—No; one's experience leads us to that conclusion, and Hull is no exception, I am sorry to say.

13370. What is the population of Hull?—One hundred and twenty-three thousand by the last census return.

13371. Are you aware that most of the large towns in England have shifted their old market from the centre of the town to the parts of the town outside the walls?—Yes.

13372. That has been done very generally, has it not?—Yes.

13373. Even where there is no danger of foreign infection?—Yes.

13374. They do that for sanitary and other good reasons?—Yes.

13375. Do you think that Hull has any exception to this necessity?—No; and I am very much disposed to say that any recommendation of this Committee with regard to a matter of that kind, although I cannot pledge myself absolutely to its being carried out, would receive the serious consideration of the corporation of Hull, with a view to giving effect to it.

13376. We should be glad to know your views?—I think it would be advantageous to remove the market; and I do not hesitate to say, in the interests of the community, that I do not think money considerations should be the only ones which influenced us upon that point.

13377. Chasmas.] I think in 1865 you had the misfortune to have the cattle plague imported into Hull?—It has been attributed to us; we have never accepted it as a fact.

Mr. SEPTIMUS LAMBERT, JUN., was called in; and Examined.

13378. Mr. Cowley.] You are a member of the firm of Septimus Lambert and Son, Cattle Salemen, of Manchester?—I am.

13379. I believe you are also a member of the Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons, both of London and Edinburgh?—I am.

13380. And you studied under Professor Bosley of the Veterinary School at Paris?—I did.

13381. You do not practice as a veterinary surgeon?—I do not.

13382. Your father has been in the cattle trade all his life, and you are now acting along with him?—Yes, during the last sixteen years I have acted with him.

13383. But although you do not practice you have studied the science and are well acquainted with the diseases of animals?—I am.

13384. You are also connected with some firm in Liverpool, are you not?—Yes, I am.

13385. And you attend the markets both of Salford and Liverpool, do you not?—Yes, I do.

13386. For the purchase and sale of cattle?—For the sale only.

13387. In Liverpool do you act as agents for the sale of foreign cattle?—We do.

13388. With regard to Irish cattle, have you any experience of them?—I have had great experience among Irish cattle.

13389. Do you sell a great number of them?—Yes, I do.

13390. Both in Liverpool and Manchester?—Mostly in Liverpool; I sell very few in Manchester.

13391. In addition to that, do you farm at all yourself?—Yes.

13392. Milch cows or what?—We have both milch cows and feeding stock as well.

13393. How many milch cows do you keep?—Between 50 and 60.

13394. Is that in the neighbourhood of Manchester?—It is about three miles from Manchester.

13395. Have you paid any particular attention to the working of the Contagious Diseases Animals Act?—Yes, I have.

13396. With regard to rinderpest, I believe your general opinion is that most extreme measures should be taken?—Yes.

13397. You have no complaint to make of the Act with regard to that disease?—No, none at all.

13398. Foot and mouth disease seems to be the one in which there is most difficulty?—Yes, that is so.

13399. What is your opinion with regard to the restrictions and regulations in force relating to foot and mouth disease?—I think any restriction with regard to foot and mouth disease is quite useless unless you put the animals under the same restrictions as animals affected with rinderpest.

13400. What do you mean by the same restrictions as in the case of the rinderpest?—I mean the total cessation of all movement of live cattle.

13401. I need hardly ask is that consistent with carrying on the markets of the country at all?—I think you cannot stop the disease without all live cattle being prevented from travelling, and this would cause a much greater loss to 0.58.

the people through raising prices of meat than is caused by the disease at any time.

13402. With regard to the disease itself do you draw any distinction between the effect of the disease upon cattle remaining upon a farm and when moved?—I think cattle remaining upon a farm suffer very little from the disease, and that cattle moved suffer very much when they are under the influence of the disease.

13403. To what do you specially attribute the increased evil from moving them?—To the travelling with their feet in a highly inflamed state, which causes greatly increased fever.

13404. I suppose I need hardly ask whether the loss from injury to milch cattle is very much greater than to any other class of animals?—Very much greater than to any other.

13405. At all times, whether moved or not?—Yes.

13406. Have you any idea, from your experience, what the average loss per animal of milch stock is from the disease?—If the disease is allowed to take its own course, and the cattle are not treated in any way whatever, except by simple diet, they recover quickly; but if treated it always aggravates the disease; a cow, if you give her gruel and bran mashes, will recover in a very short time, and be only a pound worse than if she had not had the disease.

13407. Do I understand you to say that the remedies administered by surgeons increase the disease in milch cows?—I think so; they create increased pain by causing the weight of the animal to be thrown upon its feet, thereby causing increased fever.

13408. You recommend improved diet?—I recommend improved diet and soft feeding, and, if out at grass, to be left alone in the field.

13409. Do you give that opinion from actual experience?—I give that opinion from long experience of the difference between trying to treat them and leaving them alone.

13410. You simply leave nature to do its work?—You assist nature by the diet.

13411. Do you think, with regard to the special regulations, that the action of the police as been beneficial in the way of diminishing the spread of the disease, or has it had the contrary effect, in your opinion?—I think that the fact of the police being inspectors has greatly increased the disease throughout the country, and that they act as continual centres of infection, moving from one place to another.

13412. Do I understand by that, that you think the police have carried the disease from one place to another?—Yes.

13413. The disease being highly infectious?—Yes.

13414. What is your opinion with regard to the effect of the Acts generally?—The present restrictions have tended, in my opinion, to keep up continual centres of disease in the country.

13415. With regard to foot and mouth disease, you conceive that the Acts have been a failure?—Yes, a total failure in every respect.

13416. Will you give the Committee your reasons for thinking so?—One reason why I think it has been a failure is, and it is a case in point, Sir Humphrey de Trafford, whose cattle we buy and sell, last year had 200 beasts in different parts

Mr.
S. Lambert,
Jun.,
10 July
1873.

Mr.
S. Lambert,
Jun.
—
16 July
1873.

parts of his park; some of them became affected, and the police gave him notice that no cattle were to be removed off that estate, although one part was quite a mile away from the other, and the diseased cattle were nearly a mile away from the healthy cattle. The consequence was, that a continual centre of infection was kept up upon that estate all the summer and autumn.

13417. Would those be the county police of Cheshire?—Of Lancashire.

13418. But not the borough police?—Not the borough police.

13419. The farm you speak of is just upon the border of Cheshire and Lancashire?—Yes, between Cheshire and Lancashire.

13420. Then in what way do you think that that tended to perpetuate the disease?—Because the cattle which were fit for the butcher to kill, the inspector would not allow us to take off the farm for three or four months, and during that time the disease gradually spread from one herd to another, until it went through the whole lot, and some of the cattle took the disease three times.

13421. Did the disease spread from the first centre to the other herd that were a mile away?—Yes.

13422. How do you suppose that disease was conveyed?—The men and dogs were allowed to walk through the same field which the cattle were in, and go from there to the other, and dogs were allowed to go from one field to the other, and birds, and hares, and living things would also convey the infection.

13423. It is your impression that the disease can be conveyed even by hares going across a field?—I think so, most decidedly.

13424. And by dogs, certainly?—I think so.

13425. The effect, in your opinion, I presume, is to diminish the supply to the markets?—The effect is, that it diminishes the supply.

13426. Without any corresponding good?—Yes.

13427. Now with regard to foot and mouth disease in Liverpool, have you anything to say with reference to that; have you any great quantity brought into Liverpool?—Any cattle which are imported there are healthy when they land, but they may take the disease afterwards, and they generally do take it; the animals are supposed to be healthy when they are landed; they are passed by the inspector.

13428. With regard to the Irish cattle coming into the Liverpool market, are they, so far as you know, free from disease when they land, that is to say, free from the development of the disease?—Yes.

13429. You do not find the animals in the Liverpool market with the disease in active operation upon them?—Some few have been found so, and have been seized by the Government inspector.

13430. Have you found cases where the disease has rapidly developed itself afterwards?—The animals have been apparently healthy upon the Monday, and upon the Tuesday they have become diseased, when they have been taken to the Salford market to be shown there.

13431. The Liverpool market is on a Monday, and the Salford market on Tuesday, is it not?—Yes.

13432. These animals have stood in the Liverpool market?—Yes.

13433. They would come from Dublin or Holyhead, and arrive at Liverpool on Thursday or Friday?—Yes, generally Thursday, or Friday or Saturday.

13434. I think it is in evidence that they remain in a large field at Liverpool?—Yes, they are put in fields in summer time, and in him in the winter.

13435. And then shown in the market on Monday?—Yes.

13436. And sent on to Salford?—Yes, they are bought by dealers some of them, and sent to Salford.

13437. Those animals frequently show the disease on the Tuesday when they get to Salford?—Yes, very often.

13438. Now to keep to cattle in the first instance, we will take the sheep afterwards; with regard to the foreign cattle which you have in Salford, is there any considerable quantity which comes from the east ports?—We have had no foreign cattle from any of those ports to Manchester this year.

13439. Do you get any foreign cattle at Salford, either from London or elsewhere?—We get foreign cattle at Salford from the London market.

13440. Do you expect to get any foreign cattle now that Schleswig Holstein is taken out of the schedule?—I believe that the boats do not run from the east ports to bring them in time for the Manchester market; we shall try to get some; we are going to inquire into it.

13441. Your present impression is that the boats do not run at times which would be convenient for the market?—That is so.

13442. Without that of course it could not be accomplished?—That is so.

13443. You have none from the north of Europe, Denmark, or Norway, or any of those parts, have you?—We have had none from Norway for about 10 years; we had one cargo from Norway some 10 years ago.

13444. They have not come to Liverpool?—No.

13445. The principal import which you have is sheep?—It consists of sheep entirely from the German ports.

13446. At the Liverpool and Salford markets, which supply that district of Lancashire, you are dependent upon Ireland and the home produce for cattle?—Yes; except the beasts from Spain and Portugal.

13447. Excepting some that you got through London?—Yes.

13448. You say you get some supply of foreign cattle from London now?—Yes.

13449. Has that been the case for any length of time; has it existed for several years, or is it recent?—For several years, when they have been allowed to travel alive from London.

13450. Do you know whether there is any considerable quantity of dead meat sent from the ports to Manchester and Salford?—No; it is a very small quantity, but Mr. Brown will be able to speak better to that than I can.

13451. Still keeping to cattle, what do you say with regard to the regulations as respects pleuro-pneumonia?—I think that the regulations cannot be too strict with regard to pleuro-pneumonia; in my opinion, you cannot have too stringent regulations.

13452. What would you do, then?—I have had
gr es

great experience in pleuro-pneumonia; at present we have charge of a lot of cattle which are going through it; and what I would do is as we do now. As soon as a cow shows the slightest symptoms of disease, we take her away from the others and slaughter her, and watch the others all the time. I would order all affected to be slaughtered, and compensation to the extent of two-thirds of the value given to the owners. Unless this is done, owners will not report cases of pleuro-pneumonia.

13453. Are you now slaughtering without compensation those which are under your own charge?—Yes.

13454. But, as a general rule, you find that farmers will not report?—They will not, because they try to get affected cattle out of the way as soon as they can.

13455. What course do you adopt to prevent the spread of that disease?—In our own stock, in the case of cattle in a byre, we burn gas-tar amongst them twice a day, while the cattle are in the building.

13456. With closed doors?—Yes; we close the doors and windows, and almost suffocate them. We find it a very good thing indeed.

13457-8. What effect have you found that to have upon animals so treated?—We have found the disease invariably stops after the first few affected animals have been removed, owing to the burning of the gas-tar.

13459. You find that destroys the infection?—Yes, I do.

13460. Does it injure the cattle in any other way?—Not in the least.

13461. Does it make them sneeze?—It makes them cough and sneeze a great deal at the time.

13462. Have you adopted that precaution for any considerable length of time?—Every time that we have a cow affected with pleuro-pneumonia, when the cows are in the shippens, we begin to burn this tar at once.

13463. If one cow is affected in your herd, you treat all the rest to that remedy?—Yes.

13464. What proportion of Irish cattle form the supply to the Salford market?—In the summer months, I should say that almost five-sixths of the supply is Irish.

13465. And during the winter months, what would be the proportion?—During the winter months it would be about one-half from January to March.

13466. Most of the cattle, I presume, at the Salford market are sold for immediate slaughter?—Yes, all of them, I should say; none of them are removed to other markets to be sold.

13467. Still, I presume, if the disease were developed, they might convey the infection by going along the road?—Yes, most decidedly.

13468. I presume the great bulk of the cattle, except those retained in Salford itself, are sent away by railway trucks?—Yes, most of them are trucked to the large towns in the neighbourhood.

13469. Now we will go to the sheep: what are the particular regulations which, in your judgment, affect prejudicially the question of the supply of sheep?—The regulations with regard to foot and mouth disease have the same effect as they have upon cattle, one regulation applies to the other.

13470. As far as foot and mouth disease goes, your evidence would be the same with reference to sheep as it is with reference to cattle?—Yes.

13471. With regard to sheep scab, what have

you to say to that?—I think that scab is a disease which is very easily cured, and I think that in a fat market no notice should be taken of it at all; no man but a slovenly farmer would have scab in his stock. It is the farmer's interest to have his sheep healthy, and to send them to market in a healthy state.

13472. Now, with regard to scab, I believe that the sheep which come from a foreign port affected with scab have to be slaughtered?—Yes, there is a regulation with regard even to one sheep in a cargo; if there is one sheep in a cargo, say of 2,000 affected with scab, the whole have to be slaughtered.

13473. You do not think that necessary?—I think that very absurd when the sheep are intended for immediate slaughter, that is to say, when they are going to Manchester and other districts where they never go to be fattened at all.

13474. You do not think they all ought to be condemned to be slaughtered at the port of debarkation?—No, I do not.

13475. Do you have many foreign sheep pass through your own hands?—Yes, we have a great many; I sold 2,600 on Tuesday in the Salford market.

13476. Where did they come from?—All from Hamburg.

13477. Did they come by Hull?—They came by Sunderland, and West Hartlepool, and Newcastle.

13478. They came by rail all the way, did they not?—Yes.

13479. Do you get many in Liverpool?—No; very few are sold in Liverpool, very few indeed.

13480. What is the proportion of German sheep to the total number of sheep sold in the Salford market?—In the spring months, say from March to the end of May, they are about one third, and occasionally they have been one half the supply.

13481. Could you give the Committee some figures?—I have some figures for 1871; this was the first week after the restrictions allowing foreign sheep to travel alive were removed. On May 2nd there were 2,418 German sheep out of a total of 9,459 shown. Upon May 9th, there were 3,400 Germans out of 10,678; upon May 16th, there were 4,108 German sheep out of a total of 13,260; on May 23rd, there were 4,000 Germans out of a total of 13,321; and, upon May 30th, there were 6,100 German sheep out of a total of 15,400 sheep shown; that is for one month, which I took at hazard.

13482. The bulk of the German sheep come to the London market, do they not?—Yes, the bulk of them.

13483. Do you know any reason for that preference?—The reason why they are sent to London is because they are nearer the wholesale dead meat market; if they had to be slaughtered on account of foot and mouth disease, they would make a higher price when sold there than if they had to be slaughtered a long way from the market.

13484. Therefore, if they have to be killed there is no advantage in having a dead meat market near the place of slaughter?—Yes, they are killed amongst people who buy them; whereas for Manchester and the north they are killed away from the people who consume them.

13485. That is to say, they are killed at the port of landing, and have to be sent 100 miles and upwards?—Yes.

Mr.
S. Leake,
Jun.
10 July
1873.

Mr. S. Lowry, Jun. 10 July 1873. 13486. Your evidence is that in your judgment the injury done in that way is not compensated for by any protection which the country gains?—No, not as regards foot and mouth disease.

13487. Can you give the Committee any figures of recent date of sheep slaughtered by order of the inspector at the ports of landing; you have some figures, I think, relating both to Sunderland and Hartlepool; take February 1872; the "Hugh Strenthfield"—The "Hugh Strenthfield" and the "Tunstall" brought to Sunderland 2,354 sheep, all of which were ordered to be slaughtered, because half-a-dozen were supposed to have the foot and mouth disease.

13488. *Chairman.* Why do you say "supposed"?—Because I examined them minutely; I was a day amongst the sheep, and I could only find one slight symptom of foot and mouth disease among them.

13489. You did find one case?—I found one very slight and very uncertain symptom.

13490. *Mr. Cowley.* Had you another case last March which you examined?—I did not examine them; the "Alert" arrived upon the 9th of March with 808 sheep, and all of them were condemned, because three of them had the foot and mouth disease.

13491. Those you did not see?—I sent our shepherd down to look at them, and he said that it was not foot and mouth disease, but foot rot which they had.

13492. That was a matter of opinion, but you did not see them?—I did not see them; it was his opinion.

13493. Those sheep were principally intended for the Manchester market, were they not?—Most of them were intended for the Manchester market; and some for Yorkshire.

13494. It frequently happens, does it not, that cargoes of from 300 to 400, and sometimes more are slaughtered when only three or four, or half-a-dozen are supposed to be affected?—Yes.

13495. I think you have already said, with regard to each, that you think that diseases ought not to be included in the Act at all?—I think not.

13496. Have you anything to show the importance of the Salford Cattle Market; can you tell the Committee what the average number of beasts and sheep which are shown at Salford on market day runs to, there being only one market day a week?—There are about 2,000 beasts upon the average all the year through, and the number of sheep is from about 10,000 to 12,000.

13497. What towns are chiefly supplied from the Salford market?—There is Bury, Burnley, Blackburn, Bolton, Stockport, Rochdale, Oldham, Preston, and Warrington; all the towns round about within 20 or 30 miles.

13498. Are any of the towns grouped round Manchester supplied from any of the eastern markets, Wakefield or Rotherham, for example?—If Salford market has been a very dear market some of the butchers go to Wakefield and Leeds, but if we have a heavy market they do not go there.

13499. There is an occasional supply from the eastern markets?—Yes; Wakefield and Leeds are two principal Yorkshire markets.

13500. Is there any other point which you wish to state before the Committee?—I think not.

13501. *Mr. Kewsey.* With regard to foot and mouth disease, you stated that you thought

the only thing that would be of any use would be the cessation of all movement of cattle?—Yes.

13502. But I did not understand you to recommend that to be made law?—No, I think the people would not allow it.

13503. You would not recommend it?—Certainly not.

13504. Do you think foot and mouth disease of such importance as to warrant any such stringent enactment as that?—I do not.

13505. You mentioned some cattle which were in the Liverpool Market, which were affected with foot and mouth disease; how long were they from Ireland?—It was three days since they came from Ireland; they had been landed upon the Thursday.

13506. Do you think those animals caught the infection in England, or that they came over infected?—I should think that they caught the disease upon their way from Ireland to England; I think they were perfectly healthy in Ireland before they left.

13507. If those animals had been diseased in Ireland before they left, would not they have shown the disease before the market-day?—They would have shown the disease before the market-day.

13508. You have seen, I presume, the evidence which has been given before this Committee, the various estimates of loss stated to have been suffered by stock-owners from foot and mouth disease; have you seen any of them?—I may have read a short notice of it in the papers.

13509. Did you see that return from the Hereford Chamber of Agriculture, with regard to the loss which foot and mouth disease caused to the stock-owners in the whole of England?—I did not see that.

13510. You could not give the Committee any opinion with reference to whether that return was exaggerated or not?—I could not.

13511. But do you think any statements which you have seen in the papers are exaggerated?—Most of them, I think, are exaggerated.

13512. You do not think that the loss to the stock-owners from foot and mouth disease is so serious as has been represented?—I do not think it is anything like it.

13513. Have you ever been in Ireland?—Yes.

13514. Do you know anything of the large fairs there?—I have been to Ballymacree and Mullingar and most of the large fairs.

13515. What is your opinion of the arrangements at those fairs; do you think the fairs are well managed in Ireland?—They are very well managed indeed.

13516. As you have attended those fairs you can tell the Committee what your opinion was as to the general healthy condition of the stock that were there?—When I was there all the cattle were remarkably healthy; as a rule Irish cattle are remarkably healthy.

13517. Did you purchase cattle there?—I have done so several times.

13518. Did you happen to read, or was there brought under your notice that pamphlet upon the Irish cattle trade which was published by the Royal Agricultural Society of England, edited, I believe, by Mr. Jenkins?—Yes, it was brought to my notice six weeks ago.

13519. Do you agree with the statements which

he makes with regard to Ireland, namely, that everything there is very badly managed, and that disease is rife everywhere?—I do not agree with that at all; I think the cattle are very well managed in Ireland; Irish farmers can teach Englishmen something about the management of cattle.

13520. Another statement was that Ireland was the chief source of supply of foot and mouth disease to England?—Yes, I read that.

13521. From your general knowledge, do you think that is true?—No.

13522. Did you read in the same report any of his statements about Liverpool?—Yes, about the way the cattle are landed there.

13523. Do you think those statements are correct?—No.

13524. He also made some statement about the accommodation which was provided for cattle in steamers coming over from Ireland; do you know anything about that?—I have bought cattle and landed them myself, and come over with them.

13525. Do you consider the accommodation provided for cattle on board the steamer was fair?—Capital; it could not be better.

13526. You do not agree with Mr. Jenkins in his statement that they are smothered, and all that sort of thing?—No.

13527. We have been told in evidence that it would be very much better to have all the cattle slaughtered at ports of debarkation, and conveyed thence to the various centres of consumption in the large towns; do you agree with that evidence?—No.

13528. Do you think it would have any injurious effect upon the meat market, if all cattle were obliged to be slaughtered at the ports at which they landed, and were carried inland as dead meat?—It would have this effect, that the trade would stop entirely; the foreign breeders would not send them here to run their chance of a market.

13529. Do you think that the supply of meat from abroad would stop?—Yes.

13530. *Chairman.* Why does it not stop now at Deptford or at Hull?—Because they are nearer the market and the people at Deptford.

13531. Why does it not stop at Hull?—There is a very small quantity slaughtered at Hull compared with Deptford, and I think Hull is principally supplied by foreign cattle. As regards the Hull people, they eat very little else than foreign meat, because they can buy it so much cheaper at the port; they cannot remove it; the loss is so great that people are afraid to send it away, in most cases.

13532. Mr. *Kennedy.* I suppose it would stop the supply of cattle from Spain and Portugal?—Entirely.

13533. Supposing, in the Salford market, they had had no cattle from Spain and Portugal, or foreign sheep, what effect would that have had upon the price of meat there?—I think meat would have been nearly double the price if it had not been for the German sheep and the Spanish cattle this spring.

13534. The price of meat has increased very much, has it not, within the last 10 years?—Greatly.

13535. Could you tell the Committee about how much the price of meat has increased in the last 10 years?—In most cases, I should think 3 s. a pound.

13536. Mr. *Cowley.* For best cuts?—No, 0.5s.

the carcass; we pay perhaps 5 d. more per pound for the best cuts than we used to do.

13537. Mr. *Kennedy.* The fact is, that the price of meat has increased very considerably within the last 10 years, that everybody knows?—Yes.

13538. Is it not the fact that a great deal of dissatisfaction is expressed by the inhabitants of those large manufacturing towns towards butchers and others engaged in the cattle trade?—Yes, there was great dissatisfaction; a few months ago the butchers in some of the manufacturing towns were obliged to close their shops, the people would not allow them to be open; they said that if the Government would not allow the foreign stock to come in, they would bring the price down by force.

13539. Do you find that at present the butchers can make a profitable trade?—Very few of them can pay their way; we have to give them a great deal more credit than we used to do formerly.

13540. As far as you can judge, have the restrictions imposed by the Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act, been advantageous to Liverpool?—The restrictions imposed by the Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act have been very injurious to the Liverpool market.

13541. In general terms, what are those restrictions?—The cattle are inspected by two veterinary surgeons, and six or seven policemen, who go from diseased to healthy, and from healthy to diseased stock; the police are the most active of the lot; the veterinary surgeons are not quite so active as the police; they go round from one lot to another, and if they see a diseased beast, they take it out and summon the person who shows it in the market and exposes it for sale.

13542. You consider that these enactments have injuriously affected the interests of those large cattle markets?—They have prevented the people sending their stock to the market.

13543. Is it not the fact that, for the last two years, large numbers of cattle and sheep have been purchased in London for consumption in Manchester and Liverpool?—Yes, great quantities.

13544. Has the range of prices which has prevailed in Manchester and Liverpool been higher than in London?—Yes, the prices must have been higher for dealers to go and buy them in London and bring them down and sell at a profit to the butchers.

13545. Used that to be the case formerly?—No; London was always considered to be the leading market; the prices were regulated by London formerly.

13546. Speaking in a general way, to what do you attribute the range of the price of meat at Manchester and Liverpool being higher than in London?—I attribute it, in one way, to the uncertainty of foreign stock being shown in the Salford market, and to the rise in wages in the manufacturing districts. The people are getting higher wages, and can afford to pay higher prices for meat.

13547. You do not attribute it to the amount of commission charged by the sale masters upon the sale of meat?—Not the least.

13548. Has the high rate of commission charged upon the sale of stock in Liverpool and Manchester, and other places, been the means of diverting the supply from those places?—Our trade has increased, and everyone else's, I think, in the last few years.

Mr.
S. Lambert,
Jun.—
10 July
1873.

Mr.
S. Lambert,
Jun.
10 July
1873.

13549. The fact is, that the large salesmasters' trade has increased very much?—Yes.

13550. So that it is not likely that their commission has had anything to do with diverting the trade from those places?—Not at all.

13551. Is it not the fact, that it is rather the small dealers, and the people whose business is not extensive, who have given up attending the Liverpool and Salford markets?—Yes.

13552. You have had, have you not, from your knowledge of Liverpool, a pretty good opportunity of observing the way in which the local authorities have carried out the provisions of the Act of 1869 in Liverpool?—I have.

13553. The market is under the jurisdiction of the local authority?—It is.

13554. Is it the fact that cattle have been seized and placed in quarantine there, which were stated to have been affected with foot and mouth disease, although the same cattle had been declared by several veterinary surgeons to have been sound?—I have seen cattle condemned under those circumstances. In two instances I saw two heifers condemned for foot and mouth disease, and neither of them were at all affected with it.

13555. You know those instances yourself?—From my own knowledge; I inspected them carefully, in conjunction with another veterinary surgeon.

13556. Were fines inflicted in those cases, although there was conflicting veterinary testimony?—Yes, there were.

13557. Is it the generally received opinion in Lancashire that the county local authorities give every facility to the import and movement of store cattle, and obstruct the movement of fat cattle?—Yes.

13558. Can you give the reason for that, or have you heard any reason assigned for it?—I never heard any reason assigned for it.

13559. Mr. Cowley.] You referred to Sir Humphrey de Trafford?—Yes.

13560. Were they all fat cattle in that park?—Yes.

13561. Mr. Kewenagh.] They would not allow you to remove any cattle out of that herd except for the purpose of slaughter?—No; except to slaughter them upon the field where we had no accommodation; they would allow us to kill them there.

13562. Did you ever hear of the local authorities inspecting store stock in the West Derby district?—No; I never heard of the local authorities inspecting stock in that district.

13563. Do you know of any market in England where inspection is carried out so rigidly as it is carried out at the Liverpool fat cattle market, at the Stanley Market?—No; I never saw any inspection carried out so foolishly, for I say it is absurd, taking out diseased beasts and then letting the infected herd go anywhere, for they must be infected when you take the diseased beasts away from them.

13564. Is it generally supposed that it is the fact that they are chiefly Irish cattle that come into that market that has created a prejudice against them?—I do not think so; because we depend upon the Irish cattle for our supply of beef; if you stopped the Irish supplies you would have a famine there directly.

13565. But you do not think that the local authorities are at all prejudiced against the Irish supply?—No.

13566. Professor Gamgee has told this Committee that there is no difficulty in supplying the large towns with dead meat, and that if the prejudice could be got over, it would be more advantageous to slaughter the cattle at home than to send them alive to the cattle markets; do you think that would be possible?—No, I think it would be totally impossible.

13567. Do you know anything about Cheshire?—Yes; I live upon the borders of Cheshire, and I have been a great deal in Cheshire.

13568. What character do the Cheshire farmers bear generally as cattle farmers?—As cattle farmers they are looked upon as very bad indeed.

13569. I should not be wrong in describing them, as they have been described, as slovenly farmers?—Yes, very slovenly indeed as regards cattle.

13570. Their farm buildings and the things relating to the management of stock are, as a rule, very bad, are they not?—Yes, as a rule, they are very bad indeed.

13571. Mr. Cowley.] Would you apply that to the large farmers in Cheshire, as well as the small ones?—Yes; upon the large farms, where they keep cattle; the buildings, as a rule, are very bad; there are some very good ones, but, as a rule, they are very bad.

13572. Mr. Kewenagh.] Is it not the rule, that a large number of Cheshire calves are sold each week at Manchester, and that a large number of those calves are sent afterwards to Ireland?—Yes; I have seen them sold there and sent to Ireland.

13573. Therefore it is not quite a true statement that all those calves sold there, are sold as veal calves?—No; I have sold them myself to go to Ireland.

13574. Cheshire appears by the Veterinary Returns to have suffered more from disease than any other county in England?—Yes, that is so.

13575. If that is the case would it not seem likely that in exporting calves from Cheshire to Ireland would be a very fruitful source of disease to Ireland?—Yes, I should think so.

13576. Mr. Jacob Bright.] You are aware that we have had witnesses who are in favour of compulsory slaughter at the ports in this country?—Yes, I have heard so.

13577. If that were a universal rule, would it be any considerable disadvantage to the London market?—I think it would be a very great advantage to the London market if that were the rule.

13578. You think it would be a great advantage to the London market, because London would monopolize what ought to go to the country at large?—Certainly.

13579. London would not suffer if we had a law of compelling the slaughter throughout the country, from the fact that London is a port; that is one reason, at all events?—Yes.

13580. Therefore, London would be killing all the cattle within her own doors?—Yes.

13581. But seeing that our great towns are for the most part inland, they would have no such advantage; they are not ports, and they would suffer to the advantage of London in your opinion?—Yes.

13582. You believe, in fact, that that is the condition of things to some extent at the present moment?—Yes, I do.

13583. And, therefore, the argument that because when you schedule a country it still sends its

his cattle to Deptford, you do not hold it at all a satisfactory argument as applied to Manchester, or to Sheffield, or to Birmingham?—No, I do not.

13584. You stated, as I understand, that there was a very large number of foreign sheep brought from the eastern ports to Manchester and Salford?—Yes, in the spring and summer months.

13585. And very few cattle?—Yes.

13586. Almost no cattle, as I understood?—That is so.

13587. That seems to be an extraordinary thing. What is the reason that we can have a very large supply of Continental sheep into Manchester and Liverpool, and almost no cattle?—Because the cattle are obliged to be slaughtered at the port of landing from Germany.

13588. And sheep are free?—Yes, sheep are free. If none are affected with foot and mouth disease, scab, or sheep-pox; and if they do not come in a boat with cattle.

13589. On account of that rule it follows not only that we do not get cattle at Manchester and Salford, but that our eastern ports do not get any considerable number, in consequence of there being no adequate population to consume them?—It does.

13590. What number of sheep did you tell the Committee there was in the Salford market?—I do not know the total number.

13591. It is very large, is it not?—Yes; upwards of 2,000 cattle per week, and between 10,000 and 12,000 sheep.

13592. There are almost none coming from the eastern ports?—There are no cattle.

13593. But there are a large number of sheep?—Yes, there are.

13594. Supposing it should be necessary, or should be thought desirable, or that Parliament should in fact pass a law that those sheep which you now get at Manchester and Salford should be slaughtered at Hull, or at Hartlepool, or at Sunderland, or wherever they might come, what effect, in your opinion, would that have upon Manchester and Salford?—It would cause a great rise in the price of meat.

13595. Would it cause no other rise than in the price of meat?—It would cause a rising of the people probably.

13596. Then by shutting out the sheep in that way, if the compulsory slaughter of sheep at the ports would have the effect which you describe, of course, the compulsory slaughter of beasts is having a great effect, only that the people do not see it?—They do not see it; they are getting good wages and they do not see it at present; they can afford to pay a higher price than they could a few years ago.

13597. Is there generally a difference in the price of beef and mutton between London and Manchester?—Yes.

13598. You know that absolutely?—Yes.

13599. That is to say, in a retail shop in London, you would generally get beef and mutton at a less price than in a retail shop in Manchester?—Yes.

13600. Do you know how much the difference is?—I could not say for certain how much, but there is a great difference in the prices in the cattle market; if you refer to the "Mark Lane Express" you will find it so.

13601. What is the reason that there should be a permanently lower price of animal food in London than in Manchester?—Because they are 0.58.

needer the foreign supply; beef coming to Deptford is nearer the market where it can be sold, and that tends to keep the prices down here.

13602. You think that practically it is because there is free trade for London and not for Manchester?—Yes, practically so.

13603. It is not because wages have risen in Lancashire, because wages have risen perhaps as much in London as they have done in Lancashire?—I could hardly say that.

13604. Cattle can now be admitted from Schleswig-Holstein?—Yes.

13605. But seeing the interruption which took place, it is not likely that you will soon get that supply, because the importer would have to make his arrangements, and he would want to have some security before he would undertake to make those arrangements?—Yes.

13606. If it were likely that our Lancashire population had to trust considerably to the Eastern ports, or rather to cattle slaughtered at the Eastern ports; if we had a law of compulsory slaughter, would not the supply be very precarious; would it not depend a good deal upon the weather?—It would depend greatly upon the best of the weather.

13607. Might they not find themselves very well supplied at one time, and at another time find themselves in a very uncomfortable position?—They might sometimes find themselves entirely without.

13608. Owing to the state of the weather?—Yes.

13609. I think you stated that you used gnat as a preventative of pleuro-pneumonia?—Yes.

13610. I think you have found it effectual?—We have.

13611. I presume that it is not a dear preventative?—We gave 4s. a gallon for it, and that would last about three or four months for about 30 or 40 beasts.

13612. Then, if there is a means of preventing that disease, should we make it compulsory by law to slaughter cattle which had been in communication with the disease?—No: in pleuro-pneumonia I would isolate them for six weeks or two months.

13613. You said that you would either treat foot and mouth disease as you would rinderpest, or that you would exclude it from the Act of Parliament altogether?—You would if you wanted to stop the disease in the country.

13614. You really mean to say that it is a complaint inseparable from cattle growing and cattle travelling?—Yes; in a wet season no amount of legislation will prevent foot-and-mouth disease breaking out.

13615. You have had as much medical education, I suppose, as any veterinary surgeon in the kingdom?—I have had more medical education than the majority of veterinary surgeons.

13616. Quite as good advantages as others, at all events?—Yes.

13617. Suppose we had no communication whatever with the Continent, do you think that foot and mouth disease could be banished from this country and never re-appear?—My opinion is, that foot and mouth disease will break out spontaneously in the country without any communication with the Continent.

13618. You believe it is an indigenous disease?—I do.

13619. You do not believe that this is a sacred spot,

Mr.
S. Lubert.
10 July
1875.

Mr. spot, free from all disease unless we import it from abroad?—No.

S. Lowbert,
10 July
1873

13690. Are you aware that there are people who have been before this Committee who do hold that theory?—Yes.

13691. You spoke of dogs, and other four-footed animals, as having been the means of conveying the disease?—Yes.

13692. Have you any accurate knowledge upon that subject, or is it only a supposition?—I think they are quite as capable of conveying the disease, as men are, from one lot of cattle to another lot.

13693. Could you bring forward any instances of their conveying the disease?—Yes.

13694. Could you give any instances of men conveying the disease?—Yes; I sent a man to milk some cows three miles off from my place, and he came back and said, that one of them had foot and mouth disease; previously to that he had been into another shed where some healthy cows were, and I said to him, "You should not have gone into that shippin after you found that the cow had foot and mouth disease," and three days afterwards the disease broke out in that shippin.

13695. Do you find that the bounds in hunting the country ever take the disease from one farm to another?—I should fancy they would have a tendency to do so quite as much as any other dogs.

13696. This question of the free import of cattle in Lancashire is not, I suppose, simply a butcher's question, that is to say, it is a question which the people themselves are getting to understand, is it not?—Yes.

13697. And they are taking a great interest in it?—Yes.

13698. And the drier the meat becomes, the more restless they will become upon the subject?—Yes.

13699. Mr. Lusk.] Have you been abroad much on the Continent?—I have been in France and Germany.

13700. Are cattle much cheaper there than here?—In Germany they are cheaper, as is shown by people sending them here to be sold?—Dealers buy them there, and send them here to be sold.

13701. If all the cattle were slaughtered at the ports, you say that the people would not send them at all?—They would not, on account of the uncertainty of the market.

13702. It would be absolutely necessary, in your opinion, in order to get a supply, not to slaughter the cattle when they arrive?—Yes.

13703. Do you know whether most of the foreign stock which arrive in London are slaughtered?—The foreign stock which are allowed in the cattle market, are allowed to go anywhere.

13704. If we slaughtered them all, that would stop an immense supply?—It would stop an immense supply.

13705. You think that before any fresh legislation takes place, we should look well before we slaughtered all the cattle?—Yes; I think so.

13706. You would be against that?—Certainly.

13707. Because it would raise the price of meat to the people?—Yes.

13708. You rather astonish me with your peculiar doctrine of price; have you ever noticed the price in the London market?—Yes.

13709. What is the average price of first class

meat in the London market?—Do you mean the live or dead meat market?

13710. Take it any way you like, take the average price per stone?—I read it every week in the reports of the newspapers; beef and mutton will average from 6 s. to 6 s. 4 d.

13711. That is what I notice is the price of first class meat, and when a clever butcher goes to buy a bullock, he estimates the number of stones, does he not?—Yes.

13712. He very often comes very near it?—Yes.

13713. When you say the prices are much higher in Salford and Manchester than in London, should you be surprised to hear that the price in the "Manchester Examiner" and "Times," of July the 9th, is about 9 d. to 9½ d., that would be about 6 s. 6 d. the stone, the same price exactly as London?—That may be for one week. I gave that report to the "Examiner" and "Times." This week we had a fall in prices in Salford market, and that accounts for prices being as in London.

13714. In Newcastle, 8 s. 6 d. to 12 s. 3 d.; Lamb, 11 d. to 1 s.; and if you take Doncaster, it is about the same thing?—Doncaster is of no importance; it is a very small place.

13715. You tell me the place is so very different from London; the reason I ask you that is, that it seems to be so contrary to this enlightened age where we have railways, that anything should be so very much dearer in one place than another, and when I turn to this paper, I find it is not so; that the price in one place is very much the same as in the other; now, is reference to the Cheshire farms, I know one or two gentlemen in Cheshire who are very clever men; are they Englishmen in Cheshire?—Yes, mostly, I think. I know several very clever stock farmers in Cheshire.

13716. How do you expect that being so close to Lancashire, they are so much behind everybody else?—I say that as regards the cattle farming.

13717. How do you expect that Englishmen living so near such shrewd people as those in Lancashire should not be likely to look after their own interests?—Because they are so ignorant of their own interests.

13718. When you speak of the high wages a man is getting, do you think that it is the high wages which are the cause of the high price of meat, or the demand?—The high prices are caused by the demand.

13719. Do you not think that the high price will be permanent in beef and mutton?—I do not think so.

13720. Do you think that those who have to produce beef and mutton, and who have to pay their servants higher wages will be able to sell at the old prices they used to?—High wages do not affect the price of beef and mutton in that way; in producing them there is very little wages paid; the cattle produce it themselves.

13721. Chairman.] How about a flock of ewes?—The wages affect the question very little indeed.

13722. Mr. Lusk.] Do you mean that a man who has a farm, and who is paying higher wages for his farm servants, and tea and sugar, and clothing for his people, is able to sell the beef and mutton cheaply; that everybody else is to get a high price for his labour, and that he is to get a low price for his?—I do not think agricultural wages have gone up very much in Lancashire and Cheshire, which you were speaking of.

13723. Mr.

13663. Mr. Fell.] How long have you had experience of the application of the fumes of coal tar?—During the cattle plague times we were surrounded by cattle affected with the plague, and we began to burn tar in our shippens with two herds of cattle, and although there were cattle within 40 yards of us dying of the plague, none of ours were ever affected at all.

13664. Was that when you first began to perceive that it was of efficacy in cases of pleuro-pneumonia?—We perceived it years before that.

13665. Had you used it years before that for pleuro-pneumonia?—Yes.

13666. Your firm have sold cattle wholesale for many years?—Yes.

13667. Do you find that the Lancashire people are satisfied with the same quality of meat now, as they used to be 15 years ago?—Yes, quite as well.

13668. Just the same character of meat?—Yes.

13669. Have you as ready a sale for what are called guts and stickings in London, the roughest cuts; that the roughest cuts are always in demand?—Yes, I think so.

13670. Is the Committee to understand that you attribute the relatively high price of meat in Lancashire, to the interference with the foreign trade?—Yes.

13671. And that London really has an advantage from the arrangements for the receipt of foreign cattle, which Lancashire has not?—Yes.

13672. And that relatively, therefore, meat is cheaper in London than in Lancashire?—Yes.

13673. You know something of the metropolis, I suppose, and the price of articles here besides meat; have you ever bought meat here to send down?—No.

13674. Is it not true that most articles are to be got cheaper in London than anywhere else in England?—I could not say.

13675. What do you say with reference to fish?—I do not know about that at all.

13676. You do not know that London bears the character of being able to supply commodities as cheaply as any city in the world?—I should think so as regards fish, because it is nearer the sea than most places.

13677. Not nearer to the sea than you are at Manchester; you are nearer the salmon at Manchester than we are in London?—We have had salmon in Manchester very cheap lately.

13678. An honourable Member asked you whether you considered England a sacred spot, and from her position as an island liable to be exempt from contagious diseases; I think you stated that you did not consider her to be so exempt?—I do not.

13679. Do you believe that sheep-pox is indigenous to this country?—No, I do not.

13680. Do you know that small-pox is not indigenous, but is an introduced disorder?—I think it was originally introduced here, but I think myself it is indigenous now.

13681. It has become so, but it is of recent importation?—Yes.

13682. Take venereal disease, that is of recent importation, is it not?—Yes, I think so.

13683. Therefore, England may claim the credit of being a sacred spot in as far as it had opportunities of being isolated as regards those diseases?—Yes, to a certain extent.

13684. You do not attribute the high price of meat in your district to the great increase in the price of wages?—No, I do not.

13675. Mr. Barclay.] I think you said that you did not believe that veterinary treatment did any good in the case of foot and mouth disease? No, my experience tends to show that it does not.

13676. Do you think it does any good as regards pleuro-pneumonia?—Not the least.

13677. Do you think it does any good in cattle plague?—Not the least.

13678. Nor in sheep-pox?—I never saw a case of sheep-pox, so I could not say.

13679. In regard to cattle, you know that there are a good many diseases to which cattle are subject besides those that I have named?—Yes.

13680. This country is not free from those diseases?—No.

13681. May it be generally said that each country has special diseases of itself?—No, I do not think it may, except with regard to cattle plague.

13682. And sheep-pox?—I do not know anything about sheep-pox, because I never saw a case of sheep-pox.

13683. And pleuro-pneumonia?—I think pleuro-pneumonia is an indigenous disease to this country; I think we shall never be rid of it.

13684. Do you know anything about the history of foot and mouth disease?—Yes; I have read that it was imported here.

13685. Do you know when it first made its appearance in this country?—I believe it was in 1838.

13686. Do you believe that?—I have read it; I cannot say anything else.

13687. The fact of its appearing here for the first time would be a material point in the consideration of whether it was an indigenous disease, or whether it was imported?—That was the first time it was recorded in this country; we have no record of it here before 1838, but, nevertheless, it might have been in the country.

13688. Had it been out of this country for some time previously to 1838?—I never heard of it before then; that is the first record we have of its coming into this country.

13689. I suppose your conclusions are the same with respect to pleuro-pneumonia?—Yes.

13690. You referred to a certain case to show that the Act of Parliament applying to foot and mouth disease was imperative, or rather inefficient, for preventing the spread of disease; what was the name of that place where the disease existed?—Sir Humphrey de Trafford's place.

13691. I think that was the only place you referred to as indicating the uselessness of the existing Act?—That was the only case I referred to.

13692. Have you any other case or argument in proof of the uselessness of the present Act?—No, I have no other proof now; I could bring proofs if they were required, but I have nothing in my mind at present.

13693. I think I understood you to say that the local authority prevented the movement of two herds of cattle upon that estate?—There were three or four herds; they were all upon one farm, in one occupation.

13694. Did you look into the powers of the local authority upon that subject?—Yes; we wrote to the Privy Council Office about it at the time.

13695. Did they give you any reply with reference to the power of the local authority?—They said that without knowing the locality they could not give us any certain reply.

Mr.
S. Lambert.
10 July
1873.

Mr.
S. Lombard.
10 July
1873.

13696. Did you tell them that one herd of cattle was a mile-and-a-half distant from the other one?—Yes.

13697. The Order in Council states that "the local authorities may make power for the removal of cattle out of any field, stable, cow-shed, or other premises, in which foot and mouth disease had been found to exist," the local authority hold "premises" to include all the land under one occupation?—Yes, that appears to be so.

13698. Have you any instance of the police carrying disease, as you have stated?—I cannot bring any clear instance myself, only that the police are reported to have taken the disease from the Liverpool market. When it spread from Liverpool to Prescott it was supposed to have been taken by the police, because no cattle had gone there.

13699. If the police had not interposed what would you have done to these cattle that were attacked with disease?—We should have sold them.

13700. And what would have been done with them?—They would have been eaten.

13701. But prior to being eaten when they were taken from the park?—They would have been taken to a slaughterhouse, or to a market.

13702. Would they have been taken along a highway, or would they have been exposed in a market?—Those which were very bad we should have slaughtered, and those not so bad we should have exposed in the market.

13703. Where would those which would have been slaughtered, have been slaughtered at?—At the nearest slaughterhouse.

13704. They would have been moved along a public highway previously to that?—Yes.

13705. Do you think that a judicious or fair arrangement in the interests of the public?—Yes, I do; assuming it was only foot and mouth disease.

13706. Supposing this was the only case of foot and mouth disease in the neighbourhood, do you think it would have been a fair thing to have moved those cattle along a public highway?—Yes, I think so.

13707. Do you think there would have been no risk of communicating the disease?—There would have been no more risk than from the men upon an estate; the men would have been just as liable to take it as the cattle.

13708. I suppose that an animal moved along a public highway with its feet suffering from disease would be supposed to leave infection upon the highway?—Yes.

13709. Would a man moving off the estate leave infection upon the highway in the same way?—Yes; I think the dirt upon his shoes would.

13710. Do you think the risk would be as great with a man as with an animal?—Yes, quite.

13711. Is there anything impracticable in such a case as I supposed, where it was the only diseased animal in the neighbourhood, or would there have been any serious loss occasioned by preventing the movement of that animal?—There is a serious loss by keeping it there as a centre of infection; it causes further loss.

13712. What would the loss be of slaughtering the animal upon the premises?—The loss might have been, perhaps, three or four pounds, because the butchers if they have an animal diseased will buy it cheaply, or else they will not buy it at all.

13713. Do you think it fair to the public to

allow those animals to be moved along a highway for the purpose of saving from two to three pounds a head to the owner of the animal?—It would not be fair to the public, if you could stop the disease at a loss of two or three pounds a head; but that would not stop the disease; the disease will not stop until it has run its course.

13714. Assuming you have the disease in narrow limits upon a farm, do you believe that there are any precautions which can be taken which would prevent the spread of disease to all the animals upon that farm?—Only the total stoppage of all men and things off that farm.

13715. Do you think it is possible to stop disease from spreading to all animals off that farm, by confining the animal by itself and taking precautions?—No; when you see an animal infected, other animals would have been in contact and they are infected by that time.

13716. You do not think that any precautions could prevent the spread of disease over a farm, supposing that the cattle were affected with foot and mouth disease?—I do not think that any precautions when the disease is so rife as it was last year will prevent its spreading upon a farm.

13717. I quite agree that when the disease is so rife as it was last year, it would be difficult to prevent its spread, but it is very much decreasing now, is it not?—It has totally disappeared in Lancashire; the disease ceases with the dry weather.

13718. Assuming that it ceased in Lancashire, would you propose to put any restrictions upon any herd where disease broke out again?—I would not.

13719. You would allow the disease to spread through Lancashire as it did?—I would put no restrictions on foot and mouth disease; the farmers do not want it, and the dealers do not want it.

13720. Are you aware that we have had evidence from farmers who say they want restrictions upon foot and mouth disease?—I have talked to large cattle farmers in the north, and they all think the restrictions should be taken off; they think they are absurd and ridiculous.

13721. Those witnesses we have had must be very exceptional then?—They are as far as my experience goes.

13722. Do you think that the import of foreign cattle should be unlimited?—No; I would have them put in quarantine for 24 hours, and have them examined by a veterinary inspector.

13723. What diseases would you expect to discover in that time?—If the animals came from a country where there was no rinderpest I should not expect to see that disease.

13724. Am I to understand from that answer that you approve of the division of countries into scheduled and unscheduled countries?—When the rinderpest exists in a country, I think that country should be scheduled.

13725. If the Privy Council have any doubt about the existence of rinderpest in any country, or if cattle were brought through a country where rinderpest existed, you would schedule that country?—Yes, if rinderpest had existed in the country where the animals came from.

13726. Under those circumstances the cattle would be slaughtered at the port of embarkation?—Yes, they would.

13727. Do you approve of such regulations?—Yes, I think no regulation can be too stringent as regards that disease.

13728. Then

Mr.
S. Lambert.
10 July
1873.

13728. Then if the Privy Council confine themselves to scheduling countries in which they have reasonable doubt whether rinderpest exists, or not, you would approve of their action so far?—Yes, I would.

13729. Would you approve of scheduling countries where pleuro-pneumonia was known to exist?—No.

13730. Do you think a 24 hours' quarantine would enable an inspector to determine whether an animal had pleuro-pneumonia, or not?—I could tell in one hour whether an animal had pleuro-pneumonia, or not.

13731. In what state would the disease be by that time?—If an animal shows symptoms of pleuro-pneumonia it is in such an advanced stage that no amount of medicine or veterinary skill would cure it; when a cow shows symptoms of pleuro-pneumonia her lungs, as a rule, are solid.

13732. What are the first symptoms of pleuro-pneumonia?—The first symptoms of pleuro-pneumonia are dullness and cessation of feeding, and rumination.

13733. But taking a professional examination of the animal, what would they be?—The first symptoms are increase in the action of breathing.

13734. What advantage would inspection be in these 24 hours' quarantine in determining pleuro-pneumonia?—If a cow was affected with pleuro-pneumonia when she came, it would be discoverable during that time.

13735. That is only when an animal had the disease in a highly developed stage?—It is impossible to tell the disease in an early stage.

13736. Those 24 hours' quarantine would not be any advantage in determining pleuro-pneumonia in its first stages?—No, not in its earlier stages.

13737. Have you any objection to a foot and mouth diseased animal being shown in a fair or market?—No, not the least.

13738. You said, I think, that scab was a disease very easily prevented?—It is very easily cured.

13739. Would you have any objections, if scab was discovered in a cargo of foreign sheep, to make provision that they should be dipped before they were sent inland?—I would allow them to be dressed at the port of landing before they were sent inland.

13740. Do you think that that would be a reasonable prevention?—I think it would be a safe precaution.

13741. Do you think the supply of calves from England to Ireland should be stopped?—No, I think not.

13742. Do you think it would be highly injurious to Ireland to stop the shipment of calves from England to Ireland?—It would cause a decrease in their supply of fat beef back again into England; those calves are taken over and sent back again to England as fat beasts.

13743. But from the line of examination upon that point I understood there was a very great risk of those calves taking disease from England to Ireland?—When there is disease in England, and those calves go from a diseased stock, there is great risk, no doubt.

13744. But do you think the advantage of getting calves is greater than the risk caused by taking them across?—I think so, otherwise the dealers would not buy them.

13745. Mr. Dent.] You state that you are con-

nected with the trade in Liverpool as well as Salford?—I am.

13746. Are you a partner with Mr. Verdon?—I am not.

13747. The trade of Liverpool is in the hands of a very few, is it not?—Yes, it is.

13748. How many firms are there, because I think I understood that all the small dealers had been exterminated in Liverpool?—They have been exterminated from Liverpool on account of their being afraid of having their beasts seized if affected with foot and mouth disease; that is one thing they have gone away for.

13749. Why do you imagine the price of meat is likely to fall, that it is not likely to be permanent?—I think a favourable grass and turnip season will cause more beef to be fed, and more grown, and we shall have a fall in the price.

13750. Do you go much about England and Ireland?—I go a good deal about England, but not much about Ireland.

13751. Do you think there has been a considerable increase in the home production of cattle?—Yes, lately there has been a great increase.

13752. Do you know anything about the cattle producing districts of the Continent?—I do not.

13753. *Chairman.*] You think that a favourable grass season would cheapen the price of meat?—Yes, I do.

13754. Was not last season the most favourable grass season which we have had for years?—It was for grass, but very unfavourable for feeding stock, on account of the wet and cold weather.

13755. Was not it the fact that the unfavourableness of the season arose from the large amount of foot and mouth disease which we had then?—That was one cause; another was, that cattle do not thrive in wet and cold weather, and last season was a wet and cold season.

13756. Do you consider foot and mouth disease a harkness epidemic?—I do not consider it harkness, but I consider it impossible to stop it in the country.

13757. It depends upon wet and dry weather more than anything else?—That is my opinion; the disease invariably breaks out in a very wet season. I have talked to other people in the trade, and they all agree with me in that opinion.

13758. Was not foot and mouth disease very general in 1867, when it was a very dry season?—I do not think it was general in our part of the country.

13759. You think that a milk cow does not lose more than 1*l.*, upon the average, from an attack of foot and mouth disease?—No.

13760. Do not they lose a quarter frequently? That is when they are badly milked.

13761. Are not their milking qualities frequently impaired?—No.

13762. Do you mean to say that the animals come back to the same amount of milk as they had before?—Yes, they invariably do so.

13763. Mr. Pell.] Do not they sink the calves?—Yes, it has a tendency to make them abort.

13764. *Chairman.*] How many cows have you had attacked with pleuro-pneumonia?—During the last week or two we have had half-a-dozen.

13765. How many milk cows have you had attacked with pleuro-pneumonia?—About three years ago we had three or four attacked out of a herd of about 50.

Mr. 13766. At what intervals were they attacked?
& Lanier. — There were about three weeks between each case.

10 July 13767. So that your coal tar did not stop these
1872. two or three?—I think the disease had a hold of them before we began to burn the tar.

13768. Do you mean that they were all contaminated one from the other?—I believe we must have bought an infected beast to start with, in some way or other.

13769. Do you know that equally successful results in killing out pleuro-pneumonia have been attained by other means without burning gas tar?—I have not heard that.

13770. You think that foot and mouth disease is spread by dogs and horses, and that a bullock is not more likely to carry the disease than a man?—I think that if a man goes from one lot of cattle to another he is just as likely to carry it as a bullock is.

13771. But does not an ox continue to deposit its saliva as it walks along?—It might a little.

13772. A man would not reproduce it as he walked along, he would simply have what he carried upon his feet?—That is all.

13773. What regulations have you had with reference to the fat market in Salford; I suppose the beasts can all be taken out?—Yes.

13774. And then can go anywhere?—Yes, those that are not diseased; those that are diseased go elsewhere, and are killed.

13775. If a scabby sheep were there it would have to be killed?—Yes, if the inspector saw it, it would have to be killed.

13776. There is nothing against a farmer coming into the Salford market and buying what he considered to be half fat sheep and infusing them back?—There are very few instances of store sheep being bought in the Salford market by farmers.

13777. What do the hutchers in the summer time do with the sheep which they buy?—Those which they do not slaughter they turn into a field; the butchers generally have a field of their own somewhere in the neighbourhood of the town.

13778. So that those scabby sheep could go there?—Yes, they would be allowed to go there.

13779. You think that the prices are generally cheaper in London than in Salford?—Yes.

13780. Are you not aware of this fact, that with regard to London, live stock have not increased at all during the last 20 years, and that the dead meat which has come into the metropolitan market has quadrupled?—I am not aware of that.

13781. You do not think that that would have anything to do with decreasing the price of meat?—It would have something to do with it; if the supply was greater, the price would be sure to go down.

13782. Is it not the case that in manufacturing towns in the north they have a very strong dislike to dead meat?—I believe so.

13783. And that salesmen and butchers do all they can to increase that dislike?—The salesmen do not, and I do not think the butchers do at all.

13784. You think that if all foreign imports were slaughtered at the ports we should not have any stock here at all?—I think we should not.

13785. Are you aware that when the restrictions first began in 1866, and when the whole of the cattle and sheep from foreign countries had to be slaughtered at the ports, we had the largest importation that we ever had?—That was during the time of the cattle plague, when meat rose in price, and was very dear.

13786. I think you are in error about that; in the year 1866 the price of meat fell considerably in the first quarter?—I believe it rose in 1864, if I recollect rightly.

13787. The price of meat never was above 8½d., whereas the price in 1872 was 9½d.?—I believe it fell in price towards the winter of 1868.

13788. In the year 1871 there were considerable restrictions on foreign sheep; they had almost all to be killed at the water side?—Yes, they had.

13789. In the latter part of the year 1871, the restrictions were removed?—The restrictions were removed in April 1871.

13790. Notwithstanding the price being higher in 1872 than in 1871, there were 100,000 sheep more imported in 1872 than in 1871, so that that does not prove that the restrictions stopped the import?—They did not come to Lancashire in 1872; we had a less supply of foreign sheep in Lancashire in 1872 than in 1871; we had an immense importation in 1871.

13791. And there were no restrictions then?—The restrictions began in June 1872, on account of the cattle plague breaking out at Hall.

13792. I suppose Manchester depends very largely indeed upon Irish stock?—Very largely.

13793. It is in consequence of its being so near Ireland that Irish stock goes to Manchester rather than comes to London?—I suppose that is the cause, and the high price as well; the price regulates the supply.

13794. And in consequence of London being so much easier of access to the Continent, the greater portion of the stock from the Continent comes to London?—It is not easier, so far as my experience goes; we can bring sheep from the Continent as cheap to Manchester as to London, within a very few pence.

13795. I am not speaking about the cost, but, coming by water, it is easier for them to go to London than it is to Manchester?—It is easier.

13796. Mr. Cheley. Your answer with regard to the number of sheep having fallen off had reference to the supply in Liverpool and Manchester, had it not?—It had reference to the Salford market.

13797. As regards the comparative price in London, as a matter of fact, the butchers do come from Manchester to London to buy cattle, and take them back again to the Salford cattle market?—Yes.

13798. Chairman. Do they buy English as well as foreign cattle?—They buy English as well as foreign cattle, in the spring months especially.

13799. Mr. Peck. Was not it constantly the practice, before the foreign trade became a large trade in England, for men to come up from the manufacturing districts to purchase cattle in London?—No it was the opposite way before; I think the men brought cattle from Liverpool and Manchester to sell in London before the cattle plague began.

Mr. GEORGE WOODCOCK, called in; and Examined.

13800. Mr. Jacob Bright.] You are from Sheffield, are you not?—I am.

13801. What is your occupation there?—I am butcher and cattle dealer.

13802. Have you a large business?—Yes, a good trade.

13803. Have you been in business there for a long time?—For more than 30 years.

13804. Your interest in this question, so far as I understand it, is that you wish for free trade in cattle; you wish cattle to come to Sheffield, and not to be slaughtered at the ports?—We do.

13805. That is your chief interest in this question?—It is my chief interest, and has been for some time.

13806. What is your objection to cattle being slaughtered at the ports?—There are many reasons which I could give, but I will endeavour to give you one or two; I do not mean to say but that it is very inconvenient to the butchers for the stock to be slaughtered at the ports, and then to be conveyed, say 70 or 80 miles, which is the distance of the nearest port from our town; the meat is not so nice, and there is a difference in the price, owing to the conveyance of it; I think I am rightly informed, at least from my experience of it, it costs twice or a little over to bring a beast dead to what it would alive?—Is that so.

13807. A truck costs us 2s., and you can put eight, and sometimes nine animals in it; say eight at 5s. each; I am speaking of from Hull to Sheffield, which is the nearest port we have, and Liverpool is about the same; if you bring a carcass of beef it costs 11s.

13808. Instead of 5s.?—Yes.

13809. A live animal costs 5s. and a dead animal costs 11s.?—Yes.

13810. What would that be upon 11b. of meat?—It is not perhaps such a great deal upon 11b. of meat, but taking a truck of beasts together it makes a difference; I was giving that as one of the reasons why I object, but the main reason is the meat not being so nice; I know it has been said here this afternoon, How is it that they should send dead meat from Scotland at all times of the year? If it is the same with them as it is at Sheffield it is not so nice as it would be if killed at home; we do have good beasts; I have seen some sides of beef which have been condemned; the beasts would have been worth 24s. or 25s., and they have been condemned by the inspectors when they got to Sheffield, and have been boiled down.

13811. *Chairman.*] Did they come from Scotland?—No, from Hull; and there is another thing; you were talking of the slaughter-houses at Hull; I have been there, and when you get 10 or 12, or 15 beasts killed in those small places it is impossible for it to keep; the meat is packed before it is cool, and it is sent up by railway, and if it is warm weather the carcasses are scarcely worth anything; that is the case with many of them.

13812. Mr. J. Bright.] May that be from a want of proper convenience, and a want of space in the slaughterhouse?—That would help a little, but with such weather as we have had these last two or three weeks, very damp weather, with thunder about it, is an impossibility. I saw two good calves which came from Hull on Monday which were condemned.

0.38.

13813. What has happened to the Scotch meat during the last two or three weeks?—We have not any Scotch meat sent to us.

13814. Do you think there has been any difficulty with regard to that?—I should think there had been.

13815. But supposing that meat could be brought in good condition from Hull to Sheffield, and that compulsory slaughter did not lessen the import of meat, it would probably be injurious to the butchers of Sheffield in any case?—Yes.

13816. It would injure their trade, would it not?—It would.

13817. It might injure the butchers without injuring the trade?—It might.

13818. You contend that it injures both?—Yes, our inspectors now are very particular, more so than they used to be. I am not going to say they are more particular than they ought to be; if meat is unseasoned, it is unseasoned; if they come and find a quarter of beef, no matter of how good a quality, if it is green, it is condemned at once.

13819. Is there any dead meat coming from Hull to Sheffield at the present moment?—There are some ports which are open; they bring beasts to Sunderland and Newcastle, and round about there, and we get some of them alive, and if we can get them alive, we shall not buy them dead, most certainly.

13820. Have you ever had much dead meat brought from Hull to Sheffield?—We have a good deal.

13821. *Chairman.*] How many miles is it from Sheffield to Hull?—I think it is 75 miles.

13822. Mr. J. Bright.] In bringing that dead meat, have the trains been punctual?—Not always.

13823. Sometimes they are very unpunctual, are they not?—Sometimes they have been delayed very much.

13824. That would make the distance equal to half as much again, would it not?—It would make it rather awkward, indeed. I know one or two cases in which railway companies have had to compensate the owners of the meat.

13825. You say that there has been a good deal of dead meat from Hull to Sheffield?—Yes.

13826. Has there been much in summer as well as in winter?—No.

13827. In the spring and autumn you may sometimes have very damp and close oppressive days?—Yes, we do.

13828. Then it would be very unpleasant?—The meat would look soft, but still it would keep longer than in the middle of summer considerably.

13829. Then you think it would be of great consequence to Sheffield to have cattle coming to the interior from Hull?—We do; I might say that I am the president of our association, the Butchers' Association; we have had several meetings, and we have been unanimous upon the question; it is not the first time that I have been to London upon this question; I have been before Mr. Forster before now, and stating as we think that the country is not infected, it seems very hard to me, as there does not appear to be any disease in the country, that the Government should be trying to put any restrictions upon the trade.

3 x 4

13830. *Chairman.*]

Mr. G.
Woodcock.

10 July
1873

Mr. G.
Woodcock.
—
10 July
1873.

13830. *Chairman.*] What country do you refer to?—I mean our own country, and other countries; I believe restrictions have been recently taken off from one or two countries which were scheduled before.

13831. *Mr. Jacob Bright.*] Do you get many sheep from Hull?—Not many.

13832. How is it that you do not?—Because we do not get beef, and we do not care to go over unless we can get both beasts and sheep; if I were to go myself, if I could get beef, I should go and buy, but simply to buy sheep I do not go.

13833. *Mr. Dent.*] Perhaps you do not care so much about foreign sheep as they do in Lancashire?—There are some of them very good ones.

13834. *Chairman.*] Do you know the Sheffield market?—Yes, I do.

13835. Do not the foreign sheep from Hull come to your market in the same way that they do to Salford?—A few; it is not so large a market as Salford market.

13836. Are you not rather particular in having a very good class of meat in Sheffield, as a rule, in comparison with other towns?—I should think perhaps we are.

13837. Therefore, perhaps you do not care so much for the ordinary description of foreign sheep as other towns do?—Perhaps not.

13838. I understand you to say that the difference between live and dead meat is this, that whereas a live bullock is worth almost double what it is dead, they charge you double the price for half the weight?—Yes, that is so.

13839. *Mr. Cowley.*] Have you any customers in London to whom you send meat from Sheffield?—No.

13840. Do you know any families who do get their meat from Sheffield?—No.

13841. Ordinarily speaking, with proper precautions with reference to killing meat, that is to say, precautions with reference to the character of the slaughter-house, and allowing the meat properly to cool before being packed, do you think it is impossible to send dead meat a hundred miles without its being injured in ordinary weather?—I do not; but there are several reasons, as I said before; I believe with proper care it will travel in ordinary weather, perhaps not at Midsummer, as then it will go very soon indeed, and at the price that meat has been at, that is a very serious loss, and a loss to the country as well; take myself, for instance; I want five beasts a week myself, on the average, for my own eating; it would not do for me to go to Hull; when I got to Hull it might happen that the packet had not arrived, and that I had left

my own market; I may add that I believe, as a class, the butchers would bear almost anything rather than the means of spreading the disease; that I do believe sincerely; I am only showing you that we are speaking more of the inconvenience with reference to the meat being slaughtered at the ports, and not coming into the inland towns, than anything else.

13842. One of the inconveniences which you mentioned first was, depending upon whether it was a regular or a casual market?—Yes.

13843. I suppose we should all agree that butchers would not like to go a hundred miles upon the chance of there being something to be sold when they got to the end of the journey; but my question was, whether or not the meat could be slaughtered and conveyed in ordinary weather without injury?—I admit that it could be got to Sheffield erect; but I do not think it would look as well, or keep so long by a long time, as it would at home; there is no question of that.

13844. *Mr. Dent.*] Do not some of the West Riding butchers send meat to London?—Sometimes, perhaps, at the back end of the year, when there are many sheep coming out of the west, and so on.

13845. You have come here to-day to speak entirely to the foreign trade, and the inconvenience of slaughter at the ports?—Yes.

13846. What is it that you wish to have?—I wish that there should be every precaution taken; and I agree with Mr. Lambert that wherever there is a country where there is disease, it should be scheduled, and that the cattle should not come a yard beyond the port; or if the cattle had to come across a country which had the disease, it should be just the same; but I do think that where a country is free, and inspected by intelligent and business-like men, the cattle ought to be allowed to come to inland towns from that country.

13847. By "the disease" you mean the cattle plague, do you not?—Yes, I do.

13848. You would not think it necessary to adopt restrictions with regard to foot and mouth disease and pleuro-pneumonia?—No; not the same as with respect to rinderpest, it is not so fatal a disease; and, as far as I could see, I have not seen foot and mouth disease lately.

13849. It has almost ceased now, has it not?—Yes; I was at the Wakefield market yesterday, and I did not see one animal which had anything like it.

13850. Was there much Irish stock in the Wakefield market yesterday?—Yes, there was a little; they were chiefly from Lincolnshire, and Ireland, and Yorkshire.

Mr. WILLIAM BROWN, called in; and Examined.

Mr. W.
Brown.
—

13851. *Mr. Cowley.*] You are a Butcher and Cattle dealer in Salford, are you not?—I am.

13852. And have been for how long?—Twenty-four years for myself.

13853. How many beasts and sheep, upon an average, do you purchase per week?—I should say from 70 to 100 beasts, and from 300 to 500 sheep and lambs a week.

13854. How many of those do you slaughter yourself?—About one-half, and sometimes more than one-half.

13855. You slaughter from 40 to 50 beasts a

week, do you not?—About 40 beasts a week upon the average, taking the 12 months.

13856. How many sheep do you slaughter upon the average?—Some weeks about 150, and some weeks about 300; it just depends upon the market.

13857. Slaughtering so many, do you sell them all in carcasses?—Yes, all in carcasses; I do not retail any.

13858. Are these chiefly consumed in Manchester and Salford, or do they go to the surrounding

residing towns?—Stockport, and the surrounding towns.

13859. Bury and Rochdale?—Yes; and any people that we may have coming from there.

13860. How is the dead meat sent?—Some by rail, and some butchers come to the market with their own pony traps, and they go away and they take the meat with them.

13861. What would be the greatest distance which they would take it in that way?—They would take it from eight to ten miles in pony-carts.

13862. The towns which you supply have all direct communication by railway to Manchester and Salford, have they not?—Yes.

13863. With regard to the Liverpool market, do you know that well?—I know it well; I do not think I have missed going there 10 times in the last 25 years.

13864. You buy cattle there?—I buy cattle there.

13865. Some of those cattle which you buy there you sell in the Salford market, do you not?—Yes.

13866. Now, with regard to the mode adopted by the inspectors there with regard to foot and mouth disease, have you anything to say with reference to that?—I think it is a very bad plan indeed; I never saw it in any other market only there; the police go there with two veterinary surgeons; they walk into the market, one of them with a couple of towels in his belt, and they go through all the beasts in the market, and if they think there is a doubt about an animal they open its mouth and examine it, and they keep on examining all the animals in the market like that. I do not think that they ever seem to wash their hands. I think that is a very good mode of communicating the disease to all other beasts if they find any with disease upon them.

13867. You think that is a very good mode of inoculating the other beasts with disease?—Yes, I do.

13868. You never saw that done in any other market?—Not in any other market that I was in.

13869. Do not they examine the horses in other markets?—I do not think I ever saw them examine the cattle in any other markets; at Salford I have seen a man examine an animal; if he could see that it was diseased without opening its mouth, he would send it away; but if it has not been so that he could see it, without opening its mouth, he has not said anything at all about it.

13870. Perhaps they are not inclined to be so sharp in the Salford market?—They were not so sharp as the county police who came into the Liverpool market.

13871. Are they county police in the Liverpool market?—Yes; the market is outside the borough.

13872. [Chairman.] Is the Stanley market in any way a store market?—There are a few at times there; people may come in the spring of the year, and a few sheep might go out of the market for store purposes, but very few.

13873. But not cattle?—No.

13874. Mr. Crawley.] The Irish store cattle do not come there?—No; if anything went out for feeding it might be a few Scotch sheep.

13875. Has this mode of examination in the Stanley market had any effect upon the supply to the market, in your judgment?—I should think it has brought it down to nearly half of what it was some time ago; it has taken a good third at least 0.58.

of the trade away from it; instead of increasing, as other markets have done since they commenced, it has been decreasing.

13876. The supply to the Liverpool market has been decreasing, has it not, whatever the cause may be?—Yes, since these men came into the market.

13877. With regard to the difference in the range of prices between London and Lancashire, is that a matter which you have paid attention to?—Yes; I have a brother who has always gone to the Liverpool market, and he generally buys in the north; but this year the London market has been cheaper than any other markets; he has come to London all this year, for four months out of the six, at any rate.

13878. Occasionally, as it seems to have been this year, you were lower in Salford?—Yes; this week my brother came back, and did not buy anything in the London market. Last week he had 40 beasts and some sheep, but on Monday he did not buy anything in it, and he said that he could buy them just as cheap in Manchester.

13879. You have heard Mr. Lambert's evidence with regard to foot and mouth disease; do you agree with him generally, or are there any points upon which you differ?—I agree with him upon that subject; I think there is nothing which can stop foot and mouth disease from coming on to the land.

13880. What do you say to the movement of stock?—I think that in the case of foot and mouth disease you ought to allow them to go wherever they think proper to be slaughtered within a few days. I think there ought to be no restrictions upon them.

13881. The prices, at all events, have increased in Yorkshire and Lancashire very much, have they not?—Yes.

13882. Can you say from memory, taking the last 25 years, or from the commencement of your being in business, what has been the average increase?—I should think, what I could buy when I commenced business, 22 years ago, for 1,000*l.*, would now cost me from 2,500*l.* to 2,700*l.* I was buying heifers when I first commenced business for 3*d.* per lb., or for a year or two under 4*d.*; now I have given 10*d.* per lb. just lately.

13883. With regard to the retail price, what is it?—I cannot say much about that, I am not in the trade.

13884. It has not increased quite so much?—Nothing like it; I think I never saw the butchers so poor. I never knew them to be so poor as they are at the present time; that is to say, the people who retail the meat.

13885. The butchers are not so well off as they were?—They have not been able to make their money out of the meat. This year has been the worst I ever knew for them, I think.

13886. With regard to dead meat, have you paid any particular attention to the transport of dead meat?—Yes, I have; it comes regularly to me to sell now.

13887. You sell other meat besides that which you kill, do you not?—Yes.

13888. Where do you get it chiefly from?—Mine has generally come from Hull.

13889. Have you any from Liverpool?—No.

13890. Is it all foreign?—They are the foreign beasts which were not allowed to come inland, unless dead.

Mr.
W. Brown.
10 July
1873.

13891. Do you buy it, or is it sent to you to sell on commission?—It is sent to me to sell on commission.

13892. Can you tell the Committee what loss per pound does that involve?—There is nearly 2d. per pound difference between the beasts which are killed in our market and the beasts coming from Hull dead.

13893. You infer from that, that if those beasts had been sent to Manchester alive, and killed there, you could have sold them from 1½d. to 2d. per pound more?—From 1½d. to 2d. per pound more.

13894. Do you think that is due to causes which are in any way preventable?—No; it might not make much difference in the winter, when meat could go very easily by rail, and take very little harm, if it took any.

13895. Do you know the slaughterhouses at Hull?—Yes; I have been in them.

13896. Are they everything that you could wish as a butcher?—No; they are in the old part of the town, and are very old, tumble-down places, as far as I could see.

13897. Taking all these things into consideration, and with your experience, what should you say would be the general deterioration; or is it your opinion that under any circumstances there must be deterioration, and if so, what with meat coming by railway?—It must be a great loss to any person; the meat is not so good by having to come so far; and when the butcher gets it into his hands to cut it up, he cannot cut it up to the same advantage as he can a beast which is killed at home. The meat is not so firm, owing to the shaking, and its coming upon the railway. And another thing is, that when it gets to a family, and is placed upon the dish, it will not cut so firm; it gives, owing to its being shaken upon the line, and more so at this time of year than any other.

13898. Do you attribute that to the shaking or to the packing?—To the shaking and to the transit of it; they cannot bring it so well.

13899. With regard to the scab in sheep, what do you say with reference to that disease?—I think there is so little of it existing, that it is not much thought about. I should think I have seen, for the last 12 months, 20,000 sheep a week, and in all the 20,000 I have not noticed 100 in all the markets put together with scab in them.

13900. Do you think that the nature of the disease, and the means to cure it, are such as ought to make it a ground for slaughtering them?—No; I think so little of it, that you might let it go certainly; it is a disease which will spread if it is neglected; no person has it unless he has a bad shepherd, or something of that sort.

13901. Mr. Keworth.] Do you know anything about Cheshire?—I know a little about Cheshire.

13902. Could you tell the Committee what style of farming and management of stock they have there?—I should think they feed very little stock in Cheshire; there are few dairy farms. I think they have never had much to do with feeding cattle or sheep either; there are very few sheep in the county of Cheshire.

13903. But they have a great quantity of stock?—They have a great many cows, it being a great dairy and cheese country.

13904. How are the cows kept; are they very careful in keeping them?—I should think they

are kept worse there than in any other county in England.

13905. Mr. Poll.] When you say they are kept worse, do you mean that they are not fed so well?—They are not fed so well; they milk them all through the summer, and then at the back end of the year they are in calf again; and at a great many of the dairy farms they give them a little hay, but not much, and most of the farmers keep them out of doors as long as they possibly can at the back end of the year, and when it comes a hard time, and they have to bring them up, there is not one in 10 who will give them anything besides hay; in some places they may give them straw.

13906. Your business is to buy live stock, and kill them and sell them in the carcass?—Yes, and live cattle as well.

13907. That has not been a losing business, I hope?—I have not broke many times.

13908. Would not the introduction of the trade in dead meat, if it was brought into competition with yours, be likely to interfere with the prospects of your own particular business?—Not at all; I would as soon sell dead meat on commission as anything else; but of all the people I have known who have been dealers in dead meat from Hull, or any other place, I should think nine out of every 10 have failed in it.

13909. You do not look upon them as very dangerous opponents; they were not strong enough in the back?—No; because the people who can get the Irish beasts to come alive can always face the bringing in of any dead meat.

13910. But still it would be a dangerous competition, would it not, if any dead meat was brought in by any arrangement from Hull?—Yes, if they could bring it in so as to show like the meat we kill at home, no doubt people would not care about the meat being killed at the ports.

13911. But you think there is no fear about the meat being killed at the ports competing with yours?—None.

13912. You said the meat went up to the small towns?—Yes; some as high as Stockport and Bury.

13913. In carts?—Yes.

13914. It is not an unusual practice for a local butcher and his friends to sit upon that meat, is it?—It is possible, but they would not do it any good by doing so.

13915. Do not you think that meat might be brought in as nice and fresh a condition from Hull as meat which is jobbed home by cart in the usual careless way in which you know it is dealt with by those men?—No, I do not think so; the shaking for 50 or 60 miles would be a great deal worse than five or six miles in a cart.

13916. Now, taking the meat which is not fetched by local traders, but which you would send by railway to the surrounding towns, is that packed in baskets or cloths?—Whenever it is going in a town the sheets are spread in a cart, and the meat is put into the cart upon them.

13917. But, going by railway, how is it packed?—It is packed in sheets before it leaves the market.

13918. And then it is put into the meat van?—I do not think they have many meat vans about Manchester; it is put into some of the trucks.

13919. Is it put in indiscriminately along with the

Mr.
W. Brown.
10 July
1873.

the cargo?—No, not with the cargo; but I do not think they have any proper meat vans in Manchester, but they would put the meat into trucks by itself.

13920. How far is Hull from Bury?—It is about 51 miles from Manchester, and about a hundred or more from Hull.

13921. How far is Bury from Manchester?—About eight miles.

13922. Then your meat receives about one-twelfth the shaking that the meat coming from Hull would?—Out of the 140 beasts there would not be more than two which would go as far as Bury or Stockport.

13923. But still that meat would receive one-twelfth the shaking in that way?—Yes.

13924. The effect of that is to make it very tender, as I understand?—No; that is not so.

13925. You said it would make it very soft?—That is a very different thing.

13926. Is it not the practice, when you get a tough beefsteak, to beat it?—I do not know whether it does any good or not. I have heard of cooks doing that; but I do not think that that will improve it.

13927. You know that a good deal of meat of the very tenderest and choicest quality comes up from Aberdeen, and it does not suffer from shaking?—It would be better if it came alive.

13928. It is so good that nobody has ever wished to have anything better?—Perhaps they have not tried the other way; however far it comes, it is better to come alive than dead.

13929. Do you know why the trade in live meat has fallen off, and the trade in dead meat has increased, from Aberdeen to London?—I do not think it has; I should say it has not. I really do not know, but I am certain of one thing, that, wherever the meat comes from, it is lessened in value by being shaken about in coming. If there is more dead meat sold now in London than there previously was, I should think it cannot be from anything else except from being obliged to be killed at the ports, and come up dead. I cannot speak to that, but in the other markets the dead meat trade does not increase.

13930. If there be this positive advantage in sending up meat alive, do not you think that so keen a people as the Scotch would have discovered that. There is no obligation to kill the meat at Aberdeen?—I have known people in Liverpool who have gone into the dead meat trade, but they have not prospered by it. I know a man at Berwick, who went into the dead meat trade; but he has gone to the wall at the finish; it was supposed that he could make a little more of the skins.

13931. Then it would seem to be that the longer the journey the better the people could carry on the business, because Aberdeen is half as far again as Berwick?—I do not know anyone who has prospered by the dead meat trade.

13932. Do you know anything about foreign cattle abroad?—I do not know very much about it.

13933. Do you know the price of meat abroad?—I do not.

13934. You do not know that the price of meat is rising very rapidly upon the Continent?—I know it is very dear upon the Continent, but I have no fixed idea of it.

13935. You believe that the present arrangements made for the foreign cattle trade rather restrict the importation than otherwise?—Yes, I
0.19.

believe the people who send beasts cannot make anything like the same money as they could if they were to come to the English markets alive.

13936. And, therefore, the foreigner does not send them in the same number as he would if they were allowed to come inland?—No; we should have more foreign beasts in the Manchester market if the restrictions were taken off.

13937. In other words, we have less foreign beasts under the restrictions, and then as a matter of consequences abroad they have more; they have more left in the country; that would be true, would it not?—I should think that would be so.

13938. And still, in the face of all that, meat gets dearer and dearer upon the Continent?—I could not say that; I dare say it may, if the population increased I do not see why it should not get dearer there.

13939. Is it not fair to argue from that that the increased price is not due primarily to the restriction which the Government have felt obliged to put upon the trade?—The restrictions have been one great thing.

13940. But the English restrictions do not exist abroad, and still meat has got very much dearer abroad?—But we should have had meat cheaper if it had not been for the restrictions.

13941. But would you admit that when we had the sharpest restrictions of all, which was in the year 1866, meat was unusually cheap?—I do not know about that; we sold some meat dear then; it got cheaper towards the finish, but in the beginning of the year, in March, we sold some meat very dear.

13942. Mr. Dent.] But one reason for the lower price during the ripest time was, that people were killing all the beasts for fear of rinderpest?—Yes.

13943. And the English beasts came into the market not in very prime condition?—They came in very poor condition.

13944. Did I understand you to say that 25 years ago you had bought heifers for about 3 d. a lb.?—Yes, from 3 d. to 4 d.

13945. That is about 3 s. 6 d. per imperial stone?—We buy by the score with us.

13946. That would be 5 s. a score?—Yes.

13947. What were the small Irish heifers from grass sold for?—Small Irish heifers from grass, and large Irish heifers (I think in 1848 or 1849 there were plenty of Irish heifers) of eight score sold for about from 8 l. to 9 l. a piece; there was none better.

13948. Were they fed in Ireland?—Yes, they were fed in Ireland.

13949. The Liverpool market has decreased, you say—Yes.

13950. Has the Salford market then increased while Liverpool has decreased?—Salford has increased within the last few years; it has increased more through Liverpool than it would have done.

13951. The supply of stock for the manufacturing districts has not decreased, has it?—No, not about Manchester; the Manchester market has kept increasing this last few years.

13952. Mr. Cawley.] Are you speaking of beasts?—Yes; last year, I think, the Manchester market would have decreased, but up to last year I think, the Manchester market has been increasing very much in numbers.

13953. Both in beasts and sheep?—I should think it would not have increased in sheep since
4 A 2 1868;

Mr.
W. Brown.
—
to July
1875.

1868; that would have been the largest year we have had in Manchester; that was a very hot, dry year, and there was a very large number, which made very little more than their skins, I should think.

18954. The supplies from Ireland of fat stock have not decreased, have they?—They have into Liverpool and Manchester.

18955. To what do you attribute the great rise in the price of meat?—I should think, for one thing, the consumption is greater; and beyond that, the quantity of meat has not increased to the same extent as the consumption.

18956. I suppose the consumption of meat has very greatly increased?—Yes, it has.

18957. Do a number of people now eat meat who did not eat meat formerly?—Yes; I knew plenty of places 25 years since where they used to get it about once a week or once a month, but now they want it once or twice a day.

18958. Is not there a difference in the class of animals that they require; I am told that those very fat Lincolnshire sheep which used to sell so well in the manufacturing districts will not sell now?—They are worth per pound least of anything which comes into the market.

18959. The artisan and the labouring class who used to buy the fat mutton will not buy it now; they want smaller and leaner mutton?—In Bolton and Wigan where the colliers are, and where the fat mutton used to be sold, most of the people will not take it, and it cannot be sold in any town out of Manchester like it used to be.

18960. All that has a tendency to increase the smallness of the weights and improve the quality?—Yes; if you have a nice small sheep you can sell it at 9 d. or 9½ d. per lb.; but if you have a fat Lincolnshire sheep it would be much if you made 7 d.

18961. The prosperity of the country has had a great effect upon the increase of prices, has it not?—Yes, no doubt.

18962. Your population has increased in numbers as well as in wealth, has it not?—Yes, it has. I think what has made meat get so dear is, that the population has increased so much faster than the beasts and sheep have increased in number.

18963. Do you deal much in English stock?—Yes.

18964. Do you find that the supplies of home stock cattle and sheep have kept up to the mark?—Yes, I think this last twelve months or two years, Wakefield market has been much better supplied with Lincolnshire and Yorkshire beasts, and round that district, than I ever knew before; I have not gone much further up the country than that.

18965. Then I understand that you, like the former witness, wish to have the foreign trade unrestricted, unless there is absolutely rinderpest in a foreign country?—Yes, either rinderpest or pleuro-pneumonia.

18966. Would you schedule a country if they had pleuro-pneumonia in it?—I would have all the cattle slaughtered in it at once, just the same as in the case of rinderpest.

18967. As I understood the last witness, and I suppose you mean the same, if it was declared that rinderpest existed in any country, you would have all foreign beasts from that country slaughtered at the port where they were landed?—Yes, if there was any beast came out of a foreign country where there was rinderpest, I

would have them all slaughtered at the port; I would not allow them to go inland anywhere.

18968. Supposing, as it was at the close of the last war, there was cattle plague in France, and that France, which had been a free country, was placed in the scheduled list; I suppose you would consider that that was right?—Yes, I should.

18969. Would you do the same if it was declared that there was pleuro-pneumonia existing in that country?—Yes, I would not allow those cattle to go inland anywhere where there was cattle.

18970. Then you would adopt a stricter rule than is adopted at present, because at present animals are allowed to come from countries where pleuro-pneumonia exists, and if there is no animal affected found in the cargo, they are allowed to go all over the country?—At present they will allow you to take a beast with pleuro-pneumonia anywhere, but if it is foot and mouth disease they will not.

18971. I think you are wrong about that?—No; I had a case of that myself.

18972. Because they did not find you out, perhaps?—No, the police found it out; the veterinary surgeon told me that there was a beast which had the lung disease, and I was told I could be allowed to take that away anywhere, but if it had been foot and mouth disease I could not.

18973. Was that a Salford policeman?—No, that was a county policeman.

18974. *Chairman.* You mean that you could remove that to the nearest slaughterhouse for immediate slaughter?—Yes, I could remove that animal to a slaughterhouse four or five miles off, whereas, if it had been foot and mouth disease I could not have removed the animal out of the field.

18975. You agree with the previous witness, that you would have no restrictions upon foot and mouth disease?—No; I would have restrictions upon foot and mouth disease if I thought you could only stop it, but I do not think there are any restrictions which you could put on it which would stop it from going through the country.

18976. The last witness complained of one centre having been kept up for some time; if there had been only that one centre, do not you think that was better than having 10 or a dozen?—If they could have kept it to that, it would have been a very good job, but if it comes to wet weather it will not stop in one place.

18977. You think it springs up anywhere?—Yes; during these last six weeks it has been rather drier and better weather, and I have not seen a beast in the market with foot and mouth disease for the last six weeks or two months.

18978. Do you agree with the last witness, that meat is dearer in Manchester than it is in London?—I do.

18979. Your butchers come down and buy, not only foreign cattle, but English cattle?—Yes, the Norfolk cattle.

18980. Why do not your butchers come down to Norwich-hill and buy cattle there, instead of our driving bullocks up to London, and then their going all the way up to Manchester?—Some of them do, but they would rather go to this market, because they can meet both foreign and Norfolk cattle; you could soon overstock Norwich market; you could very soon make it dearer than this market.

18981. They do not apparently take much pains

pains about the delivery of meat by rail in your district; they do not have vans to hang it up in the same as they do from Scotland?—No.

13983. Almost all the meat which comes from the West of England, or the North of Scotland, is hung up in vans!—We have not the same accommodation for the dead meat trade in Manchester as they have there.

13983. Do your customers who come and take meat, say eight or 10 miles by road, buy any edible offal; that is to say, the heart, the head, the liver, and the tongue?—No, those are always sold in Manchester, we do not give them the chance; if I killed a thousand beasts a week, I could sell the offal of them in Manchester very easily; the offal is a very easy thing to sell.

13984. There is a constant demand for it in Manchester, is there not?—Yes, any quantity of it.

13985. Mr. Poll.] You stated that the rise in the price of meat was due very much to the increased wealth of the people?—Yes.

13986. Do you think that it is attributable also to the great waste which goes on in the consumption of meat?—Yes, I think we waste as much meat in England as they eat in Germany.

13987. Is there any difficulty in selling breasts of mutton now; do you know whether they are ever absolutely flung away from want of sale?—No, I should say they would take breasts of mutton, at the price meat has been during the last few months.

13988. And skins of beef?—Yes, they would.

13989. Would you be surprised to hear what I have witnessed in Yorkshire, namely, skins of beef being flung out to the hogs to eat?—I would be surprised; it is time for them to give over

butchering in that neighbourhood; I should think that in that country, 25 years ago, they hardly knew what meat was to eat; my brother went into the Craven country a few years since, and he was on a farm of over 300 acres, and when he came home we asked him if he ever ate meat, "Yes," he said, "once there was a lamb died, and we ate it."

13990. [*Chairman.*] Do you think that the diseases amongst sheep and cattle have anything to do with the increase of the price of meat?—There is no doubt about it; I think, myself, that if it was not for disease (and foot and mouth disease has most to do with it), we should have a greater weight of meat in the same cattle.

13991. Do you think that the very dry seasons of 1868 and 1870 had anything to do with the present high price of meat?—I think they had; there were many lambs came out of Lincolnshire that year, and we would not give 8 s. a piece for them unless the skins were worth 6 s., because there was no meat on them; they were so poor they did not get over it, not one in 10. If a man bought 100 lambs he had hard work to get 10 out of them.

13992. Mr. Cosley.] With regard to the meat brought from Hull, does that come by luggage train?—Yes.

13993. Do you know what time that is upon the journey?—It leaves Hull about 10 at night, and is due in Manchester at seven in the morning.

13994. Is that meat packed?—Yes, it is packed in sheets and put in vans.

13995. It is about twice the time of an ordinary quick train, is it not?—Yes, it is.

Mr.
W. Brown.
10 July
1873.

Monday, 14th July 1873.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mr. James Barclay.
Mr. Jacob Bright.
Mr. Callan.
Mr. Carley.
Mr. Clay.
Mr. Dodson.
Mr. W. E. Forster.

Mr. Kavanagh.
Mr. Monnell.
Mr. O'Connor.
Mr. Pell.
Mr. Clare Read.
Mr. Tipping.

THE RIGHT HONOURABLE WILLIAM EDWARD FORSTER, IN THE CHAIR.

Mr. JAMES WEBB, called in; and Examined.

Mr.
J. Webb.
14 July
1873.

13996. Mr. Clare Read.] You are a Member of the Royal Veterinary College, I believe?—I am.

13997. Are you practising in connection with your father at Bishop's Stortford?—I am.

13998. Your father is also a member of the Royal Veterinary College, is he not?—He is.

13999. He has been in practice, I suppose, some years?—About 35 years.

14000. How long have you passed your examination?—Three years last April.

14001. Have you been practising since then?—Yes, all the time.

14002. Did you attend the Metropolitan Cattle Market upon the 27th May 1872?—I did.

14003. And upon the following Monday, June 3rd?—I did.

14004. And upon the following Monday, June 10th?—I did.

14005. What did you go there for; were you professionally engaged there?—I was engaged to go there by Mr. Waller.

14006. What is Mr. Waller?—I believe he is secretary to the Home Cattle Defence Association.

14007. He sent you there for the purpose of seeing whether there were any foreign cattle affected with disease there, did he not?—Yes, he did.

14008. We will take the 10th June, which was the last of your visits; what did you observe upon that day?—I detected a great number of Dutch and Spanish cattle suffering foot-and-mouth disease.

14009. About how many?—There were upwards of 30 beasts and several calves.

14010. Were they Dutch calves, or what sort of calves were they?—They were Dutch calves.

14011. There were Dutch and Spanish cattle to the number of upwards of 30 affected with foot-and-mouth disease?—There were.

14012. Did you examine those cattle?—I did very carefully, both the mouths and the feet.

14013. So much so that somebody rather objected to your inspection?—Yes, the owners of the cattle became very disagreeable to me after they found out what I was doing.

14014. You have seen a good deal of foot-and-

mouth disease, I suppose, not only there, but in other parts of England?—I have.

14015. You could not be mistaken as to what it was?—Certainly not.

14016. You are quite certain that those cattle were suffering from disease?—Quite so.

14017. Was it a bad form of the disease?—In most instances it was in its worst form.

14018. How long do you apprehend the disease had been upon those cattle?—I could safely say that they had had it nine or ten, or even more days than that; but I could quite say ten days.

14019. Then I suppose that being on the Monday they would be newly-imported cattle?—Yes, I understand they are all freshly-imported cattle which come on Mondays.

14020. How long do you suppose the disease is in developing itself in the usual way?—The average time is from 48 hours to three days; sometimes I have known it a week; but that is the average.

14021. In those instances, you seem to be very positive that they could not have contracted the disease in this country?—No, not unless they had been in the country upwards of 10 or 12 days.

14022. Did you direct anybody's attention to the fact of those cattle being diseased?—Yes, I went to the inspector, Mr. Kayment.

14023. And you directed the attention of the inspector to those cattle?—I did.

14024. What did he do?—As soon as I informed him of it, he said that he should not let me point them out to him, but that he should go round at his usual time, and inspect them himself.

14025. What time of the morning was this?—It was about half-past five.

14026. Were those cattle soon afterwards removed?—Yes, many of them were; they were selling them quickly.

14027. Did you hear anything about an officer of the Privy Council coming?—I did. I heard that there was one sent down, but he did not come until the afternoon, when the cattle were all gone.

14028. Were they taken away by purchasers to their slaughterhouses?—Yes, I got some one

to watch them to see whether they were sold or not, and when I came back the person told me that the animals were gone; he did not follow them up as I told him.

14029. That was upon the 10th June. Have you any memorandum at all of what occurred upon the 3rd June?—I have not.

14030. Have you any memorandum of the 27th May?—No; I have one of the 30th May.

14031. That is to say, you wrote upon the 30th about what you had seen upon the 27th?—Yes.

14032. What did you see upon the 27th May?—I saw a great many animals affected with foot-and-mouth disease. As nearly as I can say there were between 50 and 60 Dutch and Spanish cattle, but the greater number were Dutch.

14033. Should you say that they were in an advanced state of the disease or not?—Yes, the greater number of them were.

14034. Did you see any sheep suffering from scab at all, upon any of your visits?—I did.

14035. Upon any of those three Mondays?—Upon the 10th of June.

14036. What did you see upon the 10th of June?—I saw several sheep affected with scab.

14037. What sort of sheep were they?—Foreign sheep.

14038. Do you know whether they were Dutch or German, or what?—I do not know.

14039. Did you call anybody's attention to that fact?—I did not.

14040. Was the disease sufficiently developed for you to detect it without very much trouble?—It was very little trouble, because the animals were scratching and rubbing themselves against the posts of the pens they were in.

14041. Do you suppose those cases must have escaped the notice of the inspector when the sheep were landed?—I should imagine so.

14042. You do not suppose the disease was developed between the time of their inspection and the time of their being in the market?—Certainly not.

14043. Nor yet the cases of foot-and-mouth disease?—No, I am sure of it.

14044. Did you see any English cattle affected with foot-and-mouth disease when you were there?—I did not go amongst these; I was only requested to go amongst the foreigners.

14045. You have been there since, and have not made any further report, I believe?—I have been once there this year, but I did not make any report.

14046. You did not see anything to report upon?—I did not.

14047. You do not constantly visit this Metropolitan Market, but only when you are specially sent?—That is so.

14048. *Chairman.* Did you make any communication to Mr. Rayment, the Inspector of the Metropolitan Cattle Market?—I did. I went to him personally.

14049. Do you remember what day you did that?—The 10th of June.

14050. I have a letter here from him to Mr. Cope, in which he states that when you informed him on the 10th of June of the disease existing among the Dutch cattle, "I at once carefully re-examined them, and I could not find any evidence of the existence of disease amongst them;" did he inform you that he had done that?—I have not spoken to him since.

Q.58.

14051. What are the other days you mention besides June 10th?—The 27th May and 3rd June.

14052. Mr. *Chas. Reid.* Had your father previously been at the Metropolitan Market?—He had.

14053. Did he make any report about disease there?—He did.

14054. *Chairman.* Did he make a report to Mr. Rayment?—He made a report to Mr. Waller.

14055. Was any report made to the inspector of the Metropolitan Cattle Market?—No.

14056. I find that Mr. Rayment upon referring to his book upon Monday, May 27th, and June 3rd and 10th, says that no case of disease was recorded; but he remembers your informing him of some Dutch beasts being affected on 10th June 1872, and he states that in consequence of your information he carefully re-examined those animals, and could not find that they were affected with disease; but you were not aware of that re-examination?—I did not know that he had re-examined them; he said that he should go round the market at his usual time.

14057. Do you at all recollect how many Dutch beasts there were in the market on the 10th of June?—No, I do not remember the number.

14058. Mr. Rayment states that there were but few Dutch beasts in the market upon that day, and probably all the beasts had been landed in 24 hours?—I do not know that.

14059. Have you had any communication with Mr. Cope?—No, I have not.

14060. Were you aware that our inspector, Mr. Cope, was sent down to examine into the matter?—I heard afterwards that there was an official from the Privy Council who went down to inspect them, but that was in the afternoon.

14061. Do you know whether any of these Dutch beasts which were in the market upon June 10th, had been left over from the previous market day?—I do not know that they had.

14062. Should you imagine that they had or not?—I have no idea about that.

14063. Are you aware that the Dutch beasts which were in the market on June 10th, of which I am told there were 43, had passed three different port inspectors, namely, 19 of them by Thames Haven; 19-8 by Harwich; and 16 by Brown's Wharf?—I have understood that they were inspected at the other side of the water and this, but I do not know where.

14064. But you were not aware that those animals had undergone three different inspections?—No.

14065. Mr. *Barclay.* Have you any doubt about the fact of these animals being affected with foot-and-mouth disease?—Not the slightest.

14066. What were the symptoms of foot-and-mouth disease which these animals manifested exteriorly?—They were exceedingly lame; I saw them when they were coming up the road; the men had great difficulty in getting them along; I saw them tied up, and I then examined their mouths, and I looked at some of their feet when they would let me, and there were the vesicles which you see upon the tongue and the roof of the mouth, and in front of the pad of the upper jaw, and I found the vesicles had cicatrized, that is to say, there was a scab over them.

14067. Showing that the animals were in certain

Mr.
J. Webb.
14 July
1873.

Mr.
J. Webb.
14 July
1873.

tain cases recovering from the disease?—They were recovering, of course.

14068. That is to say, all the primary symptoms had been developed?—The primary symptoms had been developed; this was in quite an advanced state of the disease.

14069. The animals had passed the primary symptoms of the disease, and were either on their way to recovery, or to taking the secondary symptoms?—The vesicles were cicatrised over, which they usually are, about the ninth or tenth day.

14070. And if these animals were fresh imported animals they would have been affected with the disease before, or about the time of leaving the port of shipment in Holland; assuming that it was about five or six days previously?—That would be so.

14071. Did you say in your examination-in-chief that there were Spanish cattle offered with foot-and-mouth disease in the market?—They were chiefly Dutch.

14072. Were there any Spanish?—Yes.

14073. In what stage, do you recollect, was the disease with respect to the Spanish cattle?—In most of the cases I should say that the cattle had had it from 7 to 12 days.

14074. You think that the Spanish animals had been labouring under the disease in its incipient form for a period of not less than seven days?—Quite so.

14075. You reported to Mr. Rayment, the market inspector, that you saw these animals affected with the disease?—I did.

14076. Did Mr. Rayment go along with you to inspect the animals?—No.

14077. Did he make any observation?—He said no more than that he should go round at his usual time, and inspect them.

14078. He did not come along with you to inspect the animals?—He did not.

14079. Did you ask him to come?—I did.

14080. And he declined to come until his usual time for going round and examining?—Yes.

14081. Are you sure how long afterwards it was that he did take his round?—He commenced about half an hour afterwards; he commenced about six o'clock.

14082. Did those cattle remain for his examination?—No; several of them had gone before he came round.

14083. Were any of those affected with foot-and-mouth disease left for his examination?—There were; and he passed over them, and scarcely took any notice; he merely walked past them.

14084. Did you point out to him the affected animals?—I did not, after he refused to come with me; I have not seen him to speak to since.

14085. Did you find foot-and-mouth disease in the market on the other days when you examined the animals there?—I did.

14086. *Chairman.* You never examined the English beasts?—I never went amongst them.

14087. Do you know how long these Spanish beasts had been in the country?—I have not any idea, but I have always understood that they have freshly-imported ones for the Monday's market.

Mr. CLARE SEWELL READ, a Member of the Committee; Examined.

Mr.
C. S. Read,
M.P.

14088. *Chairman.* I UNDERSTAND that there is some evidence which you would wish to give with regard to the working of the Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act in Norfolk?—That is so.

14089. With regard to the first application of the Act of 1869 to Norfolk, I suppose it was in the same year; how did you set to work to carry the Act out?—I think that the Act was passed in August 1869, and at that time the cattle plague committee had tendered its resignation, and we had no local authority. The Privy Council sent down orders to the different cattle plague inspectors, who were appointed under the Cattle Plague Act, and those men of their own accord, after the instruction from the Privy Council, went about the country inspecting all cases of foot-and-mouth disease, of which there were several in the district at that time; and the Quarter Sessions, considering that they had acted without their authority, thought that the Privy Council who had set them to work ought to pay them, and the consequence is that the majority of them have never been paid at all.

14090. When you say that there was no local authority, there surely was a local authority in Norfolk by the Act, as there was for every other place?—I pointed out at the time in the House, that as a great number of the cattle plague committees had been abolished, there was no chance of the Act coming into operation until the Michaelmas Quarter Sessions.

14091. But by the Act the Justices in general,

or the Quarter Sessions assembled, were constituted the district local authority in Norfolk, as well as in other places?—Just so, but as I say, they could not meet until the Quarter Sessions at Michaelmas, consequently between the passing of the Act and the meeting of the Quarter Sessions at Michaelmas, the Privy Council put the Act in force.

14092. Was it your opinion, or the opinion of the gentlemen in Norfolk, that there was no authority under whom those inspectors acted?—Simply the authority of the Privy Council who had sent them down instructions.

14093. By instructions, you mean, I suppose, the forms which were sent all over the kingdom?—Yes, quite so. They acted upon those instructions, and visited all over the country for the foot-and-mouth disease.

14094. Had you the latter part of Section 4 before you at the time when you came to that opinion; had you your attention drawn to the fact that the last words of that section saved the powers of committees then in existence?—Yes, but then the committee did not exist. We of the cattle plague committee, had been dismissed some months previously.

14095. By what?—By the Quarter Sessions. I mention this fact to show that the county of Norfolk put the Act in force as soon as it could, that is to say, at the Michaelmas Quarter Sessions.

14096. Then there was a committee appointed at the Michaelmas Quarter Sessions?—At the Michaelmas Quarter Sessions 17 magistrates were appointed

appointed by the Quarter Sessions, and 19 boards of guardians were asked to send one representative each to the committee, which they did. They appointed a sub-committee of five members, composed of three magistrates and two farmers. The general committee meets perhaps once in six months, or once a year, and the sub-committees meet very frequently; one of the members of the sub-committee attending at the office every Saturday.

14097. Then in 1859 you sent up a memorial or an opinion to the Privy Council with regard to the Foot-and-Mouth Disease Orders, did you not?—We did; that is to say, with reference to those Orders which had been just issued; we had a very large outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease, and we found it impossible to put the pleuro-pneumonia rules in force, which I think was the substance of the Order.

14098. That was the Order in which in consequence of representations from some counties, we issued general instructions to the local authorities to put in force rules somewhat similar to the pleuro-pneumonia rules?—Yes.

14099. And that was the Order which we found in consequence of representations from Norfolk, and from other counties, that it was desirable to amend, and in place of that to give an opportunity to the local authority to pass Orders if they thought fit?—Yes, quite so; we thought that the Orders which had been issued by the Privy Council were very good in cases of small outbreaks; but that when an outbreak became so universal as it did in Norfolk, we could not enforce it.

14100. That Order being replaced by the power to issue Orders, have you ever used that power?—We have done so; we have issued a special Order to say that no cattle which were herded with foot-and-mouth diseased animals should be exposed in any fair or market or be driven along a highway.

14101. I think you would like to state to the Committee what you asked the Privy Council to do in 1872, with regard to fairs and markets?—We considered the case had got so desperate then, that a total cessation of fairs and markets for six weeks would be necessary.

14102. What was the date of your sending up that request?—I think it was in August 1872.

14103. And that would have implied the shutting up of all fairs and markets, including the Castle Hill Market, for six weeks?—Just so, except for fat stock.

14104. Had you any other Order issued by your district local authority which you would like to mention?—There is an Order issued with regard to sheep scab. We obtained the authority of the Privy Council to issue an Order to this effect, and I think it is very necessary indeed that it should become general. "Every person having in his possession or under his charge a sheep affected with sheep scab, shall forthwith treat such sheep, or cause it to be treated, with some dressing or dipping, or other remedy for sheep scab." We found that although we could shut the sheep up we had no power to cure them, and the cure is very easy indeed, if people will put it in practice.

14105. I suppose that Order was issued in carrying out the 26th Section of the Animals Order of the 20th September 1871?—Just so; we particularly asked the Privy Council to give

us such power, and they issued that Order, I believe, very soon afterwards.

14106. Was any other Order issued?—With regard to pleuro-pneumonia, we granted a license for the removal of animals which had been herded with diseased animals, to London, and that, I think, was a very good Order, as long as the cordon existed round London, but it is the only case in which I have dissented from the acts of our committee, and I do not think it ought to be allowed now.

14107. Do you remember when you issued that Order?—It has been continued from time to time, I think, for about two years.

14108. Would you like to make any observation with regard to the pleuro-pneumonia rules under the Act?—By the Act animals which are actually diseased can be removed to the nearest slaughterhouse without any certificate whatever or license, if the local authority so will, but under no circumstance can the local authority grant an Order for the removal of healthy cattle which have been herded with them, except for immediate slaughter; and the consequence is we have been obliged in Norfolk to disobey that Order; we have had cattle upon the marshes in the month of November which have been actually perishing from the effects of the weather, and from the lack of provender, and we have been obliged to have those animals removed with a proper escort to some well-sheltered spot upon the man's farm (these marshes not being contiguous to it), and declare that fresh spot to be infected, in lieu of the marsh from which they had been removed.

14109. That would imply that you would recommend an alteration of the third pleuro-pneumonia rule under the Act?—I would.

14110. What alteration would you recommend?—That the local authority should have power to allow cattle which are not ready for immediate slaughter, and which have been herded with diseased animals, to be taken to some convenient spot for food and shelter, and that the place to which they are removed should become an infected spot, in lieu of the one from which they were removed.

14111. You wish to state how many prosecutions you have had since the passing of the Act?—We have had 82 prosecutions in the county of Norfolk, 9 dismissed, one withdrawn, and 72 convicted, and we have inflicted some very heavy fines. I will just instance one or two; a farmer for removing sheep upon a highway, which were the subject of foot-and-mouth disease, was fined 35 £; for not giving notice of foot and mouth disease one man was fined 10 £, and another 26 £; for exposing scabby sheep in the market one man was fined 30 £; for exposing foot-and-mouth disease in the market, one man was fined 51 £ in one case, and 30 £ in another; of course those were large lots of cattle; I only bring those cases forward to show that we have been very severe.

14112. Do you think, with reference to your large market at the Castle Hill, that the notion taken in prosecuting and imposing these heavy fines has done anything towards stopping the exposure of diseased animals?—I believe it has; I would say that the Norwich market is so large, that with only one inspector and an assistant, it is very difficult for them to detect all the cases of disease. If you will allow me, I will just state the number of animals which were exhibited: the

4 B

Mr.
C. S. Reed.
M.P.
14 July
1873.

Mr. last three weeks in June, the numbers were
 F. S. Read, 2,485, 2,538, and 2,732 cattle, and 10,000, 15,000,
 M.P. and 14,000 sheep.

14113. What number of inspectors have you?
 —We have 12 inspectors for the county of Nor-
 folk, and there is one for the city of Norwich.

14114. Are all these inspectors veterinary sur-
 geons?—They are all veterinary surgeons; they
 have certain districts allotted to them, and all the
 local fairs and markets in the county are inspected
 by them.

14115. You stated that they had assistants;
 does that 12 include the assistants?—The only
 man who has a recognised assistant is Mr. Inspec-
 tor Smith, who is the inspector for the city of
 Norwich, and, as the railway station there is in
 the city, and the lairs are just outside the city,
 the county have agreed to pay for a sub-inspector,
 so that there might be no clashing of interest be-
 tween them.

14116. I suppose there are instructions given
 to the police to aid the inspectors?—Yes, in every
 way that they can.

14117. Do you rely upon the police to any ex-
 tent?—We do, as regards the removal of cattle
 along the roads, and also to see that they are
 not brought off the farms where disease is known
 to exist.

14118. What are your expenses in working the
 Act; in the first place with regard to inspec-
 tors?—The whole expenses of working the Act
 (and consist almost entirely of pay to inspec-
 tors) were, in 1870, 833*l.*; in 1871, 915*l.*; in
 1872, 1,375*l.*; and for the quarter ending Lady-
 day, 1873, 563*l.*; so that we are gradually in-
 creasing, although we do not inspect for foot and
 mouth.

14119. With regard to the increase of diseases,
 I suppose foot-and-mouth disease considerably in-
 creased last year?—In 1871 there were 35,000
 cases; and in 1872 we had upwards of 200,000
 cases.

14120. What were the number of deaths?—I
 have not got that; but they were very few in-
 deed.

14121. What are the statistics with regard to
 pleuro-pneumonia?—In 1871 we had 389 cases,
 and in 1872 we had 1,550.

14122. What were they in 1870?—They
 were much less.

14123. I have heard it stated sometimes that
 some of this increase, especially in pleuro-pneu-
 monia, may be owing to the regulations for re-
 porting disease having been more understood and
 more completely acted upon; do you at all be-
 lieve that to be the case?—No; I believe our
 cases have been fairly reported; certainly in the
 year 1871, as well as in the year 1872; but I am
 quite confident of this, that a 28 days' isolation of
 a farm is of no effect whatever; it is not suf-
 ficiently long. If the Committee would allow
 me, I would give you an instance which was put
 into my hands on Saturday by Mr. Inspector
 Smith, of Norwich. Forty oxen were purchased
 on the 2nd of November, and they were all kept
 by themselves; the first outbreak was on the 10th
 of December; there was not another outbreak
 until the 4th of February, which was an inter-
 val of 56 days; and the third outbreak occurred
 on the 1st of May, being an interval of 104
 days; this farm had been twice relieved from
 the Act of Parliament, so the owners might have
 sold those beasts, and sent them where he
 pleased.

14124. Would you recommend the extension
 of the 28 days?—I should, certainly; but I hope
 something will be done about killing in the case
 of pleuro-pneumonia.

14125. What extension would you recommend?
 —I would make it three months. To show you
 how extremely fatal pleuro-pneumonia is in the
 county of Norfolk, out of the 389 cases which we
 had in 1871, 206 were killed, 84 died, and only
 81 recovered; and out of 1,550 cases in 1872, 960
 were killed, 280 died, and 286 recovered.

14126. I suppose you had several outbreaks of
 pleuro-pneumonia in former years?—Yes, we
 always had it; we import 19 out of every 20
 cattle that we graze, and if any county has pleuro-
 pneumonia, it is sure to find its way to us, if we
 had none of our own.

14127. You mean, that of the cattle grazed in
 Norfolk, 19 out of every 20 are imported?—Yes,
 but I do not mean foreigners.

14128. These cattle come chiefly from Ireland?
 —Yes, chiefly from Ireland.

14129. And from Scotland also?—A few come
 from Scotland, but we depend chiefly upon Ire-
 land.

14130. Do you wish to mention any particulars
 of any report of your chief constable?—At the
 Lady-day Quarter Sessions of 1873, the chief
 constable and the chairman of the committee
 both reported that the Act with regard to pleuro-
 pneumonia, did not seem to have the slightest
 effect.

14131. Did they give any grounds for stating
 that?—Simply that although they had tried
 all they possibly could to put the Act in force,
 there seemed to be a gradual increase of the
 disease.

14132. You do not imply that they wish no
 legislative notice to be taken of the disease?—No,
 certainly not.

14133. There was no suggestion made in the
 report to that effect?—Not at all.

14134. Several counties have applied for power
 to slaughter under pleuro-pneumonia; has the
 county of Norfolk done so?—No; I should say
 that it ought to be the last to apply, because if all
 the other counties did it, we should be very happy
 to do the same; but considering that we import
 such an enormous quantity of cattle in proportion
 to what we breed, we are sure to get it from
 other counties, the disease being continually im-
 ported.

14135. I am not asking about motives, but you
 are aware that several other counties have applied
 for that power, though Norfolk has not?—Norfolk
 has not, but if Norfolk were a breeding county
 she would directly.

14136. You have a cattle insurance society,
 have you not?—We have a Norfolk Farmers
 Live Stock Insurance Company.

14137. Have you any statistics which you wish
 to mention with regard to that company?—With
 regard to pleuro-pneumonia, the losses from that
 disease averaged in 1864 and 1865, 30 per cent.
 of all the losses, and in the year 1866, when the
 cattle-plague restrictions were in force, the loss
 fell to 1 per cent; in 1867 it rose to 8 per cent,
 in 1868 the losses averaged 22 per cent, and
 last year, 1872, they again rose to 31 per cent,
 showing that they are just as bad as they were
 before we had the cattle plague.

14138. But this means, that of the number of
 animals which die, a certain proportion of them
 die of pleuro-pneumonia?—Just so.

14139. Then

14139. Then this Insurance Company is against death from any cause?—Yes, from any cause except cattle plague, that being provided for by Act of Parliament.

14140. Then the statistics may show one of two things: they may show either that pleuro-pneumonia bears a very large proportion to the diseases in a year in which diseases generally are prevalent, or it may mean that there has been a remarkably healthy time with regard to other diseases?—I think it tends to prove that when the cattle were perfectly isolated, as they were in 1866, you had then a remarkable decrease of pleuro-pneumonia.

14141. But in order to get at the statistics which would really show that, we must have the amount of animals that were affected with pleuro-pneumonia out of the whole number of cattle?—I only give them for what they are worth. There is one further suggestion which I should like to make with regard to the orders for pleuro-pneumonia and sheep scab, and that is, that it is very unnecessary for an Inspector to visit a case of chronic pleuro-pneumonia. For instance, we have had cattle that would not die and would hardly live; but still the owner persisted in not killing them, and we have had inspectors week after week to the extent of eight or ten weeks going to see this one animal, and reporting it to the Privy Council, and we suggest that that is unnecessary; we think that the owner ought to let the inspector know when the animal is dead or when it has recovered, and then the inspector should make his final visit and declare the premises to be free.

14142. Do you think it would be quite safe to do that?—I do. I do not see the necessity in a case like that for the inspector going every week, because the farm is always watched by the police.

14143. But you would not apply that in the case of a herd?—No.

14144. But in the case of a single animal or in the case of one or two?—Yes; in the case of one or two animals which have had the disease, and are supposed to be recovering from it.

14145. I do not see any Order relating to that?—But the inspector has to make a return every week to the Privy Council, and he will not make the return unless he sees the animal.

14146. Does the return state that the inspector has seen them?—Yes, it is strong inference that he should see the animal, or he could not make a return. The inspector has in the same way to see to sheep scab, and report every week the condition of the animals, until they are free.

14147. Has your local authority ever made any representation to the Privy Council upon that matter?—Yes.

14148. I am informed that we have had applications of that kind, and that we have returned an answer similar to what I have stated, that all that it is necessary is to have reasonable ground of belief?—We have been very desirous in Norfolk to carry out the Act as strictly as we could, but we shall know what to do now.

14149. Do you wish to make any suggestion with regard to Section 105 of the Act?—I do; it is this, that with regard to the Act it imposes a penalty in certain cases; but it does not say, nor is it mentioned in any other part of the Act, ex-

pressly before what court it is to be recovered, and the method of enforcing the conviction for a penalty in the second place, in consequence of which a distress warrant has to be issued, and the recovery of penalties has therefore been found troublesome. If power were given by statute to imprison in default of payment, the penalties, as a rule, would be paid at once.

14150. Is not that power given by the Summary Procedure Act?—No, you have to issue a distress warrant.

14151. With regard to the city of Norwich, have you any remark to make?—I only wish to observe that the city of Norwich has acted in the most perfect harmony with the county of Norfolk; if it had not, I do not know how we could possibly have put the Act in force.

14152. The Castle Hill market is within the city, is it not?—Yes, it is within the city, and the city authorities have in every way acted with us and consulted us upon several occasions, and I should like it very much if they formed part of our local authority.

14153. What you wish to convey I suppose is, that if the local authority of the city of Norwich held off entirely from the local authority of the county, it would be very difficult to get on?—We should have to blockade the city of Norwich; that is the only way in which we could enforce our Orders. I wish further to say this: As it has been stated in this Committee that local authorities do not try to put the Act in force, I have had the satisfaction of stating what the county of Norfolk has done, and I do not think it possible for a county situated as we are, that we could have done anything else, or could possibly have acted more stringently, and yet we have done little or no good.

14154. You are in an exceptionally difficult position on account of depending so much upon animals imported from outside the county?—Yes; if there is disease in the kingdom, we are almost sure to have it in Norfolk.

14155. Mr. Barclay. From your experience as a farmer, do you think that the loss per head by slaughtering out animals would be greater with the animals which you have in Norfolk, than with the Aberdeenshire cattle?—No.

14156. You have seen it given in evidence here, that the loss by slaughtering out 550 animals in Aberdeenshire amounted to 4,330 £?—I believe so.

14157. The compensation at the rate of one-half the loss upon that would amount to 2,115 £?—Yes.

14158. You have stated that during the last year there were 1,550 animals affected with pleuro-pneumonia in Norfolk; that is rather less than three times the number in Aberdeenshire?—Yes.

14159. The rental of Norfolk is very nearly two millions sterling, according to these returns?—The gross estimated value was two millions and a quarter.

14160. But the assessable amount?—That was nearly two millions.

14161. That at a penny a pound would amount to over 8,000 £?—Yes, about that.

14162. And three times the loss in Aberdeenshire would come to 12,690 £, one-half of which would be, over 600 £, or less than a penny in the pound upon Norfolk?—That would be so.

Mr.
C. S. Ross.
M.P.
14 July
1873.

MR. SAMUEL JAMES RAYMENT, called in; and Examined.

Mr. S. J.
Rayment.

14 July
1873.

14163. *Chairman.* ARE you the Inspector of the Metropolitan Cattle Market?—I am.

14164. Do you remember Mr. Webb coming to you in the month of June 1873, with regard to some animals which he considered had foot-and-mouth disease?—I do.

14165. Do you remember the day in June upon which he came?—Yes.

14166. What day was that?—Monday morning, June 10th.

14167. Did he state to you that he believed there were some Dutch cattle in the Edlington Market which had foot-and-mouth disease?—He did.

14168. Did you examine those cattle?—I re-examined them carefully, and I failed to detect anything whatever the matter with them.

14169. Did you look at their mouths?—I did.

14170. Did Mr. Webb make any report to you before that time?—Only on that morning.

14171. Do you recollect whether with regard to May 30th and May 27th, and June 3rd, any cases of foot-and-mouth disease among foreign animals were reported by you?—No; I reported none upon those dates.

14172. Have you any recollection whatever with regard to the Dutch animals which were in the market on June 10th, with reference to how long they had been imported?—Yes, upon the previous market day we had had two animals turned into the lair of the market, which shows that the trade was brisk, and that there were no stale beasts as they are termed; and as a matter of fact the whole of the Dutch beasts in the market on this day came by three routes, by Thomas Haven, by Harwich, and by Brown's Wharf; they were examined by the different inspectors at those places, and were afterwards inspected by me in the Metropolitan Cattle Market.

14173. Is the month of June one in which you often have cases of foot-and-mouth disease in the market?—No.

14174. Then you are pretty free from it?—Yes, we are pretty free from it.

14175. Were any cases of Spanish animals which were called reported to you?—No.

14176. Had you any conversation with Mr. Cope with regard to Mr. Webb's complaint?—Mr. Cope came to the market either that day or a day or two afterwards, stating that he was informed that foot-and-mouth disease existed in the market amongst some foreign beasts, and he accompanied me round the market and round the lairs, and he failed to discover the least sign of disease amongst any of them.

14177. Mr. *Clare Mead.* How long after Mr. Webb had called your attention to the fact of these beasts being diseased, did you go and look at them?—Directly.

14178. He says that you declined to go with him, and that you did not go for some time?—I did decline to go with him; I asked Mr. Webb if he had looked among the English beasts, and he said he had not; I thanked him for the information, and I at once went and examined the Dutch beasts.

14179. What time in the morning did these

beasts arrive?—The first thing in the morning, about three o'clock.

14180. What time were they inspected?—Between five and six; I had previously inspected them between five and six, and when Mr. Webb came to my office it was about six, as near as can be.

14181. Is every case of foot-and-mouth disease reported by you?—Yes; every case in which I am satisfied that an animal is affected.

14182. But it is a very rare thing, is it not, to find a large market in the year 1873 without beasts affected with foot-and-mouth disease?—Just about that time trade was exceedingly good; they were all fresh beasts in every market at that time; there were no beasts turned out, and there were no beasts remaining alive from the previous market day.

14183. But in May and June 1873, when foot-and-mouth disease was very general throughout England, it would not be an extraordinary occurrence to find a beast affected with foot-and-mouth disease?—It was not so in the metropolitan market at that time.

14184. Do you recollect in the autumn of 1871, 27 Dutch sheep being bought by Mr. Waller and Mr. Guernior, which were said to be the subjects of foot-and-mouth disease in an advanced stage by Mr. Lepper, of Aylesbury?—I have no recollection of Mr. Lepper, of Aylesbury examining any sheep; but I remember some sheep which were found to be affected with foot-and-mouth disease, and Professor Simonds came up as the time, and they were slaughtered at the market; they were dealt with, I think, in just the same way as we should deal with foot-and-mouth diseased beasts; a cordon existed around London at the time, and they were slaughtered within the market.

14185. Who discovered them to be diseased at that time?—I think I saw them upon Tuesday morning.

14186. Were they not in the market upon the Monday?—That I cannot say, but I believe they were.

14187. Mr. Lepper gave evidence here to say that they were in an advanced state of foot-and-mouth disease, and must have been treated for some considerable time?—I cannot say that Mr. Lepper ever saw the sheep; I am not aware of the fact; he did not direct my attention to them.

14188. But still there were some sheep diseased upon the Tuesday?—There were some sheep upon the Tuesday affected with foot-and-mouth disease. Professor Simonds saw them; there is no doubt about that.

14189. Where did you say they were?—In the lairs of the market.

14190. They had probably been in the market on the previous day?—They might have been, but I could not say for certain.

14191. Were they killed in the slaughter-houses of the Metropolitan Cattle Market?—In the slaughterhouses attached to the Metropolitan Cattle Market.

14192. Mr. *Borwick.* Are you able to say that these cattle which were in dispute upon the 10th of June had no vesicles of foot-and-mouth disease in their mouths?—I am positive of it; I examined their mouths myself.

14193. And

14183. And there were no vesicles in their mouths?—None at all.

14184. Mr. *Clare Reed*.] What time did the animals begin to leave the market?—They were leaving all day.

14185. Did any of them go away before six o'clock?—Scarcely.

14186. Then those which were supposed to have been diseased could not have left before you saw them?—I do not say that they could not

have left before, but it was quite contrary to custom for them to leave before that time.

14187. If a man had a diseased bullock, and he wanted to get rid of it, that is what he would have done?—That would have been the natural course for him to adopt.

14188. *Chairman*.] You still think that it would have been impossible for the animals about which there had been a complaint to have been removed before you went there?—Quite impossible.

Mr. S. J.
Rogwood,
14 July
1874.

LIST OF APPENDIX.

Appendix, No. 1.

Papers handed in by order of the Committee :

	PAGE.
Cattle Diseases (Ireland) :	
Return of all Cases of Pleuro-Pneumonia, Foot and Mouth Distemper, Sheep Pox, and Sheep Scab, which were officially reported to the Veterinary Depart- ment as having occurred in Ireland in the Years 1871 and 1872 respectively ; distinguishing those Cases which were reported by the Owners from those discovered by other Means, and, in the latter Cases, the Number of Prosecutions instituted, with the Result - - - - -	571
Cattle, &c. Imported into Ireland :	
Return of all Animals Imported into Ireland from Great Britain in the Years 1871 and 1872 - - - - -	572
Foot and Mouth Distemper, &c. (Ireland) :	
Talculated Return showing the Number of Farms, Leas, Premises, or Places in Ireland under Restrictions, in pursuance of the Council Orders of the 2nd No- vember 1870, 8th April 1871, and 30th May 1872, issued in accordance with the Powers vested in His Excellency the Lord Lieutenant, by and with the Advice of Her Majesty's Privy Council in Ireland, by the Acts 29 Viet. c. 4, and 33 & 34 Viet. c. 36, at the Termination of each Week from the 9th day of November 1872 to the 31st day of May 1873 ; also, the Number of Outbreaks of Foot and Mouth Distemper, Pleuro-Pneumonia, and Sheep Scab reported to the Veterinary Department during each Week of the said Period - - -	573

Appendix, No. 2.

Papers handed in by Mr. Alexander Williams :

Memorial of the Court of Quarter Sessions for the County of Chester to the Privy Council, dated 16th February 1873 - - - - -	574
Resolutions laid before the Vice President of the Privy Council on the 4th of July 1873, by the Royal Agricultural Society of England - - - - -	574
Memorial of the Highland and Agricultural Society of Scotland to the Privy Council, dated 8th March 1873 - - - - -	575
Report of the Contagious Diseases (Animals) Committee of the Central Chamber of Agriculture, as adopted and sanctioned by the Council on Tuesday, 4th February 1873 -	575
Letter from the President of the Royal Agricultural Society of England to the Right Hon. W. E. Forster, M.P., dated 12th December 1872 - - - - -	576
Suggestions by Royal Agricultural Society - - - - -	576
Extract from Minute of Meeting of the Local Authority for Kinross-shire, dated 6 May 1873 - - - - -	578
Recommendations and Suggestions agreed to at a Meeting of the Local Authority for the County of Monmouth, held at Usk on the 9th May 1873, and submitted to the Committee of the Honourable the House of Commons sitting on the Contagious Diseases (Animals) Acts and Orders in Council - - - - -	578
Statement of the Amount of Tolls, Dues, and Payments received at the Metropolitan Cattle Market during the Years 1871 and 1872 - - - - -	579
Statement of the Amount of Tolls, Dues, and Payments received at the Foreign Cattle Market at Deptford during the Year 1872 - - - - -	580
Names of the Local Authorities who, in September 1869, applied for Stringent Regu- lations for Foot and Mouth Disease - - - - -	580
Names of the Local Authorities who, in October, November, and December, asked for Modification or Revocation of Order of 28th September 1869 - - - - -	580
Names of Counties who applied the Provisions of the Order of Council of 16th December 1869 - - - - -	580

Appendix, No. 2—continued.

	PAGE.
Memorandum showing how many Local Authorities object to further Restrictions in respect to Foot and Mouth Disease, and how many asked for further Restrictions; also, how many Local Authorities have made Regulations under the Act and Orders, and how many, as far as is known, have made no Regulations, from 1st January 1872 to 31st August 1873, inclusive	581
Memorandum of Communications, dated since 1st January 1873, objecting to present or further Restrictions in respect of Foot and Mouth Disease, received from Local Authorities and others	581
Memorandum of Applications for more Stringent Regulations in respect to Foot and Mouth Disease, received from Local Authorities since 1st January 1873	582
Instructions to the Veterinary Inspectors at the Ports	583
Summary of the Papers which were registered and specially treated in the Veterinary Department during 1873	585
Extracts from the Estimates for Civil Services for 1868-69 and 1869-70, showing the Amounts paid out of the Civil Contingencies Fund for Expenses connected with Cattle Plague and with the Veterinary Department	585
Expenses of the Veterinary Department on account of Salaries, Incidental Expenses, and Travelling Expenses, subsequent to the 31st March 1868, after which Date the Sums necessary to defray such Expenses were annually provided for by separate Votes	586
Estimated Total Cost of the Veterinary Department for the Year 1872	586

Appendix, No. 3.

Suggestions by Mr. Barclay, of Provisions for discovering and dealing with Cattle Plague, Pleuro-Pneumonia, and Sheep Fox	587
---	-----

Appendix, No. 4.

Papers handed in by Mr. Kavanagh:

Report on the Cattle Transit, Ireland	588
Resolution passed by the Royal Dublin Society, May 1873	589
Veterinary Department, Privy Council Office, Ireland:	
Summary Return showing the Number and Description of Animals Imported to and Exported from Ireland during the Month of May 1873, and the respective Ports	590
Summary of Tabulated Returns showing, according to the Daily Returns furnished to the Irish Veterinary Department by the Royal Irish Constabulary and Dublin Metropolitan Police appointed to act as Ship Inspectors at Irish Ports, the Number and Description of Animals Imported into and Exported from Ireland, during the month of June 1873, setting forth the Irish Ports of Debarcation and Embarkation	590

Appendix, No. 5.

Papers handed in by Professor Baldwin:

Map of Allert Model Farms, Glasnevin (referred to in Question 3082)	591
Suggestions for an Enactment to relieve Ireland of the Loss now sustained on her by Pleuro-Pneumonia and Foot and Mouth Disease, and to protect Great Britain from the Exportation from Ireland of Animals affected with these Diseases	592
On the Loss from Foot and Mouth Disease	593

Appendix, No. 6.

Paper handed in by Mr. Ridley:

Report of the Cattle Disease Committee, Northumberland Adjourned Session, 1 May 1873	595
--	-----

Appendix, No. 7.

Papers handed in by the Chairman:

Memorial of Messrs Butchers, in the City of Glasgow	598
Letter from J. A. Clarke, Esq., to the Chairman, dated 17 June 1873	598
Letter from Mr. Alexander C. Cope to the Secretary, Veterinary Department, dated 12 July 1873	599

Appendix, No. 8.

Paper handed in by Mr. Stratton :

South Wilt Chamber of Agriculture.—Resolutions passed unanimously at the Meeting on 30 July 1873	600
Resolutions submitted by Mr. Stratton to the leading Members of the South Wilt Chamber of Agriculture, and thoroughly approved by them, in January 1873	600

Appendix, No. 9.

Paper handed in by Captain Dent:

Letter from the Superintendent, London and North Western Railway Steamboat Department, Holyhead	608
---	-----

Appendix, No. 10.

Paper handed in by Mr. O'Neill, 18 May 1873 :

Abstract Statement of the Number of Live Stock Shipped from the Port of Drogheda to Liverpool for the Three Years ending 1st January 1873	609
Summary	609

Appendix, No. 11.

Papers handed in by Mr. Thomas Verdon :

Memorial of Land Owners, Cattle Breeders, Graziers, Farmers, Cattle Salesmen, and Butchers	603
Growth of the Liverpool Cattle Trade since 1831	604
Actual Numbers of Cattle and Sheep landed in Liverpool, Seaborne, and Estimated Number by Railway	604
Number of Cattle, Sheep, and Lambs Slaughtered and Consumed within Nine Miles of Liverpool Exchange, in the Year 1873	604
Number of Cattle and Sheep Exhibited for Sale at Stanley Market, Liverpool, each Week during the Years 1860, 1870, 1871, 1872, 1875, to March each Year, 63 Weeks	605
Statement of Amounts Paid for Construction of Sheds, &c., and for Rents in connection with the "Cattle Diseases (Animals) Act" to date	607
Imports of Cattle, Sheep, and Lambs for the Year 1872	608
Summary	608

Appendix, No. 12.

Papers handed in by Professor Ferguson :

Summary of the Papers treated in the Irish Veterinary Department in the Year 1873	609
General Abstract showing the Extent to which the Foot and Mouth Distemper prevailed in each County in Ireland, and other Particulars, as set forth in the under-mentioned Headings, during the Year ended 31 December 1873	610
Abstract, showing the Number of Outbreaks of Contagious or Infectious Animal Diseases Reported from each County in Ireland, in each Month during the Four Years ended the 31st of December 1872	610
Table showing the Sanitary State of the Cattle, Sheep, and Swine, in each County in Ireland, in the Years 1860, 1870, 1871, and 1872	610
Table showing the Number of Cattle, Sheep, and Swine in Ireland, in the Years 1860, 1870, 1871, and 1872	610
Table showing the Number of Cattle, Sheep, and Swine Exported from Ireland to Great Britain, in the Years 1860, 1870, 1871, and 1872	610
Table showing the Number of Deaths from the Foot and Mouth, Pleuro-Pneumonia, and Scab Diseases	613
Table showing the Per-Centage of Deaths as compared with the Number of Animals affected with Foot and Mouth, Pleuro-Pneumonia, and Scab Diseases	616
General Abstract, showing the Extent to which Pleuro-Pneumonia prevailed in each County in Ireland, and other Particulars, during the Year ended 31st December 1873	619
General Abstract, showing the Extent to which Sheep Scab prevailed in each County in Ireland, and other Particulars, during the Year ended 31st December 1872	620
Table showing the Number of Farms, Lands, Premises, or Places in each Province in Ireland under Restrictions at certain Dates, on account of being infected with Foot and Mouth Disease, Pleuro-Pneumonia, and Sheep Scab, during the Year 1873	621
Table showing the Number of Outbreaks of Foot and Mouth Distemper, Pleuro-Pneumonia, Sheep Scab, and Sheep Pox, which occurred in Ireland in the Years 1871 and 1872, distinguishing those Cases which were Reported by the Owners of the Infected Places from those which were discovered by other Means	622

Appendix, No. 12—continued.

Table showing the Number of Instances in which Cattle Disease Council Orders have been contravened in each Province in Ireland, and in which Proceedings have been taken; also, the Result of each Prosecution, for the Years 1871 and 1872	PAGE. 624
Return of the Number and Description of Foreign Animals Imported into Ireland during the Years ended 31st December 1871 and 1872, specifying the Ports from which Imported, the Names of the Importing Vessels, the Number of Animals which Died on each Voyage, the Number Certified by the Government Inspector as being Diseased, and the Number ordered to be Slaughtered in the Custom House Decks previous to their Delivery	624
Abstract showing the Yearly Expenses now (1873) allowed for the Office of the Irish Veterinary Department (referred to as Answer and Question No. 5308)	625
Copy of General Order issued to Constabulary of Ireland in 1869 (referred to as Query 5331)	625
Copy of Report on Cruelty to Animals on their being shipped, sent to Constabulary and Dublin Metropolitan Police for their information and guidance (referred to as Answer to Query 5331)	626
Letter from Professor Ferguson to the Commissioners of the Dublin Metropolitan Police, dated 29 September 1870	627
Sansar Hill Station Report, dated 30 September 1870	627
Letter from Superintendent Carr to Professor Ferguson, dated 1 October 1870	628

Appendix, No. 13.

Papers handed in by Mr. John Algemeu Clarke:

Estimate of the Annual Home Production of Meat:

Table I.—Showing the Number of Cows and Heifers and the Number annually Dressed for Meat	629
Table II.—Showing the Number of Calves Dropped per Year, and Number probably Killed for Veal	630
Table III.—Showing the Number of Cattle at different Ages probably Killed for Beef	631
Table IV.—Showing the Numbers and Dead Weight of Cattle, Calves, Sheep, Lambs, and Pigs probably Killed for Meat	632
Table V.—Showing the Total Estimated Meat Supply to the relative Proportion furnished by Home and by Foreign Animals	633
Summary	638

Appendix, No. 14.

Papers handed in by Mr. Duckham:

Comparative Estimate of Loss sustained by the Stockowners of the United Kingdom from Foot and Mouth Disease in their Herds and Flocks during the Year 1872. The calculation is based upon the Returns made for the County of Hereford, and the Estimated Loss placed upon those Returns by the Committee of the Herefordshire Chamber of Agriculture, the Losses in that County being considered to represent the Average Losses in the Kingdom	634
Estimated Value of Cattle, Sheep, and Pigs Imported into Great Britain during the Year 1872, and Comparative Estimated Losses sustained in the United Kingdom from Foot and Mouth Disease during the same Year	634

Appendix, No. 15.

Papers handed in by Mr. Thompson:

1. Statistics of Aberdeenshire Rinderpest Association	636
2. Abstract Statement as to Outbreaks of Pleuro-Pneumonia:	
I.—From 14th April to 31st December 1871	637
II.—For the Year from 31st December 1871 to 31st December 1872	637
III.—General Abstract of the foregoing Statements	638
3. Abstract of the Receipts and Expenditure by the Local Authority of Aberdeenshire, of the Assessment leviable from the County for the Year, from 14th May 1872 to 14th May 1873	638

A P P E N D I X.

Appendix, No. 1.

PAPERS handed in by order of the Committee.

CATTLE DISEASES (IRELAND).

VETERINARY DEPARTMENT OF THE PRIVY COUNCIL OFFICE, DUBLIN CASTLE.

RETURN of all CASES of PLEURO-PNEUMONIA, FOOT and MOUTH DISEMPER, SHEEP POX, and SHEEP SCAB, which were officially reported to the VETERINARY DEPARTMENT as having occurred in *Ireland* in the Years 1871 and 1872 respectively; distinguishing those Cases which were reported by the Owners from those discovered by other Means, and, in the latter Cases, the Number of Prosecutions instituted, with the Result.

Years.	Cases reported by the Owners.				Cases discovered by other Means.				Total.				Prosecutions.		Amount of Fines Levied.
	Pleuro-pneumonia.	Foot and Mouth.	Sheep Pox.	Sheep Scab.	Pleuro-pneumonia.	Foot and Mouth.	Sheep Pox.	Sheep Scab.	Pleuro-pneumonia.	Foot and Mouth.	Sheep Pox.	Sheep Scab.	Convictions.	Fines Levied.	
1871 -	997	260,441	none	none	50	4,343	none	none	1,035	264,784	none	none	130	130	£. s. d. 95 15 2
1872 -	1,836	214,036	none	1,650	25	1,895	none	107	1,441	215,927	none	1,705	145	145	230 4 6

NOTE 1.—The Council Order, requiring sheep scab to be reported, did not come into force until the 30th May 1872.

2.—The reason of there being such a difference between the number of cases not reported and the number of prosecutions, is that frequently a great number of affected animals were involved in but one offence.

3.—The prosecutions relate only to the offence of not reporting the disease in compliance with Council Orders.

4.—In the year 1871 there were 23,821 farms, lands, premises, or places under restrictions in Ireland as infected districts, in consequence of having, or having had thereon, infectious or contagious diseases. In the year 1872 the number of farms, lands, premises, or places under restrictions as infected districts for a similar cause were 15,031.

15 April 1873.

Hugh Ferguson.

CATTLE, &c. IMPORTED INTO IRELAND.

RETURN "of all Animals Imported into Ireland from Great Britain in the Years 1871 and 1872."

	1871.										1872.										Grand Total.				
	CATTLE.					Other Animals.					Total of all Animals Imported in 1871.	CATTLE.					Other Animals.					Total of all Animals Imported in 1872.			
	Hds.	Cows.	Calves.	Cows and Calves Imported from Foreign Countries.	Cattle Imported from Foreign Countries.	Horses.	Sheep.	Swine.	Pigs.	Hds.		Cows.	Calves.	Cows and Calves Imported from Foreign Countries.	Cattle Imported from Foreign Countries.	Horses.	Sheep.	Swine.	Pigs.						
January	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
February	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
March	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
April	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
May	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
June	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
July	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
August	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
September	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
October	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
November	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
December	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Not returned	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Total	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1

By Statistics of Customs Department, and by the Department of Agriculture, 1871-72.

* Including 1 Cattle Imported from the Continent in October.

† Including 1 Cattle Imported from the Continent in September or October, distributed between the months in proportion to the respective importations.

* Including 1 Cattle Imported.

† Including 1 Cattle Imported from the Continent in September or October, distributed between the months in proportion to the respective importations.

Statistical Office, Four Courts, 4 June 1873.

W. Adams, Printer.

FOOT AND MOUTH DISTEMPER, &c. (IRELAND).

VETERINARY DEPARTMENT, PRIVY COUNCIL OFFICE, IRELAND.

TABULATED RETURN showing the Number of Farms, Lands, Premises, or Places in Ireland under Restrictions, in pursuance of the Council Orders of the 3rd November 1870, 8th April 1871, and 26th May 1872, issued in accordance with the Powers vested in His Excellency the Lord Lieutenant, by and with the Advice of Her Majesty's Privy Council in Ireland, by the Acts 29 Vict. c. 4, and 33 & 34 Vict. c. 35, at the Termination of each Week from the 8th day of November 1872 to the 31st day of May 1873; also, the Number of Outbreaks of Foot and Mouth Distemper, Pseudo-Pneumonia, and Swine Scab reported to the Veterinary Department during each Week of the said Period.

SECTION A.

Number of Farms, Lands, Premises, or Places under Restrictions at the Termination of the Weeks ended respectively on the Dates hereunder set forth, commencing when the Number of Places under Restrictions, since their imposition, was at its Maximum.

SECTION B.

Number of Outbreaks of Diseases reported during each of the Weeks particularized under Section A., setting forth Names of Diseases.

DATE.	Foot and Mouth Distemper.	Pseudo-Pneumonia.	Swine Scab.	TOTAL.	Foot and Mouth Distemper.	Pseudo-Pneumonia.	Swine Scab.	TOTAL.
15 November 1872 - - -	4,215	140	13	4,474	706	4	4	714
22 " " " " " " "	4,502	130	12	4,753	626	4	-	719
29 " " " " " " "	4,192	110	14	4,322	559	5	2	566
7 December " " " " " "	4,322	112	17	4,551	480	4	5	489
14 " " " " " " "	5,046	104	25	5,175	301	3	5	499
21 " " " " " " "	5,025	103	25	5,153	343	10	3	556
28 " " " " " " "	5,054	100	25	5,179	394	2	1	597
4 January 1873 - - -	5,025	99	26	5,150	248	3	7	258
11 " " " " " " "	5,023	95	28	5,146	170	3	1	174
18 " " " " " " "	5,728	95	34	5,857	127	4	5	136
25 " " " " " " "	5,463	27	50	5,540	61	8	7	76
1 February " " " " " "	1,871	54	45	2,010	75	4	7	86
8 " " " " " " "	1,365	35	46	1,446	60	5	4	70
15 " " " " " " "	1,425	34	47	1,506	105	5	-	110
22 " " " " " " "	824	23	40	887	67	3	1	71
1 March " " " " " " "	606	22	47	700	65	3	3	71
8 " " " " " " "	560	103	45	708	84	0	3	87
15 " " " " " " "	512	94	45	651	56	1	5	62
22 " " " " " " "	410	98	41	549	40	3	-	43
29 " " " " " " "	327	94	42	463	37	4	2	43
6 April " " " " " " "	267	50	40	357	40	-	1	41
13 " " " " " " "	285	19	43	347	50	10	4	64
20 " " " " " " "	325	15	43	383	55	5	1	61
27 " " " " " " "	391	50	39	480	33	5	2	40
5 May " " " " " " "	250	61	39	350	21	4	-	25
12 " " " " " " "	158	66	26	250	29	11	-	40
19 " " " " " " "	67	70	26	163	28	4	2	34
26 " " " " " " "	92	69	10	171	20	14	-	34
31 " " " " " " "	70	60	6	136	14	5	-	19

4 June 1873.

Hugh Ferguson.

Appendix, No. 2.

PAPERS handed in by Mr. *Alexander Williams*.

Appendix, No. 2. MEMORIAL of the COURT of QUARTER SESSIONS for the County of CHESTER to the Privy Council, dated 18th February 1873.

To the Lords of Her Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council.

The Memorial of Her Majesty's Justices of the Peace for the County of Chester, assembled at the adjourned Quarter Sessions of the Peace held at Nether Knutsford, in and for the said county, on the 18th day of February 1873,

Sheweth,

THAT great losses have occurred in Cheshire from the foot-and-mouth disease during the last three years.

That from the report of the Chief Inspector of the county, Captain James Smith, a copy of which accompanies this Memorial, it is abundantly clear that much of this disease is brought into the county by cattle imported from Ireland.

Your Memorialists therefore urge that greater care be taken by Inspectors in Ireland in the inspection of animals carried by railways and steamboats to this country, and that the provisions of the Transit of Animals (Ireland) Order of May 1871, with regard to the cleansing and disinfecting of railway trucks and pens be strictly carried out, and that all cattle and sheep imported from Ireland into this country be inspected at the ports of landing by Government Veterinary Inspectors in the same way as animals from foreign ports.

(signed) *Harry Mainwaring,*
Deputy Chairman.
George Eaton.
Edward Jayson.
Clement Sweetenham.
Wilbraham Egerton.
Philip Whitway.
J. Coote Antrix.
Thomas Thornely.
C. J. Howard.
Edward H. Sykes.

George Peel.
Richard Christy.
John Wood.
George W. Latham.
William Ferguson.
Alfred Leese.
John Carlisle.
S. N. Norris.
John Allen.
Peter Stubb.
Edward Greenhall.

RESOLUTIONS laid before the Vice President of the Privy Council on the 4th of July 1873, by the ROYAL AGRICULTURAL SOCIETY of ENGLAND.

1. THAT the foot-and-mouth disease, in an unusually virulent form, is at the present time extensively prevalent, and rapidly increasing.
2. That in the case of both cattle and sheep it causes great loss of condition and a certain percentage of deaths, especially among the young stock.
3. That the supplies of meat available for market are in consequence materially diminished and the price proportionally enhanced.
4. That both at the shipping and landing ports in the Irish Channel the precautions requisite to prevent the transit of diseased animals between the two countries are grossly neglected, and in many of the great towns in the interior of the country a great want of vigilance is also observable.

5. That

5. That under the circumstances the Royal Agricultural Society feel it their duty to represent strongly to the Government the serious mischief hereby arising, and to urge them to call upon the magistrates and municipal authorities in their respective districts to adopt such restrictive measures as shall seem to them best calculated to abate the evil, and also to insist on the regulations recommended by the Inspectors of the Veterinary Department being promptly and efficiently carried into effect.

(signed) *H. W. Wyse, President.*

MEMORIAL of the HIGHLAND and AGRICULTURAL SOCIETY of SCOTLAND to the Privy Council, dated 5th March 1873.

Unto the Lords of Her Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council.

The Memorial of the Highland and Agricultural Society of Scotland, incorporated by Royal Charter,

Sheweth,

That your Memorialists, as representing the landed proprietors and tenant farmers of Scotland, have taken a lively interest in the working of the Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act, 1869.

That your Memorialists have carefully considered the subject, and are of opinion that the want of a proper system of organisation, enforcing uniformity of action, is one of the causes of the great extent to which contagious diseases have spread throughout the country.

That at present every local authority acts according to its own views, the consequence being that the efforts of one local authority are frequently rendered useless by the counter action of another.

That such counter action has arisen between neighbouring counties, and also between counties and boroughs from the latitude given to them by the Orders in Council.

Your Memorialists therefore humbly pray your Lordships to take this most important subject into consideration, and to issue such orders as may lead to a proper system of organisation and uniformity of action, and prevent orders being given by one local authority at variance with those of another.

(signed) *John Wilson, Chairman.*

Edinburgh, 5 March 1873.

REPORT of the CONTAGIOUS DISEASES (ANIMALS) COMMITTEE of the CENTRAL CHAMBER of AGRICULTURE, as adopted and amended by the Council on Tuesday, 4th February 1873.

THE Council consider that the Act has signally failed to accomplish its objects, and that no measures adequate to deal with contagious or infectious diseases can be adopted, until the fresh importation of disease is prevented by the slaughter or quarantine of all foreign animals at the ports of debarkation.

Provided the fresh importation of disease were prevented by the adoption of the system of slaughter or quarantine, the Council would recommend additional regulations, as calculated, in their opinion, to deal efficiently with all contagious or infectious diseases, and consequently greatly to increase the production of animal food,—namely,

1. That the Council are of opinion that in dealing with cattle diseases uniform action in counties and boroughs should, as far as possible, be enforced throughout Great Britain.

2. That unless Ireland be subjected to safeguards against disease similar to those which may be adopted in this country, it will be necessary to impose restrictions on the importation of Irish stock.

3. That in cases of cattle plague or sheep-pox, the Veterinary Inspectors of the Privy Council should be empowered to order the slaughter of animals in adjacent places as well as those in contact with diseased animals; and that the slaughter of such condemned animals being carried out for the benefit of the public at large, the owners of such animals should be reimbursed the full value thereof at the public cost.

4. That the rules in the Seventh Schedule of the Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act of 1869, as to the treatment of pleuro-pneumonia, should apply also to cases of foot-and-mouth disease in cattle, sheep, swine, and gladders.

5. That all lairs or yards belonging to or used by railway and steamboat companies and market authorities, and all vessels, trucks, horse-boxes, or other vehicles which have been used for the conveyance of any animal, including a horse, which may within forty-eight hours of its removal from any such vessel, lair, truck, or other vehicle, be found infected with any contagious or infectious disease, should be treated as infected places,

Appendix, No. 2.

places, and no animal, including a horse, should be allowed to be placed in any such vessel, lair, truck, or other vehicle, until after the process of disinfection, as ordered by the Privy Council, shall have been twice performed to the satisfaction of the local authorities.

6. That in any county in which, in the months of June or July, foot-and-mouth disease exists, the movement of animals should be prohibited during these months, except with a license, such as was used during the prevalence of cattle plague; and that during those months no animal should be brought into any county without such license.

This rule not to apply to the movement of animals through any county by railway.

7. That no store animals should be brought by sea into this country except on deck, unless an efficient system of ventilation is carried out in the holds of vessels.

8. That two places of landing should be provided at every port into which cattle are imported.

9. That with regard to store animals, there should be required a veterinary certificate of health from the port of embarkation, and that, when such animals are landed, such certificate should be endorsed by a duly qualified Inspector after careful examination of the animals by daylight.

10. That there should be a detention of six hours for animals coming from Ireland, for the purpose of perfecting the inspection, and giving food and water.

That, in conclusion, the Council regret that, notwithstanding recent enactments for the purpose of securing the comfort of animals in transit, great privations are still experienced by them for want of more stringent regulations and proper supervision.

(signed) *John Algericus Clarke*, Secretary.

The President of the Royal Agricultural Society of England to the Right Hon.
W. E. Forster, M.P.

Royal Agricultural Society of England,
12 Hanover Square, 12 December 1872.

Sir,

I HAVE the honour, on behalf of the Council of the Royal Agricultural Society of England, to submit to you this enclosed series of suggestions in reference to the trade in animals, and its influence on the spread of contagious and infectious diseases amongst farm stock, in compliance with the request which you made to a deputation from the Council on July 4th. These suggestions are based on a Report to the Council by the Secretary of the Society, drawn up after a careful investigation of the subject during the past autumn. A copy of that report is also enclosed.

I am, &c.

(signed) *Cathcart*,
President.

The Right Hon. *W. E. Forster*, M.P.,
Vice President of the Privy Council.

THE Council of the Royal Agricultural Society of England having received the accompanying Report from their Secretary of his investigations into the trade in animals, beg to submit their suggestions on the subject to the Vice-President of the Privy Council:—

1. That a sufficient number of Veterinary Inspectors be appointed by the Government at the ports, both in England and Ireland, to examine properly every animal previous to shipment or landing, as the case may be.

2. That a return of the animals found affected with any contagious or infectious disease, with the names of their owners and the nature of their disease, shall be furnished at such intervals as may be deemed desirable by the Government Inspectors at the ports to the Veterinary Departments in London and Dublin respectively, and in England to the local authority.

3. That the prosecution of the owners of animals so reported as diseased shall in England be undertaken by the local authority, and in Ireland by the Veterinary Department of the Privy Council.

4. That the regulations as to right of entry, liberty to inspect, and evidence of the existence of disease (the Inspector's certificate), which are now applicable to cases or suspected cases of pleuro-pneumonia, shall be extended to foot and mouth disease (Act, sect. 31-33).

5. That

4. That all lairs or yards belonging to railway and steamboat companies, and all market places and places set apart for the holding of fairs for cattle, sheep and pigs, shall be divided into pens of a convenient size, and furnished with a sufficient number of troughs of clean water, and that these pens shall be cleansed and disinfected in accordance with the existing regulations of the English Privy Council in reference to railway pens and landing places.

6. That the cleansing and disinfection of the steamboats and other vessels used for the carriage of animals shall be rigorously enforced; and that no steamboat or other vessel shall be allowed by the Government veterinary inspector at the port of embarkation to receive animals until after the master or owner has produced and delivered a certificate signed by the Government veterinary inspector at the last port of disembarkation, certifying that such steamboat or other vessel has been properly cleansed and disinfected since the last landing of animals therefrom.

7. That the railway companies in Ireland as well as in England shall be compelled to cleanse and disinfect their railway trucks and sidings in accordance with the existing regulations.

8. That food and water in ordinary quantities be supplied to all animals either before or after inspection, both at the ports of shipment and landing, whether requested by the persons in charge or otherwise.

9. That animals exposed for sale at fairs and in markets, both in England and Ireland, shall in all cases be inspected by duly qualified veterinary surgeons or inspectors appointed by the local authority, and that it is essential that offenders against the law shall be adequately punished on conviction.

10. That the provisions of the Privy Council (Ireland) Order of 4th November 1870, be modified so as to conform to the provisions of Section 57 of the Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act with reference to contagious or infectious diseases other than glanders, cattle plague, or sheep-pox.

11. That the neglect to conform to any of the provisions of the Act, or of the Orders in Council founded thereon, shall henceforth be punished as an offence against the Act; and that the penalty clauses shall henceforth include a minimum as well as a maximum fine.

12. That all cattle dealers shall be required to take out a license, such license shall be granted or refused by the magistrates of the district in which the applicant usually resides; and that the said license shall be suspended or revoked at the discretion of the magistrates in the event of the dealer being convicted more than once of wilful non-compliance with the regulations of the Privy Council or of the local authorities.

13. That a register be kept in each district of the cattle dealers licensed therein.

14. That the lairs, yards, fields, and other premises used for the temporary reception of animals, whether inland or at the ports of landing and shipment, be duly certificated for the purpose and registered.

15. That in order to prevent cruelty, sheep and cattle should never be carried together in the same truck.

16. That in order to secure proper cleansing and ventilation of the holds of steamboats, all vessels employed in carrying animals shall be certificated; and that no certificate shall be given to any steamboat or other vessel not now engaged in the trade unless the ventilation of the holds intended for the reception of animals be performed by means of properly constructed machine ventilators.

17. That the Privy Council should from time to time send down their own inspectors to the markets in order to see that the regulations are properly carried out, and that the inspector should institute proceedings against persons whom he may detect offending against the law.

18. That at the ports licensed for the importation of foreign animals, the local authorities shall provide slaughter-houses contiguous to the ordinary cattle market, also to the landing stage for cattle from unscheduled countries, and within the defined part of the port for the landing and slaughter of animals from scheduled countries (where such exist) within the boundaries of their jurisdictions, as is the case at Deptford.

19. That in all cases the landing places for cattle from scheduled and unscheduled countries should be decidedly apart, and that the markets for cattle from scheduled countries should in all cases be separated by some considerable interval from the ordinary markets.

20. That to enable the local authorities to trace the dispersion of a contagious or infectious disease, such as cattle plague or sheep-pox, from a fair or market, the name and address of the person owning the cattle or sheep at the time of departure shall be registered by the clerk of the fair or market.

0.58.

4 D

21. That

Appendix, No. 2.

21. That with reference to cattle plague, it is desirable to add to Section 53 of the Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act, as follows:—Where, under the Act, a place is declared to be an infected place, either by the order of the Privy Council or of the local authority, or by the declaration of an inspector, a return of the cattle, sheep, and other animals (including horses) within the infected place, shall immediately be made to the clerk of the local authority by every owner of such cattle, sheep, or other animals; and in the event of any of the said animals becoming affected with any disease whatever, the same shall be immediately reported to the police by the owner of such animals. Upon such report being made to the police, the local authority shall cause the veterinary inspector to examine the animals affected, and certify in writing as to the nature of the disease.

22. That it is most desirable that in any legislation on the subject of cattle diseases uniform action should, as far as possible, be generally enforced.

23. That in cases of cattle plague the veterinary inspector of the Privy Council shall be empowered to order the slaughter of animals in adjacent fields to those actually infected, as well as the animals in the same field, cow-shed, &c., in the event of such a course being considered necessary to prevent the spread of the plague.

24. That the prohibition of the importation of cattle from Russia should continue as long as cattle plague exists in that country; and that any country permitting the importation of Russian cattle during that period should, *ipso facto*, become a scheduled country.

In addition to the foregoing suggestions, they beg leave to add the following, which, if adopted, would render compulsory the action of the local authorities in certain matters which, according to the provisions of the existing Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act, are optional with them:—

Act.—Sect. 41. Alter "may" to "shall."

Sect. 53. Alter "may" to "shall," and omit "if the circumstances of the case appear to him so to require."

Sect. 57. After "coasting vessel," insert "or a vessel engaged in the cross channel trade."

Sect. 57. After "execution of this Act," for "may" read "shall."

Sect. 56. For "may, if they think fit," read "shall."

Sect. 56. First line, for "may" read "shall;" fourth line, for "infectious disease, or" read "infectious disease, and."

(signed) Catbourn,
The President of the Society.

EXTRACT from MINUTE of Meeting of the Local Authority for Kilmarnock-shire.

5 May 1873.

"THE local authority considering the continued and increasing prevalence of pleuro-pneumonia in the county, and being of opinion that a compulsory system of stamping out, applicable to the whole of Scotland, is the only satisfactory and effectual means of checking the disease, resolved to forward to Mr. Adam, the Member of Parliament, a representation to be submitted to the Privy Council, urging the adoption of a general provision for the immediate slaughter of all animals affected with pleuro-pneumonia, and the chairman was requested to communicate with Mr. Adam on this subject."

Extracted by,
(signed) R. Burns Begg, Junior, Clerk.

CONTAGIOUS DISEASES (ANIMALS) ACTS.

RECOMMENDATIONS and SUGGESTIONS agreed to at a Meeting of the Local Authority for the County of Newcastle, held at Uxton on the 9th May 1873, and submitted to the Committee of the Honourable the House of Commons sitting on the Contagious Diseases (Animals) Acts and Orders in Council.

1. It being the opinion of this local authority that foot and mouth disease is epidemic, though also contagious, and that it often prevails without being imported or being foreign

foreign origin, and cannot be prevented or stamped out, and it being within our knowledge that the scab in sheep must necessarily, at times, exist in mountainous counties, especially in wet seasons, and cannot be prevented:

Appendix, No. 2.

We consider—

2. That while mountain runs for sheep exist, as in the county of Monmouth and adjoining counties, scab will also exist unless a compulsory system of periodical salving or other dressing be adopted.

3. That in the foot and mouth disease and the scab the visits of veterinary inspectors should be discontinued (except for the purpose of certifying the cessation of the disease) unless by special order of a magistrate.

4. But that the rules with regard to reporting to the police and the moving of diseased animals along roads and bringing them into fairs and markets, cannot be too strictly enforced, and are the most effectual remedies that can be applied.

5. That the police be empowered to make reports to the Privy Council in lieu of inspectors.

By Order of the Executive Committee,

(signed) Charles B. Fox,

Newport, Monmouth,

Clerk to the Committee.

STATEMENT of the Amount of TOLLS, DUES, and PAYMENTS received at the METROPOLITAN CATTLE MARKET during the Years 1871 and 1872.

1871.			1872.		
TOLLS:	£.	s. d.	TOLLS:	£.	s. d.
244,782 Beasts - - -	2,022	17 -	227,145 Beasts - - -	5,078	15 6
1,480,155 Sheep - - -	1,221	17 9	1,440,536 Sheep - - -	7,540	2 10
30,179 Calves - - -	125	14 10	90,351 Calves - - -	322	17 9
9,320 Pigs - - -	11	14 1	6,770 Pigs - - -	45	19 5
5,082 Horses - - -	394	1 -	6,531 Horses - - -	103	8 6
2,944 Donkeys - - -	23	1 -	5,556 Donkeys - - -	31	19 9
		2,794 5 8			13,222 17 7
DUES:	£.	s. d.	DUES:	£.	s. d.
244,239 Beasts - - -	1,530	0 8	6,331 Horse tax - - -	40	35 4½
112,240 Sheep pass - -	547	- -	123 Permitted stands - -	27	- -
30,179 Calf tax - - -	150	5 6	373 Ditto - - -	69	9 0
700 Pig pass - - -	28	- -	500 Daily stands - - -	28	- -
325 Calf pass - - -	8	5 -	10,415 Ditto - - -	320	7 6
8,089 Horse tax - - -	50	10 5	1,574 Waggon, &c. - -	78	14 -
387 Permitted stands -	40	11 -	1,666 Trucks - - -	25	- -
641 Ditto - - -	69	35 0			
838 Daily stands - - -	20	72 -			
11,243 Ditto - - -	228	1 0			
5,030 Waggon, carts, &c.	101	10 -			
953 Trucks and barrows -	24	11 -			
		7,068 6 1			322 7 4½
LAIKAGE:	£.	s. d.	LAIKAGE:	£.	s. d.
243,310 Beasts - - -	3,043	19 -	180,517 Beasts - - -	2,356	9 3
1,480 Calves - - -	20	15 5	115 Calves - - -	1	8 9
242,279 Sheep - - -	217	17 6	320,379 Sheep - - -	503	19 -
46,031 Ditto, grazing -	229	17 -	50,330 Ditto, grazing -	153	- -
13,354 Pigs - - -	51	1 3	6,031 Pigs - - -	39	14 5
45,903 Trusses hay - -	3,038	8 3	25,030 Trusses hay - -	5,217	25 2½
1,290 Trusses straw - -	144	9 -	1,458 Trusses straw - -	106	19 -
		11,414 8 2			8,700 18 4½
£.		25,126 18 11	£.		25,145 3 4½

Appendix, No. 2. STATEMENT of the Amount of TOLLS, DUES, and PAYMENTS received at the FOREIGN CATTLE MARKET at Deptford during the Year 1872.

WHARFAGE, LAINAGE, MARKET DUES, and CHARGES:		£.	s.	d.	£.	s.	d.
38,199	Beasts - - - - -	8,563	3	-			
817	Calves - - - - -	81	14	-			
124,208	Sheep - - - - -	4,069	1	-			
173	Pigs - - - - -	8	13	-			
3,655	Quarters, beef - - - - -	91	11	0			
9	Sides of beef - - - - -	-	9	-			
4	Calves (killed) - - - - -	-	2	-			
320	Sheep (killed) - - - - -	4	-	-			
1	Pig (killed) - - - - -	-	-	4			
						14,540	13 10
SLAUGHTER-HOUSE CHARGES:							
957	Beasts - - - - -	95	14	-			
71	Calves - - - - -	8	11	-			
2,199	Sheep - - - - -	44	18	4			
						144	2 4
					£.	14,684	17 2

NAMES of the Local Authorities who, in September 1869, applied for Stringent Regulations for Foot and Mouth Disease.

County of Buckingham.	County of Elgin.
Kent (Wingham Division).	Elgin, Burgh of.
County of Lancaster.	County of Haddington.
County of Aberdeen.	County of Inverness.

NAMES of the Local Authorities who, in October, November, and December asked for Modification or Revocation of Order of 28th September 1869.

County of Norfolk.	County of Edinburgh.
County of Suffolk.	County of Haddington.
County of Berwick.	County of Huntingdon.

NAMES of Counties who applied the Provisions of the Order of Council of 14th December 1869.

County of Aberdeen.	County of Cornwall.
County of Northumberland.	County of Haddington.
Soke of Peterborough.	County of Somerset.
County of Dorset.	County of Kirkcudbright.
County of Elgin.	County of Salop.
County of Essex.	County of Montgomery.
County of Oxford.	County of Devon.
County of Roxburgh.	County of Worcester.

MEMORANDUM showing how many Local Authorities object to further Restrictions in respect to Foot and Mouth Disease, and how many ask for further Restrictions; also, how many Local Authorities have made Regulations under the Act and Orders, and how many, as far as is known, have made no Regulations, from 1st January 1872 to 31st August 1872, inclusive.

Local authorities who object to further restrictions	- - - -	4	
Local authorities asking for stoppage of fairs and markets (three of which ask for Cattle Plague restrictions).		4	12
Local authorities asking for various other restrictions	- -	8	
Total	- - -	12	
Local authorities who have made no regulations—			
Counties—English and Welsh	- - - -	25	319
" Scotch	- - - -	20	
Boroughs—English and Welsh	- - - -	202	
" Scotch	- - - -	72	
Total	- - -	319	
Local authorities who have made regulations—			
Counties—English and Welsh	- - - -	34	85
" Scotch	- - - -	14	
Boroughs—English and Welsh (including Metropolis)	- - - -	31	
" Scotch	- - - -	6	
Total	- - -	85	

MEMORANDUM of Communications, dated since 1st January 1872, objecting to present or further Restrictions in respect of Foot and Mouth Disease, received from Local Authorities and others.

1 September 1872.

LOCAL AUTHORITY.	NATURE OF COMMUNICATION.
District Rhinns, County Wigtown	Consider it unnecessary to enforce regulations in Part II. of The Animals Order of 1871. (27th January 1872.)
Landowners, Graziers, Butchers, &c., principally in the interest of Liverpool.	Propose that foot and mouth disease may be exempted from the operation of The Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act, 1869. (Beginning of June 1872.)
Clerk of Peace, County Essex	Refuse to join local authority of Norfolk in memorialising Lords of Council to suspend all markets for a time. (14th August 1872.)
Clerk of Supply, County Berwick	Application for relaxation of existing rules of 57th Section of The Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act, 1869. (22nd August 1872.)

Appendix, No. 2. MEMORANDUM of Applications for more Stringent Regulations in respect to Foot and Mouth Disease received from Local Authorities since 1st January 1872.

1 September 1872.

LOCAL AUTHORITY.	NATURE OF APPLICATION.
Clerk of Supply, County of Aberdeen.	Complains of foot and mouth disease being imported into this county from England, Ireland, and south of Scotland. Requests that all local authorities may be constrained to take proper precautions, and that all animals exported from Ireland may previously undergo a careful examination. (28th February 1872.)
Clerk of Peace, County of Carmarthen.	Suggests closing markets for four weeks. (8th June 1872.)
Clerk of Peace, County of Cumberland.	Complains of increase and virulence of foot and mouth disease, and requests the immediate adoption of such measures as may be deemed expedient. (9th July 1872.)
Clerk of Peace, County of Somerset.	Complains of Bristol market, and urges Privy Council to stop fairs, &c. (30th July 1872.)
Clerk of Peace, County of Middlesex.	Proposes heavy penalties for infringement of Orders in force. (31st July 1872.)
Clerk of Peace, County of Cornwall.	Wishes to avoid applying to close shows, markets, and fairs, but suggests great caution. (9th August 1872.)
Clerk of Peace, County of Devon.	Complains of Bristol market as source of disease, and calls on Privy Council to take stringent measures. (9th August 1872.)
Town Clerk, Maidstone - -	Offers to take further steps for the suppression of foot and mouth disease if the Privy Council consider it necessary. (10th August 1872.)
Clerk of Central Committee, County of Norfolk.	Proposes stoppage of all fairs and markets for store stock in the kingdom for six weeks. That markets for fat stock shall be held under same restrictions as at the time of cattle plague, and store stock shall be moved only under similar restrictions existing at same period. (12th August 1872.)
Town Clerk, Norwich - -	Proposes no cattle shall be moved without license from cattle inspector of district from which cattle are moved. Unless this is done, considers closing of markets and fairs will be ineffectual. (13th August 1872.)
Clerk of Peace, County of Warwick.	Proposes powers should be given to local authorities to regulate holding of markets and fairs, which are held now at so early an hour as to preclude inspection before admission. (16th August 1872.)
Clerk of Peace, County of Northumberland.	Asks for the powers of prohibiting movement of all animals through their district, save those going to market for slaughter, without passes to be issued by local authority under Privy Council Regulations. (1st August 1872.)
Ditto - ditto - -	Again urges that the above powers be granted to them. (10th August 1872.)
Ditto - ditto - -	Expresses regret of local authority that Privy Council will not confer on them the powers asked for. (21st August 1872.)
Clerk of Peace, County of Suffolk	Proposes to close all fairs and markets for store stock for a time, and that the disinfection of fairs and markets should be made compulsory. That markets for fat stock, and movement of store stock, should be under the same rules as in the time of cattle plague. Also proposes that all animals moved in contravention of section 57 of the Act, should either be killed on the spot or returned to the owner in some conveyance at his, the owner's, expense. (22nd August 1872.)
Clerk of Supply, County of Elgin	Requests an Order respecting erection of fences on fields adjoining highways where contagious or infectious disease exists. (27th June 1872.)
Ditto - ditto - -	Requests an Order empowering a local authority to regulate the movement of cattle on the whole of a farm whereon foot and mouth disease exists. (16th July 1872.)
Clerk of Peace, Shropshire - -	Requests immediate stoppage of all fairs and markets for store stock in the kingdom for six weeks. (28th August 1872.)

Note.—Applications from Norfolk and Suffolk are, partly, similar to that from Northumberland.

INSTRUCTIONS to the VETERINARY INSPECTORS at the Ports.

Privy Council Office, Veterinary Department,
 Pinner Street, Westminster, S.W.
 29 December 1871.

Sir,

I HAVE to inform you that the regulations relating to the landing and inspection of foreign animals arriving at ports in Great Britain, dated 31st March 1871, will cease to be in operation from the 31st instant, and that after that date the following instructions relating to your duties as an Inspector of the Privy Council are to be strictly followed.

General.

1. The Inspector is responsible at the place or places for which he is acting as Veterinary Inspector for carrying into effect the provisions of the Foreign Animals Order of 1871, from the time at which any foreign animals are delivered into his charge by the officers of the Customs.

Copy of the Foreign Animals Order of 1871, enclosed.

2. The Inspector is also to direct his attention to the carrying into effect of the provisions of Part I. of the Animals Order of 1871, and the Transit of Animals (Water) Order of March 1871, and for this purpose he is to visit occasionally vessels carrying animals arriving at the place or places for which he is acting, and also railway stations near thereto, but he is not to incur any expenses other than those which are necessarily incurred in the inspection of foreign animals, carcasses, and other things, without a previous written authority from this department in each instance.

Copy of the Animals Order of 1871, enclosed.

Copy of the Transit of Animals (Water) Order of March 1871, enclosed.

3. The Inspector, in rendering an account of his travelling and incidental expenses, must see that every item is strictly in accordance with the scale set down in Memorandum No. 24—1871, and his account must be accompanied by a certificate to the effect that such expenses have been incurred on account of the public service, and that his attendance has been given for so many days of not less than eight hours each, or for so many days and nights of not less than twenty-four hours each, as the case may be.

4. If called upon by the officers of Her Majesty's Customs to do so, the Inspector is to examine and certify as to the risk or otherwise of the introduction of contagious or infectious disease by any animal, carcass, hide, meat, offal, hay, straw, fodder, or other article brought by sea to the place or places for which he is acting.

5. The Inspector is to report forthwith to this department any neglect on the part of any person in carrying into effect the provisions of the Act of 1860 or of any Order thereunder.

Marking.

6. The Inspector is to see that such cattle, sheep, goats, and swine within a defined part of a port as are required to be marked are marked in accordance with Article 20 of the Foreign Animals Order of 1871, and that no animal required to be marked is taken from under his charge until so marked.

Inspection and Detention.

7. The Inspector is to commence his inspection of foreign animals as soon as he conveniently can after they are placed under his charge.

8. The Inspector is to exercise his judgment whether his first inspection shall extend to an examination of each animal separately and carefully, or shall be limited to a general inspection of the whole cargo; but under any circumstances he is responsible for the effectual examination of each animal.

9. The Inspector's final inspection is to consist of a careful examination of each animal separately during daylight, and is not to take place until after at least twelve hours detention. Such detention, however, may be extended at his discretion under Article 10 of the Foreign Animals Order of 1871, but he is required to report to this department any such extra detention and the cause of it.

Contagious or Infectious Disease Generally.

10. Where the Inspector finds any contagious or infectious disease in any animal or animals under his charge, he is to give notice to the police, in order that the Inspector of the local authority may be informed thereof.

11. Where the Inspector is of opinion that any animal under his charge, not within the definition of animal in the Act of 1860, may introduce contagious or infectious disease, he is to detain such animal, and report the circumstances to this department.

Appendix, No. 2.

Cattle Plague.

12. Where the Inspector finds cattle plague in any animal under his charge, he is to detain it, and all cattle, sheep, goats, and swine brought in the same vessel therewith, and cause it and them to be slaughtered with the utmost practicable expedition at the nearest safe and convenient place.

In every such case the Inspector is to detain any animal not within the definition of animal in the Act of 1869 brought in the vessel, and report the circumstances to this department.

Pleuro-Pneumonia.

13. Where the Inspector finds pleuro-pneumonia in any cattle under his charge, he is to cause the same, and all cattle brought in the same vessel therewith, to be dealt with in the following manner:—

- (1.) The diseased cattle are to be slaughtered at the landing-place.
- (2.) The healthy cattle, if landed at any place other than within the defined part of a port, are to be slaughtered at the landing-place, or, if landed at a port at which there is a defined part, the Inspector may permit them to be removed by water into such defined part for slaughter.

Foot-and-Mouth Disease.

14. Where the Inspector finds foot-and-mouth disease in any cattle, sheep, goats, or swine under his charge, he is to cause the same, and all cattle, sheep, goats, and swine brought in the same vessel therewith, to be dealt with in the following manner:—

- (1.) The diseased cattle, sheep, goats, and swine are to be slaughtered at the landing-place.
- (2.) The healthy cattle, sheep, goats, and swine, if landed at any place other than within the defined part of a port, are to be slaughtered at the landing-place, but if landed at a port at which there is a defined part, the Inspector may permit them to be removed by water into such defined part for slaughter.

Sheep-Pox and Sheep-Scab.

15. Where the Inspector finds sheep-pox or sheep-scab in any sheep under his charge, he is to cause the same, and all sheep brought in the same vessel therewith, to be dealt with in the following manner:—

- (1.) The diseased sheep are to be slaughtered at the landing-place.
- (2.) The healthy sheep, if landed at any place other than within the defined part of a port, are to be slaughtered at the landing-place, or, if landed at a port at which there is a defined part, the Inspector may permit them to be removed by water into such defined part for slaughter.

Divided Cargoes.

16. In carrying into effect Article 8 of the Foreign Animals Order of 1871, the Inspector at the place where a part of any cargo is landed is to take care that the Inspector at the place where it is proposed to land another part of such cargo is informed thereof, and each is to see that the last-mentioned article is strictly carried into effect.

Carcases.

17. The Inspector may allow carcases of animals, which he is satisfied were healthy before being slaughtered, to be removed from the lairs without making a post-mortem examination of them, but he is to superintend the slaughter and make a post-mortem examination of each diseased animal.

18. If the Inspector is of opinion that any carcase under his charge, if allowed to be removed, would or might introduce any contagious or infectious disease, he is not to allow the removal thereof except for burial or destruction, and is to see that such burial or destruction is carried into effect.

19. If the Inspector is of opinion that any carcase under his charge is unfit for human food, he is to give notice to the police in order that the nuisance authority of the district may be informed thereof.

I am, Sir,
Your obedient servant,

Secretary.

SUMMARY of the PAPERS which were registered and specially treated in the
VETERINARY DEPARTMENT during 1872.

Appendix, No. 2.

THE duties performed by the clerks of the department may be stated to consist in the treatment of 179,390 papers :

Inward letters - - - - -	5,030*
Other registered papers - - - - -	528
Returns, declarations, &c. - - - - -	39,264
Certificates - - - - -	5,459
	<hr/> 50,471

and in the dispatch of

Outward letters - - - - -	3,043*
Circulars - - - - -	3,278
Copies of Orders of Council, upwards of - - - - -	59,000
Forms of Returns, and Certificates, upwards of - - - - -	63,600
	<hr/> 129,919
Outwards - - - - -	129,919
Inwards - - - - -	50,471
Total - - - - -	<hr/> 179,390

* These do not include some thousands of inward and outward letters and papers which were not of a nature to require registration and special treatment.

EXTRACTS from the ESTIMATES for CIVIL SERVICES for 1868-69, and 1869-70, showing the Amounts paid out of the Civil Contingencies Fund for Expenses connected with CATTLE PLAGUE and with the VETERINARY DEPARTMENT.

	£.	s.	d.	£.	s.	d.
Veterinary Department - - - - -	17,446	14	1			
* Ditto - ditto - - - - -	11,053	17	6			
Other Expenses connected with Cattle Plague to the 31st December 1867 (not under the control of the Veterinary Department) :—				28,506	11	7
Inspectors of Cattle and Miscellaneous Expenses - - - - -	49,397	2	3			
Advertisements of Orders of Council - - - - -	18,675	2	-			
Compensation for Cattle slaughtered by order of Inspectors - - - - -	25,000	-	-			
Additional Amounts between 1st February and 31st December 1867 :—						
* Inspectors of Cattle (including £,767 l. 15 s. 8 d. paid to the Veterinary Surgeons employed by the Customs Department)	4,097	2	-			
* Legal Adviser - - - - -	400	-	-			
Additional Amounts between 1st January and 31st March 1868 :—						
* Inspectors of Cattle - - - - -	280	16	8			
* Legal Adviser - - - - -	300	-	-			
* Mr. J. B. Simonds, for Expenses of attending Veterinary Congress at Zurich - - - - -	67	11	1			
				99,870	18	7
* Veterinary Department—Salaries and Expenses from 1st January to 31st March 1868 - - - - -	-	-	-	2,458	17	1

* This additional sum appears under the Estimate for Miscellaneous Expenses, in Class VII., being a portion of the amount required to repay to the Civil Contingencies Fund the advances made between 1st February 1867 and 31st March 1868.

EXPENSES of the VETERINARY DEPARTMENT on account of SALARIES, INCIDENTAL EXPENSES, and TRAVELLING EXPENSES, subsequent to the 31st March 1868; after which Date the Sum necessary to defray such Expenses were annually provided for by separate Votes.

		£.	s.	d.	£.	s.	d.
1868-69	Salaries Account from 1st April 1868 to 31st March 1869	6,092	18	8			
	Incidental Expenses - - ditto - - - ditto - - -	108	19	8			
	Travelling Expenses - - ditto - - - ditto - - -	11	18	3			
					6,296	1	4
1869-70	Salaries Account from 1st April 1869 to 31st March 1870	4,747	18	0			
	Incidental Expenses - - ditto - - - ditto - - -	1,002	2	11			
	Travelling Expenses - - ditto - - - ditto - - -	21	19	6			
					5,771	17	11
1870-71	Salaries Account from 1st April 1870 to 31st March 1871	8,214	5	11			
	Incidental Expenses - - ditto - - - ditto - - -	159	3	5			
	Travelling Expenses - - ditto - - - ditto - - -	78	-	1			
					8,452	9	5
1871-72	Salaries Account from 1st April 1871 to 31st March 1872	6,036	-	4			
	Incidental Expenses - - ditto - - - ditto - - -	337	19	0			
	Travelling Expenses - - ditto - - - ditto - - -	195	17	1			
	Examination of Cattle - - ditto - - - ditto - - -	2,800	11	10			
					11,368	9	9
1872-73	Salaries Account from 1st April 1872 to 31st March 1873	10,410	15	1			
	Incidental Expenses - - ditto - - - ditto - - -	639	13	8			
	Travelling Expenses - - ditto - - - ditto - - -	388	1	9			
					11,438	10	8

+ The payments to Inspectors for Examination of Cattle are included under this head.

ESTIMATED TOTAL COST of the VETERINARY DEPARTMENT for the Year 1872.

	£.	s.	d.	£.	s.	d.
Rent of Offices - - - - -	360	-	-			
Rates - - - - -	42	-	-			
Furniture and Household Articles, Gas, Water, Fuel, Repairs, and Wages to Carstaker, &c. - - -	283	15	9			
Legal Expenses - - - - -	402	14	6			
Salaries - - - - -	10,373	10	7			
Incidental Expenses - - - - -	539	19	11			
Travelling Expenses - - - - -	430	18	10			
Stationery - - - - -	580	-	-			
				£.	12,662	19 7

The cost of Postage is not included, as no separate account has been kept.

Appendix, No. 3.

MEMORANDUM.

SUGGESTIONS by Mr. BARELAY, of Provisions for discovering and dealing with CATTLE PLAGUE, PLEURO-PNEUMONIA, and SHEEP-POX.

Appendix, No. 3.

DISCOVERY OF DISEASE.

1. THE occupant of any farm or building (excepting licensed slaughter-houses) where any nest animal dies or is slaughtered, to report such death or slaughter within three days to the police or local authority.
2. The owner of any animal affected with any of the diseases above-named, to report the same. (*Provided by existing Act.*)
3. Every veterinary surgeon, or person professing to treat diseased animals, to certify cases of the diseases above-named, receiving a sufficient fee therefor.
4. Police constables to report any suspicious cases of disease which may come to their knowledge.

COMPENSATION.

5. The owner of stock to be compensated to the extent of three-fourths of his loss for animals slaughtered by the local authority; but no animal to be valued, in estimating loss, at over 40 £.

ORGANIZATION.

6. One local authority for each county, elected jointly by the county and the boroughs within it.
7. The cost of general management, printing, advertising, and chief inspector, to be charged rateably over the whole, and any payments for compensation and sub-inspection to be charged against the county or borough where incurred exclusively.
8. At least one inspector, with adequate salary, to be appointed in each county, devoting his whole time to the duties of his office (unless in counties excepted by Privy Council).
- The chief inspector to be responsible to carry out the whole duties under the Act within his county, to superintend the dealing with disease, and to keep and report such statistics as the Privy Council may require.
9. The chief inspectors to employ sub-inspectors (not necessarily veterinary surgeons) to take charge of herds where disease exists, and to see the orders of chief inspector duly carried out with diligence and care.

MODE OF DEALING WITH DISEASED ANIMALS AND HERDS.

10. All animals labouring under the diseases named to be slaughtered forthwith.
11. The local authority to have power to slaughter all animals in the same herd with diseased animals; and, in the case of cattle plague, all cattle in adjacent fields or buildings.
12. No animal to be moved out of an infected place for 30 days after the last case (*provided by existing Act*), nor in the case of pleuro-pneumonia during a further period of two months, without a certificate by inspector.
13. Animals affected by disease may be moved freely within an infected place on the land in the same possession, provided no other land (except a public road or highway) intervene, subject always to any rule or regulations of the local authority.
14. Local authorities to have power to make any rules or regulations, or to issue any directions regarding cattle, or persons in charge of them, within an infected place.
15. All local authority to have power to deal in such manner as they may consider expedient with any cattle labouring under foot or mouth disease found on any public road or exposed in any market or fair, and to charge any expenses against the owner, or to detain and sell the cattle failing payment in satisfaction of such expenses. (*Doubtful under existing Act.*)
16. Should any local authority fail in duly carrying out the provisions of the Act, or in suppressing disease, the Privy Council to have power to send an inspector to give directions for the suppression of the disease, with power to have such directions carried into effect, charging all expenses so incurred against the local authority.

Appendix, No. 4.

PAPERS handed in by Mr. Kavanagh.

Appendix, No. 4.

ROYAL DUBLIN SOCIETY

CATTLE TRANSIT, IRELAND.

At a Meeting of the Council of the Royal Dublin Society, held on 26th March 1872,

The Marquis of Kildare, Vice President, in the Chair.

On the motion of Viscount de Feroi, seconded by Charles Uniacke Townshend, Esq., the following Report was adopted.

REPORT.

THE Committee of Agriculture beg to report to the Council that in conformity with the resolution of the 26th February 1872, they have issued the queries on the subject of cattle transit, in relation to foot and mouth and other infectious diseases of cattle, to the principal graziers and exporters of cattle in Ireland, and having carefully examined all the answers, after much consideration have come to the following conclusions:—

FAIRS AND MARKETS.

1. They find that the cattle brought to the fairs and markets in Ireland are generally free from disease.
2. That foot and mouth disease is most prevalent in summer and autumn.
3. They are of opinion that fairs and markets ought not to be held in the streets of towns nor on public roads, but in fields or enclosures having ample means of ingress and egress.
4. That fairs and markets should be inspected by non-resident veterinary surgeons or other qualified persons, the police being directed to enforce their orders, and that when cattle yards in the neighbourhood of fairs or markets are in use, they should be inspected and cleansed, and disinfected under the superintendence of the police.

RAILWAYS.

5. Cattle-pens should be provided at all stations, and be properly cleansed and disinfected under the supervision of the police.
6. Time-tables should be issued for cattle trains, and an average rate of speed rendered compulsory, great inconvenience being experienced in the uncertainty of the arrival of cattle trains at the stations, which entails the necessity of dispatching cattle several hours earlier than should be necessary, thus exposing them to deterioration from ill-treatment, and to risk of infection. strenuous efforts should be made to have trains timed to suit the departure of the steamers.
7. The Committee find that as a general rule cattle trucks are neither cleansed nor disinfected, though the provisions of the law for that purpose are probably sufficient, if enforced.
8. The Committee consider that the provisions of Section 9 of the Order in Council of 6th March 1872, should be extended, so far as suitable, to the carriage of animals by railways.
9. A chief officer, or officers of good position, should be appointed, whose duty it should be to have the provisions of the law duly carried into effect by authorized subordinates.
10. On the several lines of railway in the United Kingdom, feeding and watering the animals should be compulsory, if the animals were beyond 24 hours in transit.

YARDS OR LAIRS AT SEAPORTS.

11. Yards or lairs at seaports should be licensed, carefully paved, regularly cleansed and disinfected, and supplied with water for the use of cattle. If cattle be detained beyond a certain specified time they should be fed as well as watered.
12. In all such lairs or yards, the inspection of cattle could, if requisite, be more efficiently carried out than on the quays, where stock would be massed together, and driven hurriedly.

STEAMERS.

STEAMERS.

Appendix, No. 4.

13. In all cattle boats, pens of a limited size should be provided, and provision made for most ample ventilation, a requirement which appears to be in many cases imperfectly carried out. The Order in Council as to cleansing and disinfection of the holds of steamers should be rigidly enforced.

14. A system of quarantine at the port of debarkation, whereby cattle might be detained for days, would injuriously interfere with trade, and would consequently increase the price of store cattle in Great Britain.

15. A distinction should be made between store cattle and those intended for slaughter. The former should be detained at the port of debarkation for at least three hours, for the purposes of rest, feeding, and watering; the latter should be forwarded to their destination without unnecessary delay.

16. In order readily to distinguish store cattle from those intended for slaughter, the Committee recommend that the latter should be marked by the owner in a conspicuous place with a distinctive and authorized brand.

17. The provisions of Section 10, of Transit of Animals (Ireland) Order, of 19th May 1871, should be extended to the ports of debarkation in Great Britain, whereby the speedy and convenient unshipment of animals would be secured, and a supply of food at a declared price provided; such provision to be enforced by the local or other authorities.

The opinion being prevalent in Great Britain, that disease, to a great extent, is carried by Irish cattle exported thereto, it nevertheless appears, from the information collected by the Committee, that the animals are healthy on removal from their pastures, but that from want of cleansing and disinfecting of trucks and steamers; over-crowding and absence of adequate ventilation in the latter, and then sudden exposure of the cattle for hours in trucks; the animals throughout their transit being either insufficiently or not at all fed, watered, or rested, and subject to such vicissitudes, overworked and half starved, they are in so weak and reduced a condition that they are thereby rendered most susceptible to disease. On this subject the Committee of the House of Commons reported as follows:—"A journey, whether by sea or rail, causes cattle to deteriorate in value, and makes them feverish, and tends to produce, if it does not actually cause, foot and mouth disease; these evils are very much increased if cattle are ill-treated or not properly watered."

The Committee have carefully considered the suggestions of the Council of the Royal Agricultural Society of England on this subject, with some of which, it will be seen by this report, they substantially agree, whilst from others they feel bound to withhold their assent as being instances of over-regulation, or as being unnecessary.

The Committee, fully impressed with the serious disadvantages resulting to the United Kingdom from an undue and vexatious interference with the trade and transfer of Irish cattle, yet in the true interests of that staple industry, feel coerced to advise the rigid enforcement of the regulations already existing for the prevention of disease, supplemented by the above amended suggestions, from which jointly they confidently anticipate consequences alike satisfactory to the Irish producer and the British purchaser.

(signed) Charles Uniacke Twisshead,
Vice-Chairman,
Committee of Agriculture.

14 March 1873.

Approved,

(signed) Kildars,
Vice President,

26 March 1873.

RESOLUTION passed by the ROYAL DUBLIN SOCIETY, May 1873.

THAT this Committee view with the utmost alarm the proposal submitted to the Contagious Diseases (Animals) Parliamentary Committee to stop all fairs and markets, and all movements of cattle and sheep, during two at least of the ensuing summer months. That they consider, if this suggestion were carried out, the loss, not only to growers and farmers, but to all classes of the community, in this country would be incalculable. That the Committee are of opinion that even were a similar measure carried out simultaneously in England and Scotland, and in this country, it would be quite inadequate to stamp out the diseases for which this remedy is proposed.

VETERINARY DEPARTMENT, PRIVY COUNCIL OFFICE, IRELAND.

SUMMARY RETURN showing the Number and Description of ANIMALS Imported to and Exported from
Ireland during the Month of May 1873, and the respective Ports.

Ports.	Animals Imported.							Animals Exported.						
	Cows, Bulls, and Goats.	Cattle.	Sheep and Lambs.	Goats.	Pigs.	Horses.	Mules.	Cows, Bulls, and Goats.	Cattle.	Sheep and Lambs.	Goats.	Pigs.	Horses.	Mules.
Dublin	240	245	68	-	8	34	-	11,786	593	1,620	10	16,028	1,225	-
Bristol	-	120	-	-	-	-	-	1,712	233	3,330	2	3,599	265	-
Wolverhampton	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	283	2,238	1,551	2	255	100	-
Bath	11	10	-	-	1	38	-	9,085	1,916	940	120	2,275	1,700	-
Cork	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	5,154	50	9,781	24	1,256	210	-
Donkirk	-	45	-	-	-	204	-	1,690	4,378	1,247	423	3,192	259	-
Ship	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	22	140	766	-	550	7	-
Waterford	-	-	-	-	-	17	-	4,338	27	1,700	1	9,809	243	-
Londonderry	23	10	10	-	-	6	-	1,774	3,693	874	-	825	45	-
Newry	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	205	-	20	-	122	9	-
Wexford	-	-	30	-	-	-	-	779	1	1,534	-	2,409	6	-
Belton	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	264	740	736	-	8	459	-	38,186	12,570	27,155	630	56,087	3,294	-

NOTE.—1. There were 508 civility horses imported into Dundalk, which are included in the total number of horses imported into that port.
2. There were 209 civility horses exported from Dublin, which are included in the total number of horses exported from that port.

VETERINARY DEPARTMENT, PRIVY COUNCIL OFFICE, DUBLIN CASTLE.

SUMMARY of TABULATED RETURNS showing according to the Daily Returns furnished to the Irish Veterinary Department, by the Royal Irish Constabulary and Dublin Metropolitan Police appointed to act as Ship Inspectors at Irish Ports, the Number and Description of ANIMALS Imported into and Exported from Ireland, during the Month of June 1873, setting forth the Irish Ports of Debarkation and Embarkation.

Ports.	ANIMALS IMPORTED.								ANIMALS EXPORTED.							
	Oxen, Bulls, or Cows.	Culivins.	Sheep and Lambs.	Goats.	Pigs.	Horses.	Mules.	Asses.	Oxen, Bulls, or Cows.	Culivins.	Sheep and Lambs.	Goats.	Pigs.	Horses.	Mules.	Asses.
Bahia	50	10	140	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	35	-	40	9	-	-
Bahia	9	1	42	-	-	-	-	-	10,601	1,005	2,310	369	1,097	1,202	1	9
Cork	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10,800	120	6,990	7	115	263	2	60
Colombo	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Dublin	755	104	880	-	-	65	-	-	14,725	2,610	22,706	8	3,540	690	6	30
Drogheda	-	30	-	-	-	9	-	-	5,000	5,070	5,106	514	1,101	177	-	84
Londonderry	-	24	-	-	-	2	-	-	4,107	1,150	15,843	1	960	175	-	-
Norwich	14	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	6,107	2,541	1,504	17	655	203	-	5
Wigan	-	-	-	-	-	8	-	-	22	54	100	-	57	8	-	-
Warrington	-	4	-	-	-	1	-	-	60	86	1,394	-	304	6	-	-
Waterford	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1,560	3,067	1,047	9	130	105	-	80
Woolwich	-	-	-	-	-	7	-	-	7,170	20	2,725	-	3,060	304	-	-
Worcester	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1,604	-	2,114	3	2,130	-	-	-
Youghal	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	805	250	1,050	-	-	194	1	-	54,401	17,517	63,504	806	13,879	5,704	6	140
Total Increase or Decrease for the month of June 1873, as compared with the month of May 1873	In-crease. 511	De-crease. 481	In-crease. 302	-	In-crease. 2	De-crease. 304	De-crease. 1	-	Increase. 10,200	Increase. 4,744	Decrease. 35,170	De-crease. 105	De-crease. 14,585	De-crease. 600	De-crease. 9	In-crease. 70

Notes.—Of the 785 cases, bulls, or cows, imported into Dublin, 746 were Portuguese, from Oporto.

6 July 1873.

Hugh Ferguson, Director General.

Appendix, No. 5

Appendix, No. 5.

PAPERS handed in by Professor Balhais, 24 April 1873.

M A P

OF

ALBERT MODEL FARMS, GLASNEVIN.

(Referred to in Question 3943.)

Appendix, No. 5.

SUGGESTIONS for an Enactment to relieve *Ireland* of the Loss now entailed on her by PLEURO-PNEUMONIA and FOOT and MOUTH DISEASE, and to protect *Great Britain* from the exportation from *Ireland* of Animals affected with these Diseases.

EXPLANATIONS.

1. Policeman, means a member of the constabulary or of the Dublin Metropolitan Police.
2. Paid magistrate, means a stipendiary magistrate or Dublin Police magistrate.
3. Department, means the central authority appointed to carry out this enactment.
4. Inspector, means an inspector of constabulary, or an inspector, or superintendent of Dublin Metropolitan Police.
5. Cattle disease inspector, means a person employed as an expert, to declare in all doubtful or disputed cases the nature of the malady under which an animal or animals are labouring; preference being given to duly qualified veterinary surgeons when they can be obtained; every person so appointed who is not a veterinary surgeon shall be subject to an examination.

I.—PLEURO-PNEUMONIA.

1. When an animal shows symptoms of this disease, the owner shall report the case at the nearest police station. Any violation of this law, or attempts to violate it, which shall be proved before a paid magistrate, shall subject the person so violating or attempting to violate it to a penalty of 6 £. for every beast.
2. The policeman in charge shall immediately report the case by telegram to the Secretary of the Department appointed to carry out this enactment.
3. The Department shall have power to make such inquiry as may be deemed fit, and if necessary to issue an order directing the inspector,—
 - (1.) To visit the case immediately.
 - (2.) To call in the nearest cattle disease inspector, if he believes it necessary.
 - (3.) If the cattle disease inspector declares the disease to be pleuro-pneumonia, the inspector shall call in a competent person to estimate the then value of the beast, and of any beasts that in the opinion of the cattle disease inspector have come within range of the infection.
 - (4.) To kill the affected animal, and all animals which have according to the report of the cattle disease inspector so come within the range of the infection, and to bury all carcasses not fit for human food, and to sell all others.
 - (5.) To destroy all litter in the shed or place in which the sick animal or animals were kept.
 - (6.) To cleanse and disinfect the said place.

The said place shall not be used again for cattle until a certificate shall have been obtained from the cattle disease inspector, stating that such place has been properly cleansed and disinfected.

4. The owner of any beast or beasts slaughtered shall receive as compensation the valuation put upon them by the person called in by the inspector; such valuation shall, however, in every case mean the lessened value of the animals which are diseased; that is, regarding them as diseased or exposed to disease, as the case may be.

II.—FOOT AND MOUTH DISEASE.

My suggestions for dealing with this disease divide themselves into two categories :

(a.) Means for getting rid of the disease now existing in the country.

(b.) For stamping out any fresh outbreak of it which may appear after it shall be got rid of.

(a.) SUGGESTIONS for getting rid of the Disease now existing in the Country.

1. An effectual way of accomplishing this would be to close all fairs and markets, and to prohibit all movements of store stock between the great May fairs and the autumn fairs.

As the country would not, and possibly could not, bear this, I would suggest to—

2. Stop all movements of store stock, except from field to field on the same farm, or from farm to farm in the occupation of the same person, as provided in 14 and 15, for a period of six weeks or two months.

3. Permit the movement of all fat animals, or animals intended for slaughter, as set forth in 11.

4. To enable graziers and others so stock their lands, animals may be offered for sale at fairs and markets under license for a short interval after the period of six weeks or two months.

5. After which, I would again prohibit all movements of store stock, as before, till the great autumn fairs.

In my first interval of six weeks or two months, the disease would go down so far that the landed gentry and tenant farmers would come and beg of you to enact the restrictions for the second period, or for as many repetitions of it as would be necessary to stamp out the disease.

10. I propose to permit the removal of fat stock, subject to the following regulations :—

The owner of any animal or animals intended for immediate transport may apply to the nearest police station for permission to remove such animal or animals. If the farm has been free from infection for ten days previous to the application, the policeman in charge of the station shall go himself or send another policeman to brand each and every such animal with a Government brand to be specially provided for the purpose, and shall give the owner a license to remove the animal or animals so branded.

11. All animals so branded shall, if left in Ireland, be slaughtered within 10 days of the date of being branded and of issuing the license; or exported to England, subject to such conditions for preventing the exportation of diseased animals to England as Parliament shall enact.

12. If it can be proved before a paid magistrate in manner hereafter provided, that any person violates or attempts to violate or evade any of these enactments, he shall be liable to a minimum fine of 5 l. per beast for every offence.

13. The movement of cattle from field to field in the same farm to be permitted.

14. The movement of cattle from farm to farm is not permitted without license, when such movement involves passing over a public road.

15. Paid magistrates and no other shall have power to impose fines or penalties under this enactment.

16. They shall do so in the manner following provided : When a policeman shall discover or believe that he has discovered any person violating or attempting to violate the law, he shall summon such person before the nearest paid magistrate, who shall have power to impose the fines and penalties set forth above.

17. The amount of the fines shall be paid to the police for their services in such proportion as the Commissioners shall think fit.

(b.) SUGGESTIONS for Stamping out any outbreak of the Disease which may be introduced after it shall have disappeared from the Country.

18. Ten days after the foot and mouth disease shall have been got rid of, I propose that every fresh outbreak of it shall be stamped out by the slaughter of all affected beasts, and of all animals which have come under the influence of the infection, as provided above for dealing with pleuro-pneumonia.

19. If the country be not prepared to bear the above scheme, I would propose to divide Ireland into a number of districts, and to deal with each and every one of those districts which is infected in the way above proposed for the whole of Ireland. The central authority may be authorised to determine the time for closing fairs and markets, and of prohibiting the movement of store stock according to the requirements of each district.

Appendix, No. 5.

ON THE LOSS FROM FOOT AND MOUTH DISEASE.

THIS disease affects the several classes of stockowners very differently.

First, dairy farmers suffer severely from it. As directed by the Committee, I shall give my own experience.

The severest attack of it which I have known occurred in 1864-65. At that time the herd at Glasnevin consisted of 31 dairy cows. The disease was brought in by two animals purchased in Smithfield Market, Dublin. It spread through 23 of them.

I may mention that for many years the milk of each cow has been measured morning and evening.

After going through the books with the utmost care, I find the total loss of milk in that season, as compared with previous seasons, was 4,024 gallons.

The value of milk in Ireland varies from 1 s. 4 d. a gallon in Dublin, to 6 d. in the remotest parts of that country.

In that year there was a depreciation of 5 l. a head produced by the disease in the 23 beasts which took it.

In the following winter the herd was attacked with "lung distemper"; the per centage of deaths in the animals which previously had foot and mouth disease, was 78, in those which had not it was 32-4. This shows that foot and mouth disease predisposes the system of animals to take other diseases. This was an unusually severe attack.

I shall now give the loss, last year, in two herds under my inspection. One of them contained 23 cows when the disease appeared on the 10th of October 1872. As usual, it spread with great rapidity, and had disappeared on the 1st of November.

The loss of milk for 21 days was 231 gallons. The disease having appeared late the loss of milk in the subsequent part of the season was not so great as if it had broken out earlier. The total falling off in the season's supply was 612 gallons. The disease told heavily on the condition of the beasts. To restore this the following extra feeding had to be used:—

	£.	s.	d.
300 bushels of brewers' grains, at 6 d. - - - -	7	10	-
Half a ton of palm nut meal - - - -	4	-	-
Quarter of a ton of linseed cake - - - -	3	10	-
Five tons of hay, at 4 l. 10 s. - - - -	22	10	-
Ten tons of turnips, at 16 s. - - - -	8	-	-
	£.	45	10 -

While the disease lasted the cows were housed; after recovery it was deemed injudicious to give them the daily run on the grass during the month of November which they would have had if the disease had not appeared. The herd was therefore housed seven weeks earlier than usual.

A further loss of about 10 l. was incurred in consequence of having to buy five fresh cows to keep up the supply of milk for customers.

The second herd contained 30 dairy cows when the disease broke out on the 17th July 1872. The animals were on the grass at the time; and as soon as a beast showed symptoms of the disease it was removed. The result of this management was that it attacked only 10 cows. It had disappeared on the 14th of August 1872.

The total loss of milk to the dairy during the prevalence of the disease was 399 gallons; the total falling off in the season's milk in consequence of the disease was 2,050 gallons.

In the old cows there was a deterioration of fully 5 l. per cow, but on the whole herd the loss of condition barely amounted to half what it was in 1864-5.

The

The herd was recently attacked with pleuro-pneumonia. The mortality in the cows which previously had foot and mouth disease in 1872, was 38·2 per cent.; among those which had not, it was only 9·4 per cent.

Appendix, No. 5.

In graziers' cattle foot and mouth disease causes a loss of flesh. When the disease attacks a lot of grass-fed beasts early in the season, while there is not much condition on them, the loss may be very trifling; but when it breaks out in beasts in a more forward state, say half fat, the loss amounts, according to my experience, to 2 *l.* per beast.

This is also the experience of several intelligent and thoughtful graziers of my acquaintance. I may be permitted to give the experience of one of those gentlemen, namely, Mr. Joseph Cuffe, who is one of the leading cattle salesmen of Dublin, and, in partnership with his brother, holds about 1,200 statute acres of grazing land. He got the disease on one of his farms among a lot of 70 beasts, purchased in November 1871. It was given a second time to the same beasts by another lot purchased in April 1872; and they got it a third time from another lot purchased in June 1872. Under ordinary circumstances the 70 beasts referred to would have gone out in June, but owing to the effects of the disease none of them went out before October. The feeding of these animals from June till October was lost, and beef was considerably lower in price in October than in June. Mr. Cuffe says, that the disease causes him a loss of upwards of 5 *l.* a head in this lot of 70 beasts.

When foot and mouth disease is prevalent at the time of purchasing store-stock, the grazer occasionally gets a chance of buying animals at a reduced rate. It occurs in this way: the rearer or owner of the store-stock takes a lot of beast to a fair; he has more at home; he knows that there is disease in the fair, or in the district through which his cattle have to travel, and to avoid the risk of bringing it home, he may be forced to sell at a sacrifice. I witnessed this last year at the great fair of Ballinacree. I have seen the same thing at other fairs and markets.

That the gain to graziers in the way pointed out is not confined to foot and mouth disease is known to all experienced men. The Irish graziers examined before the Select Committee of 1864 stated that they intentionally bought scabby sheep, because they got them at a greatly reduced price (see Questions 3745 to 3748, and Questions 3916 to 3918).

Appendix, No. 6.

PAPER handed in by Mr. Ridley.

NORTHUMBERLAND ADJOURNED SESSIONS.—1 May 1873.

Appendix, No. 6.

REPORT OF THE CATTLE DISEASE COMMITTEE.

Your Committee met at the Moot-hall, on Tuesday, the 22nd ult. They had before them the returns of the number of animals affected with Foot and Mouth disease, during the year ending on the 31st of March last, and they found that in round numbers the cattle returned, as affected, were 25,000; and the sheep, 100,000. The number given is may safely be assumed to be considerably less than the number actually suffering; but taking the above figures as correct, and estimating the loss at 1*l.* per head on cattle, and 2*s.* on sheep, which your Committee believe is very much indeed too low, a sum of 50,000*l.* is produced, entirely lost by foot and mouth disease to the county of Northumberland, excluding the Borough of Newcastle-upon-Tyne and Tynemouth, during the last year. And that is distinct from any other secondary bad effects produced by the same cause (as for example on this year's crop of lambs), which your Committee believe to be by no means inconsiderable or insignificant. Produce of the kind expended in bringing the affected animals up to a certain weight was lost with no counterpoising advantage. The loss has fallen, in the first instance, on the owners of stock, but it is possible that they may have been partially recouped by an enhanced price of beef and mutton in carcase, but no such mitigation can be pleaded for the community at large. Taking the money value as above, at 50,000*l.*, and multiplying this by 20, too low a number however, a result of 1,000,000 pounds of meat lost to the community is elicited. As to what effect this may have had upon the price of meat, your Committee are able to form no opinion, but the fact remains that 1,000,000 pounds of meat have been entirely destroyed during the past year, with no conceivable drawback whatever. It therefore becomes a serious and responsible duty, devolving not alone upon those immediately concerned, but in the opinion of your Committee upon the Government of the country, to endeavour to discover some means, and when discovered, to adopt them to prevent a repetition of this calamity, of the probability of which there are at present threatening symptoms.

Your Committee believe that it is possible to take such measures, some of them under the powers possessed by the Government, and others under other powers essential to be obtained. They believe in the first place, that the most fertile cause of the spread of foot and mouth disease in this county has been in the mode of importation of Irish cattle. In this opinion they have been confirmed by a statement made by the veterinary inspector of Newcastle Market, that of the Irish cattle shown during the last six months of 1872, nearly 7,500 in number, 6 to 7 per cent. have exhibited foot and mouth disease in different stages of development, some very recent and some of remote origin. They have been further confirmed in this view by the most valuable and important Paper of Mr. Jenkins in the last number of the Proceedings of the Royal Agricultural Society, which distinctly indicates sources of disease which cannot but in the greatest degree contribute to the continued infection of the constant stream of cattle passing from Ireland into England. These sources of infection and contagion may be briefly enumerated as the following:—The improper arrangements, subject to some notable exceptions, and construction of the lairs at the Irish ports of embarkation; the entire absence of any means of proper cleansing and disinfection of these places; the improper construction and absence of means of sufficient ventilation of the ships, as well as their imperfect disinfection, employed in the transit, and the absence of proper provision for watering and feeding the cattle while travelling. The inspector of cattle trucks employed by this county writes, that he believes that cattle exhibited in Dublin Market on a Thursday are often shown in Newcastle Market on the succeeding Tuesday, and that during the whole of that interval they are insufficiently supplied both with food and water, this of course during a time when water is more than an essential. The same indifference to sources of infection seems to be shown at the ports of destination on this side, and to the construction and state of the lairs there.

Your Committee after careful considerations think, and recommend that in view of this state of things, and of the importance at the same time of maintaining the supply of Irish cattle

cattle so essential for feeding purposes to this country, that urgent representations should be made, if existing Acts of Parliament are insufficient for the purpose, to the Government to obtain legislative powers to regulate Irish cattle traffic, that all these matters should be with the least practicable delay remedied.

There seems no reason whatever why they should not in some cases, as for example in the arrangements made by the North Western Railway Company it is in a great measure done. And it is further desirable that on this side of the Channel also the lairs and pens should be properly constructed and cleansed after each time of using, so that during the whole of the transit every opportunity of contagion may be removed.

Your Committee further recommend as most important, that at these ports of debarkation, wherever Irish cattle are found to be diseased, not these only, but all other animals in contact with them, should be placed in quarantine until they are all certified to be incapable of conveying infection or contagion.

They also believe that it is essential for the security of the purchaser on this side, that Irish cattle should travel with a pass, bearing in the first place the certificate of a veterinary inspector at the port of embarkation; secondly, by the similar office as that of landing; and, thirdly, if the animals have been in any market on this side, by that of the inspector there in each case certifying to the foregoing regulations having been obtained, and that the animals have not been in contact with other animals capable of conveying infection.

With reference to markets in this country, they are strongly of opinion that the Privy Council should be memorialised. 1. To prevent the sale of store stock or stock not for immediate slaughter in *Fair Stock Markets*. 2. To have the lairs and other places for sheep and cattle adjacent to markets inspected, and, as far as possible, disinfected. 3. To prevent cattle travelling at all by night; and, 4. Lastly, to give the county authority power to have the removal of animals generally regulated and controlled by passes.

Your Committee think it would be very advisable that directions should be given to the police to give notice, as far as practicable, to the adjacent occupiers where foot and mouth disease breaks out, with the view of then taking precautions against infection. Instances have come to their knowledge when such a course would have been the means of preventing serious loss.

Your Committee strongly impress on the quarter sessions, in view of the great national loss which took place by foot and mouth disease last year in this county, and of the strong probability that the state of things may be repeated, to take every means in their power to impress upon the Government the serious importance of taking effective measures in the direction indicated, and with this view to request the Members of Parliament for this county to use their best influence in that direction.

(signed) R. Bardon Sanderson,
Chairman.

For Adjourned Sessions,
1 May 1873.

Appendix, No. 7.

PAPERS handed in by the *Chairman*.MEMORIAL of MASTER BUTCHERS, in the City of *Glasgow*.

Appendix, No. 7.

To the Right Honourable *W. E. Forster*, Vice President, and the Lords of Her Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council.

The humble Memorial of the Undersigned Master Butchers, in the City of Glasgow,

Sheweth,

THAT your Memorialists are all engaged in the butcher trade of Glasgow, and so connected with the cattle trade of the country.

That for a considerable time past, the supply of cattle to the Glasgow Cattle Market has been exceedingly limited, owing to the existence of the restrictions imposed on the importation of foreign cattle.

That in consequence thereof, the price of cattle has risen to a greater height than it ever was before, and the price of butcher meat has also had to be raised in a corresponding degree.

That this increase in price has rendered it a matter of great difficulty to many of the working classes who form the bulk of the population of Glasgow (numbering nearly half a million) to procure butcher meat, and the lessening of the purchases by these working classes has been so great, that many of the butchers in Glasgow have had to give up business.

That in the opinion of your Memorialists the necessity for the restrictions before-mentioned no longer exists, and especially when it is considered that in many of the Continental countries there is no disease among the cattle; and the Memorialists humbly suggest to your Lordships that said restrictions should be removed, and that foreign cattle should be allowed free ingress to the Glasgow market.

And your Memorialists will ever pray, &c.

[Here follow the signatures, 124.]

The Right Honourable *W. E. Forster*, M.P.Central Chamber of Agriculture,
Salisbury Hotel, Fleet-street, London, E.C.,
17 June 1873.

Sir,

In accordance with a letter from Mr. Austen Leigh, received this morning, I have to inform you that the cases of importation of foot and mouth disease referred to in my evidence were as follows:

1. Early in July 1869, the steamer "*Suede*" brought 110 cattle to West Hartlepool, 10 were found diseased, but 100 were allowed free transit inland. This was immediately followed in the latter part of July with an outbreak of the disease in the district round West Hartlepool.
2. On 28th June 1868, a cargo of 1,200 sheep from Hamburg arrived at Newcastle-on-Tyne; two were slaughtered for foot and mouth disease; the others were grazed in pastures adjoining fields in which cows were feeding. The cows fell into the complaint, and the disease then extended into the interior.

2. Various

3. Various cargoes of animals were imported into London in February 1869, June, July, and later months in the same year; and the outbreak of foot and mouth disease in the London dairies followed in July of that year. At the same time occurred an outbreak in Buckinghamshire, due to Spanish cattle; and outbreaks in Essex were traced to the importations at Thames Haven.

The disease was excluded from the North of England by the quarantine system pursued at Newcastle-on-Tyne until, in the spring of 1869, the Privy Council obliged the discontinuance of that system.

The Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act came into force on the 9th August 1869; but it was not until 28th September 1869 that the Privy Council ordered the detention and slaughter of animals arriving in the same vessel with affected animals; and up to the end of 1871, animals out of such diseased cargo were admitted into the Metropolitan Market, whence sheep standing side by side, or in the same pens, were allowed free transit to any part of the kingdom.

In September 1869, 1,078 sheep affected with foot and mouth disease, were slaughtered at the landing places in the Port of London; but the sheep in the same cargoes were admitted into the Metropolitan Market, and thence anywhere; the order for slaughtering within 10 days not having been issued.

I am prepared to quote the authorities for these statements.

I have, &c.
(signed) *John Algonon Clarke,*
Secretary.

Mr. Alexander C. Cope to the Secretary, Veterinary Department.

Sir,

12 July 1872.

I HAVE the honour to report, in reference to the alleged exposure of diseased Dutch animals in the Metropolitan Market, that I have seen Mr. Rayment upon the subject, who says he is not aware that any diseased cattle were exposed for sale, upon either of the days named in Mr. Webb's reports.

On June the 10th, Mr. Rayment being apprised by Mr. Webb of diseased Dutch cattle being in the market, affected with foot and mouth disease, immediately made a second examination of all the Dutch cattle there, and was unable to find any symptoms of such disease in any of them. Mr. Rayment, after inquiry, also informed me that there were no Dutch cattle remaining in the market lairs from the previous market day, June 6th; and Mr. Rayment is firmly of opinion that all the Dutch cattle in the market on June the 10th (except some which had been in this country for some time) were imported either on the previous Saturday or Sunday.

Having, therefore, been examined by two inspectors within a space of 48 hours, it would be impossible for them to be passed if they had had the disease in its worst type, as remarked by Mr. Webb.

I have, &c.
(signed) *Alexander C. Cope, M.R.C.V.S.*

The Secretary,
Veterinary Department.

Appendix, No 8.

PAPER handed in by Mr. Stratton.

Appendix, No. 8. The following RESOLUTIONS were passed unanimously at the Meeting on 20 July 1872.

SOUTH WILTS CHAMBER OF AGRICULTURE.

CONTAGIOUS DISEASES amongst CATTLE.

RESOLUTIONS to be submitted to General Meeting, at Warminster, 20 July 1872:—

1. THAT this Chamber views with alarm the continued and increasing prevalence of the foot and mouth disease in this and neighbouring counties, and begs to express its opinion that more stringent measures are needed to keep the disease in check.

2. This Chamber desires to impress on the Central Chamber the very serious losses which foot and mouth disease inflicts on the dairy farmers of the west of England, into which district the disease is being constantly brought from Bristol. They calculate that the loss on each dairy cow affected averages at least £ L, and during the months of May, June, and July, the results are ruinous. The co-operation of the Central Chamber in passing for stronger measures for the prevention of infectious diseases amongst farm stock is earnestly requested by this Chamber.

3. In the opinion of this Chamber no adequate measures can be taken until all ingress of infected animals is prevented by an efficient quarantine at the ports of this country.

4. If the importation of infectious disease were prevented by an efficient system of quarantine, this Chamber would be prepared to submit to additional restrictions on the movement of stock so long as any infectious or contagious disease existed in the county; and would recommend that as long as such disease existed, the months of May and June in each year should be closed against the movements of cattle, except under a license similar to that in use during the period of the cattle plague, which system proved so successful in eradicating all infectious diseases during that period. This system to be effectual must of course be enforced in each county of Great Britain and Ireland.

The following RESOLUTIONS were submitted by Mr. Stratton to the leading members of the South Wilts Chamber of Agriculture, and thoroughly approved by them, in January 1873.

CONTAGIOUS DISEASES (ANIMALS).

MR. STRATTON recommends the following Resolutions to the consideration of "The Committee appointed by the Council of the Central Chamber to consider the working of the Contagious Diseases Act."

The Committee considers that the Act has signally failed to accomplish its objects, and that no measures adequate to deal with contagious or infectious diseases can be adopted until the fresh importation of disease is prevented by the slaughter or quarantine of all foreign animals at the ports of debarkation.

Provided the fresh importation of disease were prevented by the adoption of the system of slaughter or quarantine, this Committee would recommend the following additional regulations

tions as calculated, in their opinion, to deal efficiently with all contagious or infectious diseases, and consequently greatly to increase the production of animal food.

Appendix, No. 8

1. Your Committee are of opinion that in dealing with cattle diseases uniform action should as far as possible be enforced throughout Great Britain and Ireland.

2. That unless Ireland were subjected to the same safeguards against disease as may be adopted in this country, it would be necessary to impose restrictions on the importation of Irish stock.

3. That in cases of cattle plague or sheep-pox the Veterinary Inspectors of the Privy Council should be empowered to order the slaughter of animals in fields adjacent to those actually infected, as well as those in contact with diseased animals.

4. That the regulations hitherto existing as to the treatment of pleuro-pneumonia should be applied also to cases of foot and mouth disease, sheep-scab, and glanders.

5. That for the purposes of the Cattle Diseases Act, in order to ensure uniformity of action, all boroughs should be subject to the regulations of the county authorities.

6. That any vessel, lair, shed, truck, horse-box, or other vehicle, which has been used for the conveyance of any animal, including a horse, which may within 48 hours of its removal from such vessel, lair, truck, or other vehicle be found infected with any contagious or infectious disease, should be treated as an infected place, and no animal, including a horse, should be allowed to be placed in such vessel, lair, truck, or other vehicle, until after the lapse of six days and until the process of disinfection as ordered by the Privy Council shall have been twice performed to the satisfaction of the local authorities.

7. That in any county in which foot and mouth disease exists, the movement of animals should be prohibited during the months of May and June, except with a license such as was used during the prevalence of cattle plague; and that during those months no animal should be brought into any county without such license.

These rules not to apply to the movement of animals through any county by railway.

8. That the slaughter of infected or suspected animals being carried out for the benefit of the public at large, the owners of such slaughtered animals should be reimbursed the full value thereof at the public cost; two-thirds of such value should be paid from the Consolidated Fund, and one-third from the county rate.

Appendix, No. 9.

PAPER handed in by Captain Dent.

Appendix, No. 9.

LONDON AND NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY STEAMBOAT DEPARTMENT,
HOLBHEAD.

Sir,

Superintendent's Office, 7 May 1873.

In carrying out the last Order in Council, dated 24th March 1873, relating to ships carrying cattle, the inspectors appointed require us to whitewash all parts of the interior of the ship, including bulwarks, &c., each time we have carried cattle on a previous voyage from Ireland, several of the vital parts of the ship, such as skin and frame, which we have hitherto been most careful to keep protected by anti-corrosive paint, are thereby subjected to the injurious effect of a constant succession of deteriorating influences, which must in time corrode both plates and rivets, and affect the seaworthiness of the vessels. Under a recent Act of Parliament, it is a misdemeanour for any person charged with the care of the ships, not to make and keep the ship seaworthy. Under these circumstances, I have written to my directors and the Board of Trade, objecting to have the responsibility, when an inspector (who in carrying out his instructions fairly acknowledges that in doing so he is quite ignorant of the effects on the ship) has the power to order that to be done which I know to be injurious. It is to our interests to prevent the spread of disease; and long before the Government moved in the matter, I had strictly enforced such measures of cleansing and disinfecting as my experience showed me would be most beneficial, and which carried us safely through the cattle plague without mishaps or complaint.

If you can dispense with the application of the whitewash to such parts of the iron hull of the ships as I have named, at all events, till we have had an opportunity of being heard before the Committee now sitting, and they have expressed an opinion thereon, I can safely promise that the chances of infection shall not be increased thereby; the cleansing and disinfection of our ships shall be carried out thoroughly, and everything done that experience can suggest to meet the views of the Government.

I am, Sir,

(signed) Chas. W. Dent, Captain, R.N.,
Superintendent.Thomas H. Burke, Esq.,
The Under Secretary for Ireland,
Dublin Castle.

Appendix, No. 10.

PAPER handed in by Mr. O'Neill.

Appendix, No. 10. ABSTRACT STATEMENT of the Number of LIVE STOCK Shipped from the Port of Drogheda to Liverpool for the Three Years ending 1st January 1873.

Year Ending	Horses.	Pigs.	Store Cattle.	Fat Cattle.	Total Number of Cattle.	Sheep.	Lambs.	Total.
1 January 1871 -	964	31,888	19,209	43,698	63,856	70,082	25,574	100,256
1 January 1872 -	1,248	48,111	21,918	41,893	63,754	74,800	26,963	110,762
1 January 1873 -	1,888	35,938	28,283	41,693	67,309	62,744	20,370	90,120
TOTAL - -	3,800	115,763	60,401	126,450	186,921	208,225	110,000	510,138

SUMMARY.

TOTAL Number of Sheep and Lambs	-	-	-	-	319,138
" " Cattle	-	-	-	-	186,921
" " Pigs	-	-	-	-	113,763
" " Horses	-	-	-	-	3,800
TOTAL - - -	-	-	-	-	623,622

Appendix, No. 11.

PAPERS handed in by Mr. Thomas Verdon.

MEMORIAL of Landowners, Cattle Breeders, Graziers, Farmers, Cattle Salesmen, and Butchers. Appendix, No. 11.

To the Right Honourable W. E. Forster, Vice President, and the Lords of
Her Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council.

The humble Memorial of the undersigned Landowners, Cattle Breeders, Graziers
Farmers, Cattle Salesmen, and Butchers,
Sheweth,

THAT your Memorialists being all engaged in or connected with the Irish Cattle Trade, are deeply interested in all that concerns the well-being of that trade, and therefore in the suppression of disease in cattle.

That the cattle of Ireland, in which industry most of your Memorialists are interested, represents an amount, according to reliable information, of 50,000,000 l. sterling.

That about 410,000 cattle, and about 410,000 sheep were exported last year from Ireland to Great Britain, valued by competent persons at about 12,000,000 l.

That a certain Act, called the Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act, was passed in 1869.

That in that Act a certain disease, called the Foot and Mouth Disease, is included in the schedule of contagious and infectious diseases.

That in that Act a certain disease, called "Scab," with which sheep are sometimes affected, is also included in the schedule of contagious and infectious diseases.

That, in the judgment of your Petitioners, neither the one nor the other of these diseases should be a subject of legislation; and the legislation regarding them, and the vexatious regulations which have been imposed, have weakened and impeded the working of the Act in respect of the more serious diseases, such as rinderpest, pleuro-pneumonia, sheep-pox, and glanders.

That your Memorialists represent that the injurious effect of the "Foot and Mouth" and "Scab" Disease is only transient, and that the operation of the restrictions imposed by the Act in respect of these diseases, causes serious injury to trade, which cannot be at all compensated by any advantages which may possibly be derived from restrictions which have been perfectly futile in preventing the spread of disease.

That it is the opinion of your Memorialists that these unnecessary legislative enactments have had a most injurious effect on the cattle trade of this country.

That it is the belief of your Memorialists that the working of this Act has been the means of causing great fluctuations in the price of flesh meat, and that to its working the exceptional high prices which have been prevalent in many large towns for flesh meat is to be attributed.

That this is a grievous wrong to the inhabitants of those large towns.

That the experience of your Memorialists is, that the operation of the Act, with reference to "Foot and Mouth" disease and "Scab," has been to impose very harsh and unnecessary restrictions on the movement of fat cattle, without affording any protection to store cattle; and your Memorialists are satisfied that this is quite contrary to the intentions of Parliament in passing the Act.

Your Memorialists request, that to enable your Lordships to have full information with reference to the facts stated in this Memorial, you will take care to have the inquiry now being carried on before a Committee of the House of Commons, made as exhaustive as possible, so that your petitioners may be afforded the opportunity of proving the correctness of the statements of this Memorial.

And your Memorialists will ever pray, &c.

Signed by
5 Deputy Lieutenants.
60 Justices of the Peace.
406 Graziers and Salesmen.
264 Butchers and Cattle Dealers.
755 Signatures.

LIVERPOOL CATTLE TRADE.

The growth of the Liverpool Cattle Trade may be gathered from the following figures of the number of Cattle exposed for sale in Liverpool since 1831.

Year.	Cattle.	Sheep.
1831 - - -	45,000	210,000
1841 - - -	65,000	277,000
1851 - - -	115,000	347,000
1861 - - -	140,000	422,000
1871 - - -	103,000	453,000

17 May 1873.

John Leonard, Chairman,
Liverpool Cattle Market Company.

ACTUAL Numbers of CATTLE and SHEEP landed in Liverpool, Seaborne,
and Estimated Number by Railway.

1860 - -	216,000	Cattle, Seaborne. " Railway.	1871 - -	234,244	Cattle, Seaborne. " Railway.
	20,000			20,000	
	236,000	254,244			
	600,618	Sheep, Seaborne. " Railway.		310,000	Sheep, Seaborne. " Railway.
	140,000			110,000	
	736,618			420,608	
1870 - -	390,613	Cattle, Seaborne. " Railway.	1872 - -	204,000	Cattle, Seaborne. " Railway.
	13,000			20,000	
	241,613	214,000			
	410,001	Sheep, Seaborne. " Railway.		333,208	Sheep, Seaborne. " Railway.
	120,000			60,000	
	200,001			382,208	

17 May 1872.

John Leonard, Chairman,
Liverpool Cattle Market Company.

NUMBER of CATTLE, SHEEP, and LAMBS Slaughtered and Consumed within
Nine Miles of Liverpool Exchange, in the Year 1872.

	Cattle.	Sheep.
Liverpool - - - - -	71,800	262,042
Bootle - - - - -	10,894	47,634
Warrles and Crosby - - -	1,000	4,000
Wavertree - - - - -	1,000	4,000
Other out townships - - -	2,000	8,000
Birkenhead. No Return - -		
Estimate - - - - -	5,000	20,000
	91,494	345,676

John Leonard, Chairman,
Liverpool Cattle Market Company.

THE Number of CATTLE and SHEEP Exhibited for Sale at Stanley Market, Liverpool, each Week during the Years 1869, 1870, 1871, 1872, 1873, to March each Year; 53 Weeks.

Date.	Beasts.	Sheep.	Date.	Beasts.	Sheep.
1869:					
1 March - - -	2,118	9,197	7 March - - -	2,203	8,120
8 " - - -	2,389	9,751	14 " - - -	2,473	6,023
15 " - - -	2,197	8,758	21 " - - -	1,991	4,487
22 " - - -	2,077	5,788	28 " - - -	2,216	5,067
29 " - - -	2,415	5,086			
5 April - - -	2,146	5,378	4 April - - -	2,380	4,600
12 " - - -	1,812	5,568	11 " - - -	2,413	7,064
19 " - - -	2,127	7,792	18 " - - -	1,528	7,790
26 " - - -	1,747	6,491	25 " - - -	1,880	6,008
3 May - - -	1,973	7,611	2 May - - -	1,981	5,968
10 " - - -	2,978	7,708	9 " - - -	2,030	8,375
17 " - - -	1,907	12,184	16 " - - -	1,779	7,704
24 " - - -	1,749	12,088	23 " - - -	1,587	7,008
31 " - - -	2,085	10,633	30 " - - -	1,418	10,078
7 June - - -	2,355	14,938	6 June - - -	1,907	9,028
14 " - - -	1,816	13,506	13 " - - -	1,409	12,648
21 " - - -	2,010	13,015	20 " - - -	1,868	9,038
28 " - - -	2,022	16,520	27 " - - -	1,421	12,699
5 July - - -	1,670	14,242	4 July - - -	1,209	11,361
12 " - - -	1,059	14,538	11 " - - -	2,141	13,710
19 " - - -	2,180	17,148	18 " - - -	1,868	12,400
26 " - - -	1,418	17,672	25 " - - -	1,814	11,778
2 August - - -	1,999	16,216	1 August - - -	1,868	13,317
9 " - - -	2,360	21,048	8 " - - -	2,287	13,444
16 " - - -	2,254	16,480	15 " - - -	2,460	12,349
23 " - - -	2,480	10,596	22 " - - -	2,277	12,498
30 " - - -	2,280	17,862	29 " - - -	2,708	17,002
6 September - - -	2,217	18,566	5 September - - -	2,745	15,453
13 " - - -	2,108	16,671	12 " - - -	2,014	13,846
20 " - - -	2,901	16,543	19 " - - -	2,160	11,333
27 " - - -	2,618	16,348	26 " - - -	2,972	12,749
4 October - - -	2,018	14,064	3 October - - -	2,430	12,443
11 " - - -	2,512	10,178	10 " - - -	2,733	10,612
18 " - - -	2,159	18,953	17 " - - -	2,155	10,306
25 " - - -	2,337	14,912	24 " - - -	2,408	10,323
1 November - - -	2,047	13,489	31 " - - -	2,030	8,769
8 " - - -	2,122	11,461	7 November - - -	2,230	10,185
15 " - - -	2,283	9,218	14 " - - -	2,221	9,482
22 " - - -	2,110	8,904	21 " - - -	2,237	9,028
29 " - - -	2,226	6,796	28 " - - -	2,168	8,286
6 December - - -	2,474	11,541	5 December - - -	2,210	8,160
13 " - - -	2,360	11,222	12 " - - -	2,268	12,126
20 " - - -	2,683	9,005	19 " - - -	2,026	9,168
27 " - - -	1,618	6,262	26 " - - -	1,494	8,290
1870:					
3 January - - -	2,019	8,803	1871:		
10 " - - -	2,268	8,807	2 January - - -	2,503	8,198
17 " - - -	2,369	9,751	9 " - - -	2,015	7,679
24 " - - -	2,330	8,366	16 " - - -	2,235	7,762
31 " - - -	2,601	7,801	23 " - - -	2,268	8,075
7 February - - -	2,307	7,408	30 " - - -	2,464	7,983
14 " - - -	2,227	6,982	6 February - - -	2,184	8,620
21 " - - -	2,505	5,737	13 " - - -	2,108	5,200
28 " - - -	2,438	7,671	20 " - - -	2,013	5,045
			27 " - - -	2,198	5,086
			5 March - - -	1,968	5,120
			12 " - - -	2,216	5,511
	128,008	606,064		126,827	593,645

NUMBER of Cattle and Sheep Exhibited for Sale at Stanley Market, Liverpool, &c.—continued.

Date.	Beasts.	Sheep.	Date.	Beasts.	Sheep.
1871:			1872:		
20 March - - -	2,016	5,110	1 April - - -	1,750	5,512
27 " - - -	1,958	5,082	8 " - - -	1,663	5,079
3 April - - -	2,005	5,067	15 " - - -	1,639	4,560
10 " - - -	1,835	3,740	22 " - - -	1,551	4,511
17 " - - -	2,668	4,222	29 " - - -	1,515	4,011
24 " - - -	1,807	5,259	6 May - - -	1,483	5,178
1 May - - -	1,838	5,960	13 " - - -	1,465	4,696
8 " - - -	1,808	7,484	20 " - - -	1,338	5,632
15 " - - -	1,629	5,501	27 " - - -	919	5,417
22 " - - -	1,444	10,145	3 June - - -	1,070	5,024
29 " - - -	1,921	9,063	10 " - - -	1,191	5,718
6 June - - -	1,554	10,326	17 " - - -	1,218	5,585
13 " - - -	1,546	9,327	24 " - - -	1,198	5,590
19 " - - -	1,826	10,322	1 July - - -	1,214	5,161
26 " - - -	1,721	8,300	8 " - - -	1,507	5,050
3 July - - -	1,013	11,464	15 " - - -	1,520	5,350
10 " - - -	1,763	12,026	22 " - - -	1,632	5,056
17 " - - -	2,074	12,157	29 " - - -	1,783	5,367
24 " - - -	1,889	15,035	5 August - - -	1,461	7,500
31 " - - -	2,841	15,832	12 " - - -	1,696	10,705
7 August - - -	2,127	15,647	19 " - - -	1,810	12,229
14 " - - -	2,080	15,130	26 " - - -	1,578	5,558
21 " - - -	1,686	15,315	2 September - - -	2,110	16,144
28 " - - -	893	14,501	9 " - - -	2,542	9,029
4 September - - -	1,316	17,180	16 " - - -	2,691	5,091
11 " - - -	1,509	11,289	23 " - - -	2,543	5,517
18 " - - -	1,490	11,058	30 " - - -	2,408	10,121
25 " - - -	1,075	11,538	7 October - - -	2,701	8,070
2 October - - -	2,054	11,270	14 " - - -	2,809	7,970
9 " - - -	2,691	10,245	21 " - - -	2,643	7,086
16 " - - -	2,085	10,743	28 " - - -	2,031	7,291
23 " - - -	2,332	8,025	4 November - - -	2,623	7,580
31 " - - -	2,417	6,912	11 " - - -	2,097	5,561
6 November - - -	2,067	9,349	18 " - - -	2,020	7,027
13 " - - -	2,868	8,401	25 " - - -	2,715	5,213
20 " - - -	2,837	8,415	2 December - - -	2,815	6,327
27 " - - -	2,921	5,509	9 " - - -	2,367	6,070
4 December - - -	2,531	5,595	16 " - - -	2,307	6,505
11 " - - -	2,818	6,388	23 " - - -	1,760	5,528
18 " - - -	2,554	8,099	30 " - - -	1,715	4,541
25 " - - -	784	1,673			
1872:			1873:		
1 January - - -	2,027	4,510	5 January - - -	1,872	6,669
8 " - - -	1,572	5,283	12 " - - -	2,502	8,177
15 " - - -	2,010	8,573	19 " - - -	1,913	5,689
22 " - - -	1,785	5,554	26 " - - -	1,788	4,790
29 " - - -	1,820	5,102	2 February - - -	1,805	6,324
5 February - - -	1,814	5,540	10 " - - -	1,605	4,970
12 " - - -	1,578	5,325	17 " - - -	9,142	4,408
19 " - - -	1,800	5,340	24 " - - -	1,650	5,070
26 " - - -	1,792	4,601	3 March - - -	1,557	4,500
4 March - - -	1,706	4,478	10 " - - -	1,501	5,128
11 " - - -	1,591	5,322	17 " - - -	1,755	4,110
18 " - - -	1,395	4,395	24 " - - -	1,743	3,416
25 " - - -	1,734	4,009	31 " - - -	1,612	4,710
	106,350	453,564		99,718	550,937

John Leonard, Chairman,
Liverpool Cattle Market Company.

STATEMENT of Amounts paid for Construction of SHEDS, &c., and for RENTS in connection with the "Cattle Diseases (Animals) Act" to date.

VAUXHALL ROAD:				£.	s.	d.	
Sundries	-	-	-	130	17	8	
COLLINGWOOD DOCK:							
				£.	s.	d.	
Mersey Board	-	-	-	200	-	-	
Brickwork	-	-	-	18	3	7	
					278	3	7
SANDHILLS:							
Holms & Nicol	-	-	-	448	10	10	
Hall & Sons	-	-	-	240	-	-	
Sundries	-	-	-	168	0	6	
				848	0	4	
Rents	-	-	-	308	8	1	
					1,147	13	6
				£.	1,451	13	8

Liverpool, 19 May 1873.

Archibald Tweedie, Treasurer.

IMPORTS OF CATTLE, SHEEP, AND LAMBS FOR THE YEAR 1878

	January		February		March		April		May		June		July		August		September		October		November		December	
	Cattle	Sheep	Cattle	Sheep	Cattle	Sheep	Cattle	Sheep	Cattle	Sheep	Cattle	Sheep	Cattle	Sheep	Cattle	Sheep	Cattle	Sheep	Cattle	Sheep	Cattle	Sheep	Cattle	Sheep
India	1,000	1,111	1,000	1,001	1,000	1,001	1,000	1,001	1,000	1,001	1,000	1,001	1,000	1,001	1,000	1,001	1,000	1,001	1,000	1,001	1,000	1,001	1,000	1,001
England	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000
Scotland	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000
Wales	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000
France	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000
Germany	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000
Italy	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000
Spain	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000
Portugal	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000
Other Ports	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000
Total	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000

SUMMARY.

	TOTAL from INDIA		TOTAL from ENGLAND		TOTAL from SCOTLAND		TOTAL from WALES		TOTAL from FRANCE		TOTAL from GERMANY		TOTAL from ITALY		TOTAL from SPAIN		TOTAL from PORTUGAL		TOTAL from FOREIGN	
	Cattle	Sheep	Cattle	Sheep	Cattle	Sheep	Cattle	Sheep	Cattle	Sheep	Cattle	Sheep	Cattle	Sheep	Cattle	Sheep	Cattle	Sheep	Cattle	Sheep
1878	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000

Total Number of Cattle, Sheep, and Lambs Imported into Liverpool from the 1st January 1878 to the 31st December 1878

From India 1,000
From England 1,000
From Scotland 1,000
From Wales 1,000
From France 1,000
From Germany 1,000
From Italy 1,000
From Spain 1,000
From Portugal 1,000
From Other Ports 1,000
From Foreign 1,000

Appendix, No. 12.

PAPERS handed in by Professor Forgyuen.

SUMMARY of the PAPERS treated in the IRISH VETERINARY DEPARTMENT in the Year 1872.

RECEIVED.	SENT OUT.	
1. Constabulary reports relative to the outbreaks of disease - - - - -	1. Instructions to constabulary to restrict farms, &c. - - - - -	18,072
2. Weekly returns - - - - -	2. Weekly reports returned to constabulary for correction - - - - -	2,209
3. Declarations - - - - -	3. Declarations returned for correction - - - - -	242
4. Applications for, and reports of, the removal of restrictions - - - - -	4. Instructions to constabulary to remove restrictions - - - - -	2,583
5. Requisitions for stationery from constabulary stations in the provinces - - - - -	5. Stationery, parcels of, and forms sent to constabulary - - - - -	1,743
6. Licences - - - - -	6. Licences sent to constabulary for correction - - - - -	20
7. Magistrates' notices - - - - -	7. Magistrates' notices for correction - - - - -	25
8. General letters and Government documents to be reported on and registered - - - - -	8. General letters and Government documents replied to and reported on - - - - -	607
Constabulary reports on the outbreaks of disease, with instructions thereon returned - - - - -		18,072
Weekly reports returned to constabulary for correction - - - - -		2,209
Declarations returned to constabulary for correction - - - - -		242
Returned reports relative to the removal of restrictions - - - - -		2,583
Requisitions from constabulary registered and returned - - - - -		1,743
Licences returned to constabulary for explanation, and received after correction - - - - -		20
Magistrates' notices returned for explanation or correction - - - - -		25
Total Received - - - - -	Total Sent Out - - - - -	23,457
55,785		

Samuel Cowen,
Office Serjeant, Veterinary Department,
and Acting Serjeant, Dublin Metropolitan Police.

VETERINARY DEPARTMENT OF THE PRIVY COUNCIL OFFICE, DUBLIN CASTLE.

GENERAL ABSTRACT, showing the Extent to which the FOOT and MOUTH DISEASES prevailed the Year ended

PROVINCES AND COUNTIES.		Number of Police Districts in each County.	Number of Police Districts in which Infected Farms, &c., were abstracted.	Number of Farms, &c., in each County.	Number of Infected Farms, &c., in each County.	Percentage of Infected Farms, &c., as compared with the Total Number of Farms in each County.	Number of Cattle, Sheep, and Swine in each County.		
							Cattle.	Sheep.	Swine.
ULSTER.									
1	Antrim	41	96	25,525	99	38	160,380	84,295	51,512
2	Armagh	24	21	21,665	200	97	51,227	14,378	24,031
3	Cavan	27	25	21,447	218	2-20	132,411	25,830	43,152
4	Donegal	69	19	25,182	14	17	201,641	202,320	22,287
5	Down	44	49	25,010	286	94	161,666	71,966	21,542
6	Fermanagh	23	14	14,517	55	37	106,724	16,710	59,085
7	Londonderry	21	12	12,513	75	55	112,845	47,444	32,441
8	Monaghan	24	21	28,548	140	98	81,180	17,044	25,075
9	Tyrone	25	27	31,421	120	40	19,382	55,839	45,137
Total		336	225	221,840	1,703	97	1,153,795	420,822	229,727
LEINSTER.									
1	Carlow	19	19	8,434	200	4-90	45,936	62,938	26,494
2	Dublin	19	69	6,722	716	11-7	81,487	74,411	27,418
3	Dublin Metropolitan Police District	18	15	(B.)	110	0-20	(A.)	-	-
4	Kildare	29	27	18,120	192	0-92	82,297	145,690	17,240
5	Kilkenny	27	24	15,428	623	4-01	112,277	160,261	25,285
6	King's	64	48	11,641	225	7-4	43,424	121,766	25,285
7	Longford	26	26	9,282	478	5-18	60,520	22,282	19,024
8	Louth	29	25	6,994	407	5-80	35,588	54,529	16,927
9	Meath	15	14	18,121	1,401	10-24	161,201	220,897	25,466
10	Queen's	33	22	12,292	683	5-51	73,404	100,083	20,347
11	Westmeath	24	29	11,712	477	4-06	88,078	151,266	26,244
12	Wexford	41	27	26,522	216	1-23	105,251	126,820	77,179
13	Wicklow	25	24	3,363	646	6-07	74,410	100,227	26,175
Total		421	421	125,071	5,651	6-07	920,764	1,415,228	268,215
MUNSTER.									
1	Clare	54	49	16,069	345	1-9	148,492	161,161	62,027
2	Cork	147	61	26,529	365	95	245,742	252,624	271,228
3	Kerry	40	16	19,417	201	1-01	222,910	111,059	22,215
4	Limerick	22	70	17,987	400	2-22	201,270	68,563	40,219
5	Tipperary	135	125	26,463	1,460	5-73	228,760	242,341	57,285
6	Waterford	26	29	9,642	169	1-77	87,260	60,737	26,265
Total		426	222	126,121	5,811	2-22	1,224,726	662,666	408,265
CONNAUGHT.									
1	Galway	20	29	21,592	710	1-92	169,227	653,229	61,224
2	Limerick	20	23	14,920	256	1-67	105,925	87,722	67,722
3	Mayo	20	22	26,074	115	1-5	179,000	240,228	25,228
4	Roscommon	23	49	21,273	772	3-62	167,161	127,667	22,229
5	Sligo	26	24	14,227	85	1-22	168,146	64,427	28,229
Total		265	221	128,666	1,973	1-64	622,223	1,307,729	181,228
GENERAL TOTAL		1,668	1,279	606,864	14,527	2-20	4,927,223	4,222,117	1,281,228

(A.) Not known, as the Cattle, Sheep, and Swine within the Dublin Metropolitan Police District are not given separately in the Agent's percentage can be made as to the Number of Cattle, &c., which become affected out of the Total Number of Cattle, &c., in the District.

(B.) Duplication same as at (A.). The Number of Farms, &c., not given separately.

VETERINARY DEPARTMENT OF THE PRIVY COUNCIL OFFICE, DUBLIN CASTLE.

in each County in Ireland, and other Particulars, as set forth in the undermentioned Headings, during 31st December 1872.

Number of Cattle, Sheep, and Swine on Infected Farms, &c., in each County.			Number of Cattle, Sheep, and Swine which became Affected in each County.			Number of Cattle, Sheep, and Swine which Died from the Disease in each County (C).			Percentage of Cattle, &c., Affected, as compared with the Total Number of Cattle, &c., in each County.			Percentage of Cattle, &c., Affected, as compared with the Total Number of Cattle, &c., on Infected Farms, &c., in each County.			Percentage of Cattle, &c., which Died, as compared with the Number of Cattle, &c., Affected.		
Cattle.	Sheep.	Swine.	Cattle.	Sheep.	Swine.	Cattle.	Sheep.	Swine.	Cattle.	Sheep.	Swine.	Cattle.	Sheep.	Swine.	Cattle.	Sheep.	Swine.
1,392	457	204	425	265	8	2	-	-	25	25	41	50.50	50.72	20.2	42	-	-
1,674	614	378	584	336	22	6	-	-	3	21.1	13	45.92	57.96	6.45	25	-	-
2,466	1,334	1,165	2,262	207	251	19	-	50	1.6	8	42	24.11	17.42	10.76	59	-	10.52
511	615	51	379	34	11	-	-	-	2	60	43	42.05	40.1	21.50	-	-	-
2,662	2,241	475	1,404	327	20	16	4	5	54	8	61	11.71	10.801	4.38	124	1.15	23
669	49	121	305	2	35	1	4	5	16	33	14	12.93	29.43	12.67	95	2.81	31.42
1,265	825	121	410	153	11	3	1	1	30	50	11	24.61	9.66	39.68	-	-	-
1,625	865	242	524	180	67	6	2	1	56	16	14	34.66	14.885	19.02	196	2	2.7
1,732	1,092	549	885	160	23	11	35	13	54	26	90	27.94	15.96	15	1.1	20.75	45.31
47,264	2,479	3,869	2,165	1,359	126	41	46	42	64	1	13	42.9	21.6	11.9	65	2.002	22.44
6,390	2,293	1,449	2,147	465	433	31	-	35	6.59	75	149	26.27	9.78	20.34	54	-	6.93
16,210	15,165	1,344	5,165	3,521	215	55	12	26	15.87	7.15	93	50.34	25.42	10.27	64	24	7.84
1,736	577	319	686	44	7	19	-	-	(3.1)	-	-	27.7	21.29	2.79	147	-	-
25,515	21,814	2,681	11,225	6,634	491	37	51	30	1.1	46.5	2.66	41.866	20.98	22.72	43	1.07	5.6
11,790	5,377	6,745	5,145	3,811	189	12	4	11	2.51	13.15	1.05	30.79	9.55	22.83	28	73	2.15
15,122	23,262	2,319	5,221	2,848	222	35	3	15	9.68	13.5	1.06	11.14	8.75	12.12	2	14	5.73
7,157	3,477	1,899	2,005	344	399	3	-	12	115	107	125	30.25	20.99	31.02	1	-	4.61
10,429	11,521	1,221	4,294	3,867	299	29	51	24	12.99	2.69	1.00	39.487	25.57	10.19	47	2.63	15
15,169	47,409	2,666	16,964	11,656	228	39	145	2	10.60	2.27	1.6	19.06	24.42	12.12	33	124	7.7
14,279	14,153	2,115	4,988	5,515	418	21	1	5	6.01	1.35	1.38	42.86	9.27	10.76	28	97	2.15
23,365	26,155	2,166	11,625	7,312	337	39	6	-	12.92	9.15	1.56	16.61	21.63	14.63	22	95	-
2,958	3,653	1,769	1,605	46	678	14	-	60	1.51	4.4	48	30.607	1.15	27.61	47	-	5.51
19,742	6,462	1,910	4,751	1,742	576	30	25	60	7.97	4.5	2.27	10.425	19.22	21.204	124	1.28	14.96
67,203	291,808	21,153	21,159	60,352	4,992	421	325	319	9.7	2.53	1.23	29.15	10.42	29.23	46	56	6.23
7,719	4,448	1,821	5,294	29	201	7	-	-	9.19	61	27	46.57	1.77	19.58	15	-	-
9,318	6,952	2,129	6,018	777	599	22	-	29	1.73	22	51	69.23	18.97	19.91	59	-	3.63
4,759	861	3,201	9,862	4.7	266	5	-	5	91	84	18	47.47	5.502	22.65	24	-	2.91
14,412	5,366	2,045	7,264	108	189	15	1	1	3.07	15	51	38.63	5.91	9.24	8	19	6.82
25,365	53,495	7,043	16,658	2,619	4,479	60	3	30	7.1	1.901	1.51	16.14	7.85	20.92	42	67	4.48
4,716	1,161	1,990	1,896	72	402	2	-	17	9.97	14	51	47.73	9.291	29.598	140	-	2.82
7,742	21,784	15,894	27,385	3,263	2,244	129	2	124	2.97	37	61	19.18	7.51	20.65	92	96	5.79
11,771	22,696	617	6,176	6,923	545	30	3	-	2.22	94	29	37.68	19.11	35.5	39	64	-
2,778	602	497	1,365	35	84	4	-	-	9.59	11	46	37.4	1.15	23.69	29	-	-
2,112	4,842	88	6.01	239	37	-	-	-	1.6	94	93	27.04	3.96	19.81	-	-	-
19,680	29,840	1,579	5,231	3,256	146	60	8	24	4.68	1.31	41	47.51	13.64	11.00	114	34	31.33
1,684	1,385	99	449	84	13	14	-	-	43	59	66	31.42	5.07	16.75	5.11	-	-
20,159	26,629	8,482	14,463	8,887	418	96	11	31	2.21	65	94	46.55	14.77	10.33	67	42	7.47
22,138	221,571	46,370	159,572	54,379	8,884	713	421	517	9.75	1.93	64	47.24	10.5	19.8	45	75	5.75

High Fergues.

and Statistics for the Year 1872, they being included in the Total Number of Cattle, Sheep, and Swine in the County Dublin, consequently Duane.

(C.) Animals Slaughtered on account of the Disease are included amongst those which Died.

ABSTRACT. *Describe the Numbers of Outbreaks of Contagious or Infectious Animal Diseases reported*

Y E A B 1 0 2 1

[illegible]

CITY OF NEW YORK AND COUNTY OF NEW YORK

Number of Referrals Reported during the Year 1995							Number of Referrals Reported during the Year 1996			
First and Middle	Plasma Parameters	Clay Analysis	Stress	First and Middle	Plasma Parameters	Clay Analysis	Total			
10	1	1	1	10	1,000	100	1,111			

See each County as listed in each Month during the Four Years ended the 31st December 1872—continued

Y. H. A. B. 1472

[illegible]

ATTACHMENT OF THE PROPOSAL

Number of Fisheries Reported During the Year 1961				Number of Outbreaks Reported During the Year 1961			
Percent Breaks	Percent Outbreaks	Range (No.)	Total	Percent Breaks	Percent Outbreaks	Range (No.)	Total
70.07	68.8	- - -	8,614	64.07	63.1	70	12,000

TABLE showing the SANITARY STATE of the CATTLE, SHEEP and SWINE

PROVINCES AND COUNTIES	Number of Animals attacked with Foot and Mouth Disease, Plague-Pneumonia, and Sheep Scab in the undermentioned Years.																
	1869.				1870.				1871.				1872.				
	Foot and Mouth.			Plague-Pneumonia.	Foot and Mouth.			Plague-Pneumonia.	Foot and Mouth.			Plague-Pneumonia.	Foot and Mouth.			Plague-Pneumonia.	Sheep Scab.
	Cattle.	Sheep.	Swine.		Cattle.	Sheep.	Swine.		Cattle.	Sheep.	Swine.		Cattle.	Sheep.	Swine.		
ULSTER:																	
Antrim	16	-	-	-	25	-	-	4	968	154	21	63	425	261	6	40	-
Armagh	14	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1,267	4	18	3	601	256	12	-	-
Cavan	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1,273	3	302	4	2,385	267	321	2	47
Down	24	9	11	-	5	-	-	-	1,647	67	199	13	1,194	237	30	31	117
Donegal	-	-	-	-	3	-	-	-	965	2	27	6	370	34	11	-	-
Fermanagh	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	709	12	57	1	306	2	25	-	-
Londonderry	-	-	-	-	10	-	-	-	667	-	37	1	440	153	16	10	-
Monaghan	-	-	-	-	9	-	-	-	1,174	106	221	3	854	166	40	1	-
Tyrone	1	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	1,010	8	84	-	908	149	19	4	-
Total	65	20	21	-	55	-	-	6	10,374	633	647	93	7,562	1,639	458	106	224
MUNSTER:																	
Clare	-	-	-	-	119	-	-	6	9,412	19	146	3	3,420	79	560	16	16
Cork	372	6	16	-	2,379	19	154	6	9,151	104	1,275	4	5,433	785	893	63	426
Kerry	-	-	-	-	5,068	-	-	-	717	-	65	-	2,028	68	236	10	-
Limerick	-	-	-	-	265	66	6,064	110	371	98	7,194	160	2,194	160	179	17	-
Tipperary	-	-	-	-	3,388	-	163	70	11,045	848	2,000	19	10,287	2,624	1,473	207	348
Wexford	54	-	80	-	95	-	13	30	23,040	226	5,772	63	1,890	72	483	130	19
Total	436	6	97	-	10,081	10	628	240	51,241	1,413	9,850	216	37,286	2,760	3,941	617	909
LEINSTER:																	
Cork	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1,037	204	756	4	3,147	465	450	5	2
Dublin	-	-	-	-	1,080	1	4	30	1,375	906	199	63	6,169	5,324	280	51	57
Dublin Metropolitan Police District.	-	-	-	-	476	5	3	55	463	-	23	112	428	44	7	64	-
Kildare	-	-	-	-	1,901	150	25	83	15,287	699	943	33	12,325	6,654	420	45	2
Kilkenny	-	-	-	-	12	-	-	128	13,295	140	2,583	334	5,445	514	946	361	11
King's	-	-	-	-	61	-	-	32	7,680	1,684	745	21	5,335	3,048	262	30	168
Longford	-	-	-	-	8	-	-	10	5,100	623	630	3	2,815	244	249	3	-
Louth	-	-	-	-	69	-	-	-	4,109	684	274	1	4,533	9,067	800	1	-
Meath	-	-	-	-	4,314	140	19	32	22,070	3,490	816	26	20,364	12,625	228	6	42
Queen's	-	-	-	-	7	-	-	17	6,379	657	680	24	4,568	1,243	434	90	53
Westmeath	-	-	-	-	18	-	-	-	21,738	6,710	1,810	32	11,427	7,323	237	29	30
Wexford	-	-	-	-	37	-	-	40	2,033	42	911	17	1,806	40	430	22	168
Wicklow	-	-	-	-	45	-	-	58	7,688	724	1,101	2	6,934	1,623	266	11	-
Total	-	-	-	-	7,695	208	45	475	128,672	17,442	11,102	716	95,189	48,352	4,602	683	683
CONNAUGHT:																	
Galway	-	-	-	-	265	10	-	-	1,039	896	274	25	6,770	6,023	145	25	-
Leitrim	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2,250	-	134	1	1,295	50	94	2	68
Mayo	-	-	-	-	9	-	-	23	5,698	82	87	-	646	269	17	-	-
Sligo	-	-	-	-	8	-	1	0	1,656	602	625	4	1,831	2,988	194	-	3
Sligo	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1,804	443	265	1	449	62	13	-	2
Total	-	-	-	-	262	10	1	23	20,553	1,603	1,207	31	14,601	5,697	415	27	68
GENERAL TOTAL.	501	22	98	-	18,311	309	677	756	290,279	31,376	23,024	1,066	152,373	54,379	6,994	1,461	1,290

Note.—Percentage of animals attacked, as compared with the total number of animals in Ireland for the year 1872, is equal to 2.35.

Percentage of cattle attacked with Plague-Pneumonia, as compared with the total number of cattle in Ireland for the year 1872, is equal to .05.

Percentage of animals attacked with Foot and Mouth Disease, as compared with the total number of animals in Ireland for the year 1872, is equal to 2.25.

in each County in Ireland in the Years 1869, 1870, 1871 and 1872.

Number of Cattle, Sheep and Swine in each County in Ireland in the Undermentioned Years.

1869.			1870.			1871.			1872.		
Cattle.	Sheep.	Swine.	Cattle.	Sheep.	Swine.	Cattle.	Sheep.	Swine.	Cattle.	Sheep.	Swine.
120,776	85,409	63,541	145,774	91,591	67,000	158,089	97,596	78,927	168,581	94,385	54,325
75,500	55,187	15,000	75,232	52,881	36,075	75,507	55,482	31,207	81,222	54,775	34,525
113,479	50,846	50,618	113,021	27,345	45,720	122,454	25,535	49,511	102,484	35,630	47,127
100,325	226,510	24,527	107,031	81,811	54,711	136,448	60,008	69,870	141,553	71,555	51,886
151,257	67,918	50,181	175,029	225,129	34,329	185,019	215,555	45,895	199,544	299,939	52,287
50,930	12,127	10,952	100,835	15,096	24,801	109,834	17,668	34,305	108,774	18,740	22,055
300,445	45,446	20,465	105,475	64,643	84,849	114,500	45,174	45,744	112,555	45,445	22,451
75,857	18,259	14,189	73,613	15,894	25,215	79,056	15,902	35,134	86,580	17,944	29,085
267,618	67,382	28,528	163,019	38,771	46,384	178,969	61,561	96,078	200,502	65,592	42,257
1,057,761	877,754	225,228	1,279,406	540,848	348,379	1,186,566	845,485	420,145	1,166,785	558,929	539,737
101,960	162,370	46,387	107,559	174,733	52,287	109,596	167,947	60,579	105,692	161,163	45,867
271,552	289,559	124,515	334,557	566,051	191,520	345,556	545,525	195,595	556,142	393,624	171,646
300,725	743,187	11,423	311,943	159,759	67,892	325,956	195,540	75,448	323,910	135,030	62,521
151,072	84,737	18,868	163,625	60,219	75,677	157,751	69,510	77,852	151,275	69,063	64,580
276,868	594,101	81,321	315,264	277,563	105,710	318,158	245,580	166,794	326,541	183,641	97,526
86,667	66,357	47,434	85,163	55,371	88,302	86,448	54,547	66,585	87,292	58,789	56,995
1,205,132	1,594,261	416,778	1,335,283	1,964,168	548,297	1,256,795	1,915,145	569,177	1,256,785	988,856	539,336
46,451	55,385	22,240	45,363	67,045	36,062	44,529	63,286	22,574	45,668	62,890	36,094
47,362	59,507	18,596	46,768	68,587	33,547	45,760	59,419	26,515	51,447	74,411	37,415
81,425	168,306	14,920	81,569	143,049	16,796	81,468	138,710	18,486	86,857	112,559	17,040
101,517	181,964	40,899	106,953	111,021	52,335	116,234	169,889	61,827	112,377	169,284	66,595
61,320	107,562	21,871	63,966	140,963	59,545	63,021	125,552	25,595	65,664	131,780	34,540
54,712	55,790	14,813	55,500	25,525	23,779	56,961	55,559	31,411	60,530	32,180	19,814
58,107	54,355	11,756	60,123	44,254	15,878	54,490	47,858	16,758	55,964	53,656	18,617
135,255	225,078	14,654	150,995	899,066	19,156	150,549	286,465	22,466	161,504	200,907	15,246
95,464	117,064	20,053	75,215	85,125	35,106	75,039	95,817	34,545	75,594	100,063	28,147
46,547	261,056	15,185	66,058	163,472	25,740	25,592	145,791	23,226	46,632	160,806	59,045
115,545	165,264	26,772	115,031	145,054	68,476	116,668	138,340	81,472	100,765	156,662	77,179
77,087	214,771	23,158	76,641	169,697	28,507	75,195	129,618	36,268	74,439	190,237	36,173
949,893	1,545,151	268,067	941,965	1,491,086	528,109	847,617	1,552,567	384,600	929,784	1,415,392	348,470
186,619	695,657	46,629	164,759	675,728	68,134	156,524	681,073	75,254	182,357	685,939	61,664
90,010	50,828	15,489	95,454	21,600	20,900	101,466	90,855	30,985	104,593	51,925	20,703
149,187	355,461	42,919	166,998	346,214	61,587	172,010	316,612	65,925	173,896	340,163	61,569
70,929	196,097	94,605	96,590	127,483	55,811	103,876	192,335	36,556	167,185	197,847	34,879
84,631	66,568	14,979	85,618	65,475	21,782	92,487	65,476	27,257	102,149	64,647	39,439
587,299	1,336,892	247,734	583,412	1,394,644	218,454	652,553	1,501,551	238,682	653,618	1,397,790	231,875
4,702,794	4,848,156	1,000,793	3,995,569	4,333,964	1,459,332	3,993,102	4,225,702	1,656,794	4,955,153	4,262,117	1,365,866

Rep. Inquiry.

TABLE showing the Number of CATTLE, SHEEP, and SWINE in Ireland, in the Years 1869, 1870, 1871, and 1872.

YEARS.	Cattle.	Sheep.	Swine.	YEARS.	Cattle.	Sheep.	Swine.
1869 - -	5,727,794	4,848,158	1,070,793	1871 - -	5,973,109	4,928,791	1,516,724
1870 - -	5,795,380	4,838,984	1,460,383	1872 - -	4,967,150	4,969,117	1,335,885
Increase or Decrease for 1870.	Increase 86,586	Decrease. 914,174	Increase. 379,590	Increase or Decrease for 1872.	Increase. 24,331	Increase. 23,396	Decrease. 201,839

Hugh Ferguson.

TABLE showing the Number of CATTLE, SHEEP, and SWINE EXPORTED from Ireland to Great Britain, in the Years 1869, 1870, 1871, and 1872.

YEARS.	Cattle.	Sheep.	Swine.	YEARS.	Cattle.	Sheep.	Swine.
1869 - -	509,106	1,015,594	354,520	1871 - -	485,025	694,308	528,254
1870 - -	453,059	920,384	422,070	1872 - -	616,080	518,505	463,544
Increase or Decrease for 1870.	Decrease. 56,047	Decrease. 894,800	Increase. 167,456	Increase or Decrease for 1872.	Increase. 130,355	Decrease. 166,102	Decrease. 84,700

Hugh Ferguson.

TABLE showing the Number of DEATHS from the FOOT AND MOUTH, PLEURO-PNEUMONIA, and SCAB DISEASES.

YEARS.	FOOT AND MOUTH.			PLEURO-PNEUMONIA.	
	Cattle.	Sheep.	Swine.	Cattle.	Sheep.
1869 -	3	-	-	-	-
1870 -	45	-	51	274	-
1871 -	700	90	1,192	580	-
1872 -	718	611	617	881	2

TABLE showing the PER-CENTAGE of DEATHS as compared with the Number of Animals affected with FOOT AND MOUTH, PLEURO-PNEUMONIA, and SCAB DISEASES.

YEARS.	FOOT AND MOUTH.			PLEURO-PNEUMONIA.	
	Cattle.	Sheep.	Swine.	Cattle.	Sheep.
1869 -	50	-	-	-	-
1870 -	25	-	4.37	50.33	-
1871 -	31	39	5.17	56.48	-
1872 -	46	75	5.76	50.05	11

Hugh Ferguson.

GENERAL ABSTRACT, showing the Extent to which PLEURO-PNEUMONIA prevailed in each County in Ireland, and other Particulars, as set forth in the undermentioned Headings, during the Year ended 31st December 1872.

PROVINCES AND COUNTIES.		Number of Police Districts in each County.	Number of Police Districts in which the Disease existed.	Number of Farms, &c., in each County.	Number of Isolated Farms, &c., in each County.	Percentage of Isolated Farms, &c., compared with the Total Number of Farms in each County.	Number of Cattle on Isolated Farms, &c., in each County.	Number of Cattle affected in each County.	Number of Cattle which died from the Disease.	Total Number of Cattle in each County.	Percentage of Cattle affected, as compared with the Total Number of Cattle in each County.	Percentage of Cattle affected, as compared with the Total Number of Cattle on Isolated Farms.	Percentage of Cattle which died, as compared with the Total Number of Cattle affected.
ULSTER:													
1	Armagh	41	10	28,606	15	66	132	41	32	166,381	0.01	0.07	7.64
2	Armagh	34	4	25,685	4	0.01	12	9	1	81,227	0.01	0.03	3.3
3	Cavan	37	1	21,647	1	0.00	12	9	1	125,654	0.01	0.03	3.3
4	Down	69	3	35,154	3	0.00	17	4	1	191,644	0.02	0.06	6.6
5	Down	41	19	34,024	19	0.05	154	34	19	241,588	0.06	0.21	21.73
6	Fermanagh	25	—	14,517	—	—	—	—	—	108,794	—	—	—
7	Lancashire	24	2	19,618	2	0.01	48	10	7	125,965	0.00	0.03	3.3
8	Lancashire	24	1	26,549	1	0.00	3	3	1	81,227	0.01	0.03	3.3
9	Monaghan	35	1	21,421	1	0.00	3	4	2	180,302	0.02	0.07	7.64
10	TYRONE	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
TOTAL		336	32	221,946	41	0.02	409	305	68	1,285,735	0.008	0.03	3.3
LEINSTER:													
1	Dublin	19	3	1,664	3	0.05	48	5	1	45,000	0.01	0.03	3.3
2	Dublin	29	12	6,792	12	0.02	254	51	27	91,647	0.05	0.19	19.19
3	Dublin Metropolitan Police District.	18	11	—	11	—	859	64	11	(A.)	—	10.95	7.64
4	Kildare	36	10	10,454	10	0.11	187	48	29	80,287	0.05	0.24	24.24
5	Kildare	27	15	15,482	15	0.11	2,483	361	238	112,277	0.21	0.90	90.90
6	Kildare	45	8	11,945	8	0.05	297	30	20	43,034	0.07	0.22	22.22
7	Kildare	28	3	9,160	3	0.03	67	3	1	60,220	0.04	0.14	14.14
8	Louth	29	1	8,494	1	0.01	37	1	1	34,684	0.02	0.07	7.64
9	Louth	35	6	15,161	6	0.04	154	6	3	161,204	0.03	0.16	16.16
10	Meath	35	10	12,291	10	0.10	150	29	24	75,364	0.08	0.36	36.36
11	Meath	24	3	11,719	3	0.05	289	29	9	95,522	0.03	0.16	16.16
12	Westmeath	41	6	10,332	6	0.05	184	22	15	105,755	0.02	0.11	11.11
13	Wicklow	38	4	8,563	4	0.05	208	11	8	74,419	0.01	0.05	5.55
TOTAL		491	59	128,671	59	0.05	5,668	662	425	950,754	0.05	0.25	25.25
MUNSTER:													
1	Cork	24	4	15,060	4	0.08	60	10	9	398,799	0.00	0.03	3.3
2	Cork	147	5	26,093	5	0.02	154	48	16	348,142	0.17	0.27	27.27
3	Kerry	49	3	15,461	3	0.02	99	13	9	222,310	0.00	0.03	3.3
4	Limerick	82	16	17,007	16	0.17	1,000	170	105	281,278	0.08	0.36	36.36
5	Tipperary	158	16	22,463	16	0.12	1,008	167	93	628,769	0.02	0.15	15.15
6	Wexford	35	11	9,548	11	0.03	847	178	115	87,289	0.04	0.21	21.21
TOTAL		496	55	128,121	55	0.04	3,525	647	343	1,256,789	0.05	0.21	21.21
CONNAUGHT:													
1	Galway	89	4	35,882	4	0.01	84	26	16	150,307	0.01	0.09	9.09
2	Leitrim	36	1	14,580	1	0.00	32	9	1	108,093	0.00	0.03	3.3
3	Mayo	26	—	16,974	—	—	—	—	—	179,998	—	—	—
4	Donegal	63	—	23,273	—	—	—	—	—	197,185	—	—	—
5	Sligo	35	—	16,227	—	—	—	—	—	162,140	—	—	—
TOTAL		235	5	128,666	5	0.04	76	27	10	652,615	0.01	0.06	6.6
GENERAL TOTAL		1,568	189	606,394	189	0.03	9,968	1,441	881	4,337,188	0.03	0.12	12.12

(A) and (B).—See Note at foot of Table, pages 610, 611.

(C).—Cattle slaughtered on account of the disease are isolated amongst those which died.

Page Progress.

GENERAL ABSTRACT, showing the extent to which SHEEP SCAB prevailed in each County in Ireland, and other Particulars, as set forth in the undermentioned Headings, during the Year ended 31st December 1872.

PROVINCES AND COUNTIES.		Number of Police Districts in each County.	Number of Police Districts in which the Disease existed.	Number of Farms in each County.	Number of Infected Farms, &c. in each County.	Percentage of Infected Farms, &c. compared with the Total Number of Farms, &c. in each County.	Number of Sheep on Infected Farms, &c. in each County.	Number of Sheep affected in each County.	Number of Sheep which died from the Disease.	Total Number of Sheep in each County.	Percentage of Sheep affected, as compared with the Total Number of Sheep in each County.	Percentage of Sheep affected, as compared with Total Number of Sheep on Infected Farms.	The number of Sheep which died, as compared with Total Number of Sheep affected.
ULSTER:													
1	Armagh	41	-	25,636	-	-	-	-	-	54,365	-	-	-
2	Armagh	34	-	23,585	-	-	-	-	-	24,175	-	-	-
3	Cavan	37	4	21,667	4	01	661	67	-	25,839	06	29.85	-
4	Down	69	-	22,165	-	-	-	-	-	222,220	-	-	-
5	Dumfries	44	8	22,010	7	62	487	147	-	71,500	08	20.10	-
6	Fermanagh	28	-	14,517	-	-	-	-	-	16,716	-	-	-
7	Londonderry	34	-	22,524	-	-	-	-	-	45,443	-	-	-
8	Monaghan	34	-	20,240	-	-	-	-	-	17,244	-	-	-
9	Tyrone	35	-	31,422	-	-	-	-	-	55,681	-	-	-
Total		338	10	222,045	11	004	788	214	-	350,330	03	27.19	-
LEINSTER:													
1	Cadogan	19	1	5,664	1	01	141	2	-	62,655	000	1.41	-
2	Dublin	99	-	5,782	-	00	174	57	-	74,411	07	29.75	-
3	Dublin Metropolitan Police District.	16	-	(B.)	-	-	-	-	-	(A.)	-	-	-
4	Kildare	39	1	19,854	1	009	8	2	-	142,506	001	25	-
5	Likenny	27	-	13,492	-	01	125	51	1	165,284	01	24.6	3.22
6	Longford	48	7	11,044	11	00	369	148	-	121,590	11	30.42	-
7	Louth	28	-	9,182	-	-	-	-	-	32,582	-	-	-
8	Meath	29	-	8,494	-	-	-	-	-	32,459	-	-	-
9	Monaghan	33	2	13,151	2	01	385	42	-	220,567	01	10.9	-
10	Queen's	33	-	12,291	-	00	345	52	1	100,515	04	10.25	1.56
11	Westmeath	54	4	12,719	4	03	117	30	-	151,856	01	25.64	-
12	Wexford	41	6	16,032	7	04	418	190	-	125,892	13	45.45	-
13	Wicklow	35	-	9,283	-	-	-	-	-	159,237	-	-	-
Total		491	27	122,671	34	02	2,611	562	2	1,415,598	03	25.99	0.35
MUNSTER:													
1	Clare	54	3	16,920	3	01	63	34	-	191,123	006	20.25	-
2	Cork	147	10	26,590	11	03	1,170	498	-	320,834	16	42.50	-
3	Kerry	43	-	16,651	-	-	-	-	-	116,839	-	-	-
4	Limerick	69	3	17,667	3	01	114	77	-	20,502	11	27.54	-
5	Tipperary	128	6	25,482	9	05	639	218	-	265,081	12	49.24	-
6	Watersford	35	1	9,648	1	01	77	16	-	46,767	02	10.42	-
Total		466	23	124,161	27	06	2,869	938	-	1,688,028	00	44.66	-
CONNAUGHT:													
1	Galway	69	-	38,399	-	-	-	-	-	688,390	-	-	-
2	Leitrim	39	1	14,390	1	005	71	68	-	21,033	06	27.22	-
3	Mayo	58	-	20,074	-	-	-	-	-	240,125	-	-	-
4	Sligo	33	1	21,273	1	004	44	5	-	192,547	002	11.54	-
5	Sligo	34	1	16,327	2	01	98	2	-	64,447	003	9.69	-
Total		268	3	126,066	4	005	126	83	-	1,367,790	005	14	-
GENERAL TOTAL		1,289	45	608,864	78	01	5,685	1,795	2	4,265,113	04	34.79	0.11

(A) and (B).—See Note at foot of Table, page 610, 611.

N.B.—There were no Sheep slaughtered on account of the Disease.

Engl. Sheep n.

TABLE showing the Number of FARMS, LANDS, PREMISES, or PLACES in each PROVINCE in Ireland under Restrictions at the undermentioned Dates on account of being infected with FOOT AND MOUTH DISEASE, PLEURO-PNEUMONIA, and SHEEP SCAR, during the Year 1872.

PROVINCES.	Week ended 6 January.			Week ended 5 February.			Week ended 2 March.			Week ended 30 March.			Week ended 27 April.			Week ended 25 May.		
	Foot and Mouth.	Pleuro-Pneumonia.	Total.	Foot and Mouth.	Pleuro-Pneumonia.	Total.	Foot and Mouth.	Pleuro-Pneumonia.	Total.	Foot and Mouth.	Pleuro-Pneumonia.	Total.	Foot and Mouth.	Pleuro-Pneumonia.	Total.	Foot and Mouth.	Pleuro-Pneumonia.	Total.
ULSTER - - -	182	11	193	67	13	80	24	9	33	5	9	14	3	8	11	3	5	8
MUNSTER - - -	1,510	8	1,518	424	28	452	188	12	200	48	17	65	10	23	33	69	98	77
LEINSTER - - -	1,131	38	1,169	384	89	473	118	25	143	41	16	57	32	48	80	27	52	79
CONNAUGHT - - -	269	1	270	87	1	88	12	-	12	6	-	6	-	-	-	-	1	1
TOTAL - - -	2,960	58	3,018	712	93	805	332	46	378	92	44	136	45	77	122	79	86	168

PROVINCES.	Week ended 22 June.				Week ended 20 July.				Week ended 17 August.				Week ended 14 September.			
	Foot and Mouth.	Pleuro-Pneumonia.	Sheep Scar.	Total.	Foot and Mouth.	Pleuro-Pneumonia.	Sheep Scar.	Total.	Foot and Mouth.	Pleuro-Pneumonia.	Sheep Scar.	Total.	Foot and Mouth.	Pleuro-Pneumonia.	Sheep Scar.	Total.
ULSTER - - -	7	9	3	19	18	8	3	29	140	3	2	145	267	9	8	278
MUNSTER - - -	125	26	11	162	119	31	26	166	188	23	16	227	361	44	16	421
LEINSTER - - -	184	63	21	268	274	58	39	371	1,263	42	19	1,324	1,656	98	39	1,793
CONNAUGHT - - -	6	1	-	7	8	-	2	10	29	2	2	33	100	2	2	104
TOTAL - - -	320	100	36	456	579	97	41	617	2,330	102	39	2,471	2,467	158	66	2,691

PROVINCES.	Week ended 11 October.				Week ended 9 November.				Week ended 7 December.				On the 31 December.			
	Foot and Mouth.	Pleuro-Pneumonia.	Sheep Scar.	Total.	Foot and Mouth.	Pleuro-Pneumonia.	Sheep Scar.	Total.	Foot and Mouth.	Pleuro-Pneumonia.	Sheep Scar.	Total.	Foot and Mouth.	Pleuro-Pneumonia.	Sheep Scar.	Total.
ULSTER - - -	394	14	-	408	453	13	-	466	419	35	1	455	209	11	1	311
MUNSTER - - -	414	50	1	465	659	41	-	691	964	33	4	1,001	1,044	29	-	1,073
LEINSTER - - -	1,500	73	8	1,581	2,249	84	12	2,345	1,837	64	12	1,913	1,968	60	2	1,970
CONNAUGHT - - -	226	-	-	226	650	1	-	651	790	1	-	791	621	1	-	622
TOTAL - - -	2,534	137	9	2,680	4,112	138	13	4,263	4,182	118	17	4,317	5,538	101	3	5,642

Note.—No farms, lands, premises, or places restricted on account of sheep scar until the month of June, as the Comed Order, requiring premises, &c. infected with said disease, was not passed until the 26th May 1872.

TABLE showing the Number of OUTBREAKS of FOOT and MOUTH DISTEMPER, PLEURO-PNEUMONIA, SHEEP were reported by the Owners of the Infected Places

		1871.											
		Outbreaks reported by Owners.				Outbreaks discovered by other Means.				TOTAL.			
		Foot and Mouth.	Pleuro-Pneumonia.	Sheep Scab.	Sheep Pox.	Foot and Mouth.	Pleuro-Pneumonia.	Sheep Scab.	Sheep Pox.	Foot and Mouth.	Pleuro-Pneumonia.	Sheep Scab.	Sheep Pox.
ULSTER.													
Antrim	- - - -	188	22	-	-	18	2	-	-	207	24	-	-
Armagh	- - - -	268	3	-	-	16	-	-	-	284	3	-	-
Cavan	- - - -	471	2	-	-	22	-	-	-	493	2	-	-
Down	- - - -	334	11	-	-	29	-	-	-	363	11	-	-
Donegal	- - - -	139	8	-	-	9	-	-	-	148	8	-	-
Fermanagh	- - - -	142	1	-	-	4	-	-	-	146	1	-	-
Londonderry	- - - -	150	1	-	-	8	-	-	-	158	1	-	-
Monaghan	- - - -	207	2	-	-	26	-	-	-	233	2	-	-
Tyrone	- - - -	228	-	-	-	16	-	-	-	244	-	-	-
TOTAL	- - -	2,169	46	-	-	132	2	-	-	2,301	48	-	-
MUNSTER.													
Cork	- - - -	238	3	-	-	7	-	-	-	245	3	-	-
Co. -	- - - -	329	4	-	-	28	-	-	-	357	4	-	-
Kerry	- - - -	80	-	-	-	8	-	-	-	88	-	-	-
Limerick	- - - -	724	28	-	-	19	2	-	-	743	30	-	-
Tipperary	- - - -	1,459	16	-	-	16	-	-	-	1,475	16	-	-
Waterford	- - - -	1,745	19	-	-	41	2	-	-	1,786	21	-	-
TOTAL	- - -	4,943	63	-	-	209	4	-	-	5,152	67	-	-
LEINSTER.													
Carlow	- - - -	488	2	-	-	6	-	-	-	494	2	-	-
Dublin	- - - -	798	21	-	-	12	-	-	-	810	21	-	-
Dublin Met. Police District	- - - -	138	32	-	-	1	-	-	-	139	32	-	-
Kildare	- - - -	1,484	19	-	-	14	-	-	-	1,498	19	-	-
Kilmorey	- - - -	1,878	158	-	-	18	5	-	-	1,896	163	-	-
King's	- - - -	723	-	-	-	20	1	-	-	743	1	-	-
Lancaster	- - - -	738	2	-	-	27	1	-	-	765	3	-	-
Louth	- - - -	478	1	-	-	40	-	-	-	518	1	-	-
Meath	- - - -	1,581	6	-	-	27	1	-	-	1,608	7	-	-
Queen's	- - - -	221	10	-	-	21	3	-	-	242	13	-	-
Wexmouth	- - - -	1,622	8	-	-	24	1	-	-	1,646	9	-	-
Wicklow	- - - -	329	9	-	-	8	1	-	-	337	10	-	-
Wicklow	- - - -	628	8	-	-	15	-	-	-	643	8	-	-
TOTAL	- - -	11,526	286	-	-	262	10	-	-	11,788	296	-	-
CONNAUGHT.													
Galway	- - - -	995	5	-	-	17	-	-	-	1,012	5	-	-
Leitrim	- - - -	498	1	-	-	13	-	-	-	511	1	-	-
Sligo	- - - -	373	-	-	-	49	-	-	-	422	-	-	-
Roscommon	- - - -	1,404	2	-	-	52	1	-	-	1,456	3	-	-
Sligo	- - - -	820	1	-	-	50	-	-	-	870	1	-	-
TOTAL	- - -	4,415	9	-	-	139	1	-	-	4,554	10	-	-
GENERAL TOTAL		22,797	407	-	-	691	17	-	-	23,487	454	-	-

Note.—Sheep Scab. The Council Order requiring the owners or occupiers of farms, lands, pastures, or places

SCAB, and SHEEP POX which occurred in Ireland, in the Years 1871 and 1872, distinguishing those Cases which from those which were discovered by other Means.

1872.											
Outbreaks Reported by Owners.				Outbreaks Untraced by other Means.				TOTAL.			
Foot and Mouth.	Pseudo-Potomac.	Sheep Scab.	Sheep Pox.	Foot and Mouth.	Pseudo-Potomac.	Sheep Scab.	Sheep Pox.	Foot and Mouth.	Pseudo-Potomac.	Sheep Scab.	Sheep Pox.
ULSTER:											
308	38	-	-	2	-	-	-	396	18	-	-
309	4	-	-	3	-	-	-	306	4	-	-
317	2	4	-	1	-	-	-	318	2	4	-
354	12	7	-	3	-	-	-	357	19	7	-
38	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	63	5	-	-
88	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	51	-	-	-
62	3	-	-	1	-	-	-	63	3	-	-
169	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	169	1	-	-
167	-	-	-	2	1	-	-	168	1	-	-
1,594	45	11	-	16	1	-	-	1,599	41	11	-
- - Total.											
MUNSTER:											
389	4	3	-	2	-	-	-	393	4	3	-
347	6	3	-	1	-	3	-	348	6	11	-
354	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	354	3	-	-
403	23	3	-	2	6	-	-	404	23	3	-
1,447	26	9	-	10	3	-	-	1,459	23	9	-
307	15	1	-	3	1	-	-	309	15	1	-
2,047	131	22	-	30	9	3	-	2,067	136	27	-
- - Total.											
LEINSTER:											
358	8	1	-	-	-	-	-	369	8	1	-
716	28	2	-	5	1	-	-	728	26	3	-
308	36	-	-	3	13	-	-	311	49	-	-
580	12	1	-	3	-	-	-	589	15	1	-
697	144	3	-	4	-	-	-	701	144	3	-
369	7	9	-	3	-	3	-	369	7	11	-
473	2	-	-	3	1	-	-	479	3	-	-
468	1	-	-	2	-	-	-	467	1	-	-
1,277	7	3	-	11	-	-	-	1,259	7	3	-
356	16	2	-	2	-	-	-	353	16	3	-
712	9	4	-	2	-	-	-	712	6	4	-
518	7	7	-	-	-	-	-	516	7	7	-
333	2	-	-	3	-	-	-	336	2	-	-
3,118	277	22	-	60	16	3	-	3,179	192	34	-
- - Total.											
CONNAUGHT:											
768	3	-	-	10	2	-	-	776	4	-	-
349	1	1	-	1	-	-	-	350	1	1	-
109	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	112	-	-	-
765	-	1	-	4	-	-	-	771	-	1	-
86	-	3	-	1	-	-	-	90	-	3	-
1,637	3	4	-	18	2	-	-	1,656	6	4	-
- - Total.											
14,743	442	49	-	114	27	7	-	14,837	468	58	-
- GENERAL TOTAL.											

Inferred with this disease to report the existence of said disease therein, was not found until the 30th May 1872.

TABLE showing the Number of Instances in which CATTLE DISEASE COUNCIL ORDERS have been Contravened in each PROVINCE in Ireland, and in which Proceedings have been taken; also, the Result of each PROSECUTION, for the Years 1871 and 1872.

PROVINCE.	1871.					1872.				
	Number of Prosecutions.	Result of Prosecutions.				Number of Prosecutions.	Result of Prosecutions.			
		Fines.	Costs.	Disburse.	No. Rel.		Fines.	Costs.	Disburse.	No. Rel.
ULSTER - - - -	11	£. s. d. 15 15 4	-	-	-	21	55 6 -	-	1	1
MUNSTER - - - -	21	4 15 6	-	-	-	30	25 1 3	-	1	-
LEINSTER - - - -	52	79 - 8	-	-	-	63	151 16 8	-	4	-
CONNAUGHT - - - -	25	6 2 10	-	-	-	21	8 - 6	-	-	-
TOTAL - - - -	109	95 15 2	-	-	-	124	239 4 5	-	6	1

Note.—In this Table, the prosecutions include proceedings against persons for not reporting the existence of the disease, for having moved animals from an infected place without licence, and for allowing dogs to roam from a district infected with foot and mouth distemper.

High Foreman.

RETURN of the Number and Description of FOREIGN ANIMALS Imported into Ireland during the Years ended 31st December 1871 and 1872, specifying the PORTS from which Imported, the Names of the Importing Vessels, the Number of Animals which Died on each Voyage, the Number Certified by the Government Inspector as being Diseased, and the Number ordered to be Slaughtered in the Custom House Docks previous to their Delivery.

Date of Importation.	Number and Description of Animals.					Ports Imported from.	Name of Importing Vessel.	Number of Animals which Died on each Voyage.	If under certificate by Government Veterinary Inspector to be diseased.	Number ordered to be slaughtered before delivery.	On what Account ordered to be slaughtered.
	Bullocks.	Cows.	Holsteins.	Calves.	Sheep.						
Port of Dublin:											
15 April 1871	68	-	-	-	-	Oporto	"Marian"	-	-	-	Injured during voyage.
20 "	119	-	-	-	-	"	"Alexander"	-	-	-	
21 May "	144	-	-	-	-	"	"	-	-	-	
12 June "	147	-	-	-	-	"	"	-	-	-	
20 "	150	-	-	-	-	"	"	-	-	-	
15 July "	100	-	-	-	-	"	"	-	-	-	
4 Sept. "	62	-	-	-	-	"	"	-	-	-	
Port of Cork:											
15 April 1871	150	-	-	-	-	Portugal	"Magnet"	-	-	-	
TOTAL for Year 1871 - -	664	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	
Port of Dublin:											
31 Jan. 1872	32	-	-	-	-	Oporto	"Alexander"	-	-	-	All slaughtered on account of foot and mouth distemper.
29 Feb. "	44	-	-	-	-	"	"	-	-	-	
21 Mar. "	40	-	-	-	-	"	"	-	-	-	
6 April "	22	-	24	-	-	Bernardine	"Martha"	-	3	20	
16 "	62	-	-	-	1	Oporto	"Alexander"	-	-	-	
8 May "	100	-	-	-	-	"	"	-	-	-	
4 June "	60	-	-	-	-	"	"Magnet"	-	-	-	Injured during voyage.
1 July "	24	-	-	-	-	"	"Alexander"	-	-	-	
16 "	60	-	-	-	-	"	"Marian"	-	-	-	
22 "	160	-	-	-	-	"	"	-	-	-	
15 Aug. "	50	-	-	-	-	"	"Alexander"	-	-	-	
31 "	154	-	-	-	-	"	"Martha"	-	-	-	
20 Sept. "	81	-	-	-	-	"	"Alexander"	-	-	-	
17 Oct. "	90	-	-	-	-	"	"Martha"	-	-	-	
Port of Cork:	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
TOTAL for Year 1872 - -	841	-	24	-	1	-	-	-	3	20	

High Foreman.

ABSTRACT showing the YEARLY EXPENSES now (1873) allowed for the Office of the
IRISH VETERINARY DEPARTMENT.

(Referred to in Answer and Question No. 5302.)

The Right Honourable the Lords of Her Majesty's Treasury.

	£.	s.	d.
Director General - - - - -	750	-	-
One assistant veterinary surgeon, to be employed only in cases of necessity, not to exceed 1 £ 1 s. per diem for all so employed - - -	383	3	-
One chief clerk - - - - -	114	2	10
One clerk - - - - -	102	6	9
One ditto - - - - -	90	-	5
One office keeper and cleanser - - - - -	26	-	-
One boy messenger - - - - -	31	4	-
Rent of offices, quarantine yard, and sheds - - - - -	113	-	-
Taxes on the above premises - - - - -	23	-	-
Light and fuel - - - - -	50	-	-
Travelling and incidental expenses - - - - -	300	-	-
	£-	1,962	19 -

COPY of GENERAL ORDER issued to CONSTABULARY of Ireland in 1860.

(Referred to as Query 5331.)

CRUELTY TO ANIMALS.

THE Constabulary are to exercise vigilance in the enforcement of the 12 & 13 Vict. c. 92, and 17 & 18 Vict. c. 60, for the more effectual prevention of cruelty to animals, copies of which Acts are at each station, and every member of the force who shall be convicted of the neglect of a duty which cannot fail to be regarded as important by every person of common humanity, will expose himself to punishment.

Sections 2, 12, 19, 20, and 29 of the Act first above cited especially demand the attention of the force, and will be found in Appendix, No. 16.

COPY of REPORT on CRUELTY TO ANIMALS on their being shipped, sent to Constabulary and Dublin Metropolitan Police for their information and guidance.

(Referred to in Answer to Query 5331.)

Veterinary Department of the Privy Council Office,

Dublin Castle, 16 July 1872.

The Under Secretary,

I HAVE the honour to report that my experience of, and observations relative to, the manner in which cattle are treated at the Irish ports, previous to, and when being shipped for exportation, are not such as enable me to confirm all of the reports on the subject received by the Government from the police, I having repeatedly observed at the shipping places in Ireland, particularly in the port of Dublin, animals subjected to much unnecessary suffering in embarkation, by being struck most wantonly with thick ash plants and other kinds of sticks, as well as having their tails cruelly twisted, a procedure which inflicts far greater pain than beating with a stick, by the drovers, porters, and cattle-men when forcing them to go the required way, whether along the quay or other place of embarkation, or from it to the gangways along which the cattle are put on board. In consequence of the unnecessary harsh manner in which cattle were shipped at the port of Dublin, I, on the 20th September 1870, by order of the Government, applied to the Commissioners of the Dublin Metropolitan Police for a report on the subject, copy of application annexed. The Commissioners consequently gave special directions to experienced officers of their force to attend at the North Wall quays to watch the procedure of cattle-shipping, and to report thereon.

I was along with the said police officers at the embarkation of several cargoes of live stock on board the City of Dublin Steam-packet Company's vessels, but, to my surprise, on such occasions, not a single instance of unnecessary harsh treatment could either I, or the police, detect on those occasions, although some days before I had observed several. The cause of this, to me, astonishingly unexpected gentle way in which the animals were shipped when the police and I were watching the procedure, became revealed when I observed, on the first day of my attendance with the police, that, evidently for the occasion, the said Steam-packet Company's Traffic Manager was present, and that, although he directed my attention

Appendix, No. 12.

to the gentle way in which the cattle were on that occasion embarked, and assured me that the cattle-shipments were always similarly conducted. I, on inquiry, ascertained, before I left the quays, that the persons engaged in shipping the animals had been made aware of and cautioned relative to the special duty the police were then and there performing, that of the object of my being present with them. On the 24th September the Commissioners of Police forwarded, for my information, a most ably drawn report on the result of the observations made personally by their officers on the manner in which the cattle were shipped at the port of Dublin. A copy of said report is annexed, to which attention is particularly requested.

The statements made therein corresponded exactly with what I myself had observed at the quays during the preceding five days, but not at all with what I had repeatedly witnessed previous to the 20th September 1870, nor with what occurred at the North Wall on only the third day subsequent to the date of the police reporting so favourably as to the manner in which cattle were embarked or shipped at the port of Dublin. The occurrence alluded to was that of a cow having been treated with such brutality on board a steamer when being shipped, that, as a result of the Steam-packet Company's servant who had ill-treated the animal having been prosecuted at the instance of a private individual, and convicted, he was sentenced to be imprisoned for two months, although none of the police saw the animal ill-treated; but unnecessary pain is seldom inflicted in the presence of the police. A copy of the police report relative to this case is also annexed.

With the discontinuance of the special police vigilance, the ill-usages of cattle about to be, and being, shipped, was resumed. Perhaps it was subsequently again discontinued; but since then I have not had much personal observation as to how cattle are treated while being shipped, I not having had time since 1870 to attend at the shipping places, except very occasionally. My appearance being now well known to almost all the drovers and porters, none of them would ill-treat cattle in my presence. From what I observed when I was daily at the quays, there must be even more than enough of such more important duties for the police to perform at the North Wall than regularly superintending the shipment of cattle. I have reason to believe that the necessary number of constables could not be conveniently spared for such extra special duty in behalf of the prevention of cruelty to animals.

Colonel Lake's suggestion, that it might be desirable to apply to the Board of Trade to take the matter in hand, is an excellent one. But as the Cattle Disease (Ireland) Acts specially provide that the Lord Lieutenant may make orders for the protection of animals against unnecessary suffering in transit, and for the payment of the expense of carrying out such Council Orders, it is not improbable that the Board of Trade would decline accepting such proposed responsibility. It is generally thought that the interference of the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals has tended to render the police throughout Ireland, as well as in Great Britain, inactive in relation to the carrying out of the provisions of the Acts for the prevention of cruelty to animals; such inactivity is but the natural result of delegating to irresponsible societies, or self-constituted bodies, any of the duties properly appertaining to the police of the country, or of a locality. The greater the division of executive power, without an equally great imposition of responsibility, the more practically unsatisfactory will be the police application of the law from which such power is derived. The establishment of a society for the prevention of larceny or felony, with employees having the arresting and other powers of police officers, but being in no way responsible or subject to imperial control as such, would be found most embarrassing, and to injuriously affect the efficiency of the regular police forces. In a like manner, the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals having, in Ireland, voluntarily undertaken police duties without having the machinery, or pecuniary or other means for their proper fulfilment, the provisions of the Acts for the prevention of cruelty to animals are but seldom enforced; for, as a natural consequence of such a distribution of responsibility, the vigilance of the regular police forces of the United Kingdom, in behalf of the prevention of cruelty to animals, is in a very relaxed state, and is likely to continue so, although by no means as a necessary consequence. Since the subject of cruelty treating cattle, when shipping them for exportation, has lately been alluded to in Parliament, the traffic managers and other superior officers of the steamship companies have most probably put their cattle-shipping employees on their guard; and it is not unlikely that, for the present, there is a cessation of the unnecessary cruelty to which Irish cattle are frequently subjected when being shipped for exportation. The amelioration will, however, be but temporary, notwithstanding the terror of the police reports on the subject. Addressing the steamship companies relative to the unnecessary sufferings inflicted on animals in and immediately previous to their embarkation, would have but little effect, as, with respect to the offence in question, the liability is purely a personal one, and does not extend to employers, although the principal offenders are their own servants; and, on the occasions of shipping cattle, time is generally so great an object that the men employed at the work are required to accomplish it as quickly as possible. All the Irish cattle exporting ports of any consequence are tidal. At the great majority of them, the animals coming by rail for embarkation frequently do not arrive until so near sailing time that, to insure the cattle being shipped soon enough to prevent the carrying vessel missing the tide, they are often shipped in a hurried manner, and are thus occasionally exposed to such violence as entails much suffering. But some of the cattle brought for shipment are very wild and difficult to manage, from not having been housed or handled. To get such animals shipped in time, or sometimes even at all, frequently requires the exercise of such an amount, as well as kind, of force as undoubtedly constitutes

constitutes cruelty; the shower of blows to which they are subjected often rescinding off their ribs in a most appalling manner. It not unfrequently happens in such embarkations that a horse is knocked off; even an eye is occasionally knocked out. Although it has frequently been attempted to justify such brutal treatment as being necessary for the accomplishment of the desired purpose,—the shipment of the animals within a given time,—the magistrates, before whom such cases have been brought, have almost invariably refused to allow that such brutality admitted of any justification whatever, and have severely punished the offenders. By many cattle-men in Liverpool and at some other extensive cattle-import landing places in Great Britain, and by a few even in Ireland, the animals, the movement of which is intrusted to them, are scarcely ever struck with a stick, goods being used instead of ordinary sticks. The "good" used is an iron or steel-pointed instrument, sharp enough to smartly prick the animal, but so short and guarded at the point that it cannot penetrate through the skin. The good is generally fastened, ferrule fashion, to the end of a stick, although sometimes its handle is of thin metal instead of wood. A slight touch from the point of the good acts far more effectually in driving or goading cattle than the most unmerciful belabouring of them with sticks. The use of the good has the great advantage of not bruising or otherwise injuring the meat of animals driven with it; whereas that beneath the skin of Irish cattle, driven with sticks, is so frequently blackened from the severity of the blows inflicted that, as a general rule, Irish cattle do not bring as high prices in the English markets, for immediate slaughter, as English or Scotch ones of a similar weight and quality. The humps on the hips and shoulders are generally received in railway trucks, or on shipboard; but those along the back are most frequently caused by the blows received from sticks.

Previous to concluding this report, I have the honour to submit that the question of fast as to what constitutes the infliction of unnecessary suffering on an animal while shipping it, is one, the solution of which frequently involves the careful consideration of all the circumstances connected with the particular case, which may be an exceptional one. For instance, the animal so treated while being shipped may be so terrified or furious as to be, in the ordinary acceptation of the terms, an "unmanageable and dangerous," that, to effectually accomplish its embarkation with safety to those actually employed thereat, and before the sailing of the vessel, the exercise of what under other circumstances would be deemed wanton cruelty, is absolutely "necessary." However, as a question of mere "fact," there may be a difference of opinion as to whether the infliction of severe suffering or torture in such cases is or is not justifiable, the 2nd and 4th clauses of the 12 & 13 Vict. c. 93, unmistakably settle the law of such cases.

(signed) *Hugh Ferguson, R.M.V.S.*

Veterinary Department of the Privy Council Office,
Dublin Castle, 20 September 1870.

Gentlemen,

I AM directed to request the favour of your ordering information to be collected, relative to the treatment to which animals, principally cattle, are subjected when being shipped at the port of Dublin for exportation to Great Britain; also to submit, for your information and consideration, paragraphs 335, 336, 337, and 338 of the Minutes of Evidence taken before the Transit of Animals Committee, and contained in the Appendix to the Report of said Committee, which is herewith sent.

I have, &c.

(signed) *Hugh Ferguson, R.M.V.S.*

To the Commissioners of the Dublin
Metropolitan Police.

Dublin Metropolitan Police, Summer Hill Station,
C Division, 20 September 1870.

Station Report.

WITH reference to the attached communication, we beg to report for the information of Mr. Superintendent Carr, that from our own observation, and that of Acting Inspector Morris and Sergeant Lee, who are continually on duty at North Wall, and see cattle shipped daily, we are of opinion there is no cruelty used, at least we never saw or heard of any.

Cattle are shipped by means of a stage, along which they pass one by one, then tied on deck, or driven to the under deck, in same way by a gangway, with sticks about a foot apart, nailed across to prevent their slipping. Just as the cattle enter the ship there is a head-rope thrown over their horns by which they are led and tied up in the vessel; some animals become restive and will not go down without being forced by pushing from behind, and sometimes pulling the head-rope, but in the majority of cases they pass down quietly and without any force. We spoke to some of the oldest and most respectable men in the trade, and they are quite satisfied with the present mode of shipping, and say for their own interest they see that no cruelty is used; that cattle shipped in Dublin cannot be brought into the London market without being knocked about by the sea voyage, which invariably sickens them, and then the long journey by rail prevents them being in as good condition as when taken off the grass, &c.

Appendix, No. 12. One dealer in particular states they can dispose of cattle at as remunerative prices in Liverpool or Manchester as in London. He states the principal cause of injury to cattle for the London market is caused by dealers hiring railway trucks for a certain amount, and, for the purpose of saving expense, pack too many of them together, when they sweat, and injure the meat.

(signed) *P. Hogan, Inspector.*
P. Fitzgerald, Inspector.

Dublin Metropolitan Police,
 Superintendent's Office, C Division, 1 October 1879.

I have to report, for the information of Her Majesty's Veterinary Surgeon, that between 11 and 12 a.m., 29th ult., one of the Holyhead Steam Packet Company's servants, named Patrick Toole, was charged at Summer Hill Station, by a man named Joseph Jones, of No. 19, Gloucester-street, with cruelly ill-treating a cow on board the steamship "The Countess of Dublin," at the North Wall Quay, a short time previously, by striking the animal several times on the head with a stick. The case was sent before the magistrate (C. J. O'Donel, Esq.), and the prosecutor stated in his evidence that blood was caused to flow from the eye of the animal by the ill-usage she received; whereupon the magistrate sentenced Toole to be imprisoned for a period of two months. The prisoner was taken into custody by Sergeant Lee, 13 C; but he the sergeant did not witness the ill-treatment.

(signed) *Richard Corr, Superintendent.*

To Professor Ferguson, R.M.V.S.

PAPERS issued in by Mr. John Alcock Clarke.

Statement of the American Board Proceedings of 1848.

TABLE L.—Showing the Number of Cows and Heifers and the Number Annually Deaf to 1848.

PERIOD or QUARTER.	Cows Annually added to the Herd, Estimated in Past-Season.	Heifers and Cows Estimated in Past-Season, Monthly, 1 per Cent. deducted.	Cows Estimated at Past-Season, Monthly, 1 per Cent. deducted.	Cows Estimated at Past-Season, Monthly, 1 per Cent. deducted.	Cows Estimated at 1848-Season, Monthly, 1 per Cent. deducted.	Cows Estimated at 1848-Season, Monthly, 1 per Cent. deducted.	Cows Estimated at 1848-Season, Monthly, 1 per Cent. deducted.	DEAF, OR DEAFENED COWS			
								Estimated at Past-Season, in Two Percentages and above Monthly deducted.	Added for 1848-Season, in Two Percentages Monthly deducted.	Added for 1848-Season, in Two Percentages Monthly deducted.	Some Number of Deaf or Deafened Cows for 1848.
First Quarter of the Year	100,000 Heifers in milk.	110,000 Heifers in milk.	120,000 Cows in milk.	130,000 Cows in milk.	140,000 Cows in milk.	150,000 Cows in milk.	1,000,000	-	-	100,000	-
Second Quarter of the Year	100,000 Heifers in milk.	110,000 Heifers in milk.	120,000 Cows in milk.	130,000 Cows in milk.	140,000 Cows in milk.	-	1,000,000	-	-	100,000	-
Third Quarter of the Year	100,000 Heifers in milk.	110,000 Cows in milk.	120,000 Cows in milk.	130,000 Cows in milk.	140,000 Cows in milk.	-	100,000	-	-	10,000	-
Fourth Quarter of the Year	100,000 Heifers in milk.	110,000 Heifers in milk.	120,000 Cows in milk.	130,000 Cows in milk.	140,000 Cows in milk.	150,000 Cows in milk.	110,000	10,000	-	-	-
Total	400,000	440,000	480,000	520,000	560,000	600,000	2,100,000	10,000	1,100,000	200,000	100,000

TABLE III.—Showing the Number of Curves in different Ages probably killed for Error.

Number mentioned of the Short Curve as One Year old and under Two Years old Age in the Short Curve.	Number added to the Short Curve the Third Curve, and mentioned as Sixteen to Eighteen Years, or thirty.	Number of Young Curves not killed remains.	Number killed for Short Curve as Three Years old and under Four Years old.	Number of Curves, Young, Middle, Open, and killed mentioned as Three Years old and under Four Years old in the Short Curve — Twenty, Eighteen, thirteen.	Number killed for Short Curve as Four Years old and under Five Years old.	Number killed for Short Curve as Five Years old and under Six Years old.	Number killed for Short Curve as Six Years old and under Seven Years old.	Number killed for Short Curve as Seven Years old and under Eight Years old.	Number killed for Short Curve as Eight Years old and under Nine Years old.	Number killed for Short Curve as Nine Years old and under Ten Years old.	Number killed for Short Curve as Ten Years old and under Eleven Years old.	Number killed for Short Curve as Eleven Years old and under Twelve Years old.	Number killed for Short Curve as Twelve Years old and under Thirteen Years old.	Number killed for Short Curve as Thirteen Years old and under Fourteen Years old.	Number killed for Short Curve as Fourteen Years old and under Fifteen Years old.	
100,000 1 to 2 years old.	100,000	100,000	10,000	100,000 1 to 2 years old.	10,000	100,000 1 to 2 years old.	10,000	100,000 1 to 2 years old.	10,000	100,000 1 to 2 years old.	10,000	100,000 1 to 2 years old.	10,000	100,000 1 to 2 years old.	10,000	100,000 1 to 2 years old.
100,000 2 to 3 years old.	100,000	100,000	10,000	100,000 2 to 3 years old.	10,000	100,000 2 to 3 years old.	10,000	100,000 2 to 3 years old.	10,000	100,000 2 to 3 years old.	10,000	100,000 2 to 3 years old.	10,000	100,000 2 to 3 years old.	10,000	100,000 2 to 3 years old.
10,000 3 to 4 years old.	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000 3 to 4 years old.	10,000	10,000 3 to 4 years old.	10,000	10,000 3 to 4 years old.	10,000	10,000 3 to 4 years old.	10,000	10,000 3 to 4 years old.	10,000	10,000 3 to 4 years old.	10,000	10,000 3 to 4 years old.
100,000 4 to 5 years old.	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000 4 to 5 years old.	10,000	10,000 4 to 5 years old.	10,000	10,000 4 to 5 years old.	10,000	10,000 4 to 5 years old.	10,000	10,000 4 to 5 years old.	10,000	10,000 4 to 5 years old.	10,000	10,000 4 to 5 years old.
1,000,000 1 to 2 years old.	100,000	100,000	10,000	1,000,000 1 to 2 years old.	100,000	1,000,000 1 to 2 years old.	100,000	1,000,000 1 to 2 years old.	100,000	1,000,000 1 to 2 years old.	100,000	1,000,000 1 to 2 years old.	100,000	1,000,000 1 to 2 years old.	100,000	1,000,000 1 to 2 years old.

TABLE IV.—Showing the Numbers and Dead Weight of Curries, Goats, Swine, Lambs, and Pigs probably Killed for Meas.

ANIMALS KILLED	Average Age when Killed	Number	Dead Weight per Head, in Imperial Stones	Weight of Meat in Imperial Stones	Weight of Skin in Stone	Pelts per Skin	Value of Skin
Goats	1½ to 2½ years	10,000	50 (250 lbs.)	20,000	—	—	—
Goats	2½ to 3½ years	100,000	60 (300 lbs.)	2,000,000	—	—	—
Goats	3½ to 4½ years	100,000	60 (300 lbs.)	20,000,000	—	—	—
Goats, Bulls, &c.	Older	100,000	60 (300 lbs.)	10,000,000	—	—	—
Swine and Bearded Goats	"	200,000	10 (500 lbs.)	10,000,000	—	—	—
Total Bees	"	1,000,000	4½ (225 lbs.)	11,000,000	—	—	—
Fox, Culver	8 to 10 weeks	100,000	7 (35 lbs.)	1,000,000	—	—	—
Total Bees and Fox	"	1,100,000	10½ (525 lbs.)	22,000,000	400,000	10 (500 lbs.)	10,000,000
Lambs (1½ per each of 100,000, Total Sheep and Lamb Killers)	10 to 16 weeks	1,100,000	8 (40 lbs.)	8,800,000	—	—	—
Sheep	Average 1½ years	1,000,000	10 (50 lbs.)	10,000,000	—	—	—
Total Mutton and Lamb	"	21,000,000	4½ (22 lbs.)	18,800,000	400,000	10 (500 lbs.)	10,000,000
Swine Pigs and Potters	Average 1 month	1,000,000	4½ (22 lbs.)	—	—	—	—
Pigs	Average 1½ years	1,000,000	10½ (525 lbs.)	—	—	—	—
Total Pigs and Swine	"	2,000,000	15 (750 lbs.)	10,000,000	100,000	10 (500 lbs.)	10,000,000
Total Dead Weight of Meas	"	"	"	"	1,000,000	"	10,000,000

TABLE V.—Showing the TOTAL ESTIMATED MEAT SUPPLY to the relative proportion FURNISHED by HOME and by FOREIGN ANIMALS.

ANIMALS IMPORTED in 1872.	Number.	Dead Weight per Head, Imperial Stones.	Weight of Meat in Imperial Stones.	Weight of Meat in Tons.	Price per Ton.	Value of Meat.
					£.	£.
Oxen and Bulls - -	110,537	56 (584 lbs.)	3,064,702	—	—	—
Cows - - - -	23,840	40 (590 lbs.) (Cattle 44½ (528 lbs.)	1,162,600	—	—	—
Calves - - - -	33,325	7 (98 lbs.)	334,576	—	—	—
TOTAL CATTLE -	172,902	37½ (524 lbs.)	6,479,577	40,455	70 (7½ d. per lb.)	2,831,350
Sheep and Lambs -	803,817	4 (30 lbs.)	5,239,948	30,845	84 (9 d. per lb.)	1,760,080
Pigs - - - -	10,101	7 (98 lbs.)	112,707	704	65 (7 d. per lb.)	46,240
TOTAL IMPORTED FOREIGN ANIMALS }	- -	- -	- -	61,404	- -	4,838,190

SUMMARY.

	Weight in Tons.	Per Cent.
HOME SUPPLY of MEAT - - - -	1,007,351	83·15
FOREIGN ANIMALS in 1872 - - - -	61,404	5·07
FOREIGN DEAD MEAT.—Bacon, Pork, Hams, Beef, and Other Meat in 1872 - - - -	142,374	11·77
TOTAL MEAT SUPPLY - -	1,211,209	100·00
POPULATION of the UNITED KINGDOM, 1871 -	31,609,910	6·99 Imperial stones of meat per head.

Appendix, No. 14.

PAPERS handed in by Mr. Duckham.

COMPARATIVE ESTIMATE of Loss sustained by the STOCKOWNERS of the UNITED KINGDOM from FOOT and MOUTH DISEASE in their Herds and Flocks during the Year 1872. The calculation is based upon the Returns made for the County of Hereford, and the Estimated Loss placed upon those Returns by the Committee of the Herefordshire Chamber of Agriculture, the Losses in that County being considered to represent the average Losses in the Kingdom.

Live Stock in Herefordshire. See Agricultural Returns.	Estimated Loss See Report of Committee.	Live Stock in Great Britain. See Agricultural Returns.	Comparative Estimate of Loss in Great Britain.	Live Stock in Ireland. See Agricultural Returns.	Comparative Estimated Loss in Ireland.	Total Estimated Loss in Great Britain and Ireland.
	£. s. d.		£.		£.	£.
Cattle - - 63,123	93,015 - -	Cattle - 5,824,994	7,543,343	Cattle - 4,957,143	6,659,686	12,603,729
Sheep - - 313,381	37,339 10 -	Sheep - 27,621,597	5,699,661	Sheep - 4,203,117	778,331	6,377,992
Pigs - - 33,697	4,571 10 -	Pigs - 1,771,719	635,293	Pigs - 1,381,366	231,479	686,772
Total estimated loss in Herefordshire, as reported - -	£135,325 - -	Total comparative loss in Great Britain - -	£13,678,297	Total comparative estimate of loss in Ireland - -	£7,669,515	£21,347,812

ESTIMATED VALUE of CATTLE, SHEEP, and PIGS imported into GREAT BRITAIN during the Year 1872, and Comparative Estimated Losses sustained in the UNITED KINGDOM from FOOT and MOUTH DISEASE during the same Year.

	£.		£.
109,502 Oxen and bulls, average value, say 20s. - -	2,190,340	Total estimate of loss sustained by Foot and Mouth Disease in Great Britain and Ireland during the year 1872 - - - - -	13,510,707
36,928 Cows, average value, say 18s. - - -	673,506		
55,468 Calves, average value, say 5s. - - -	2,837,320	Total estimate of value of importations of Live Stock during the year 1872 - - - - -	4,506,552
310,339 Sheep and lambs, average value, say 2s. -	1,621,678		
16,068 Pigs, average value, say 3s. - - -	65,774		
TOTAL - - - £.	4,656,532	TOTAL - - - £.	14,994,125

HEREFORDSHIRE CHAMBER OF AGRICULTURE.

CONTAGIOUS DISEASES (ANIMALS) COMMITTEE.

YOUR Committee have to report that, after due consideration, it was resolved to obtain, as far as possible, the assistance of the highway boards throughout the county to collect information respecting the losses sustained by the stockowners during the past year from contagious diseases amongst their herds and flocks. With this object in view, a circular letter was addressed to the chairman of each highway board, and a similar letter, accompanied by a packet of schedules for distribution, was sent to the waywardens of each parish,

parish, township, or chapelry in the county. The object of the inquiry was explained on the schedules, and a request made that the number of cattle, sheep, and pigs which had been attacked by contagious disease, and the number of each kind that had died from the attack during the year 1873, be given by the owner, and a declaration signed certifying its correctness. It appears that the foot and mouth disease prevailed very generally. A few cases only of pleuro-pneumonia are reported, and those of a doubtful nature.

Whilst your Committee have pleasure in acknowledging the prompt response made to the circular by a large number of stockowners, it is a source of great regret and disappointment that very many who suffered severe losses did not forward returns from some misapprehension on their part as to the object in view.

From the returns, your Committee have appended a summary to this Report, with a carefully-considered estimate of the direct losses sustained. Large as the estimated direct losses are, they by no means represent the full amount of loss sustained, the estimate being based upon the direct loss of butchers' meat, and average depreciation in value during the attack. But in a breeding county such as Herefordshire, in which large herds of pedigree cattle are kept, and many eminent breeders have suffered very severely from the death of first-class animals, which money cannot replace—also from bulls and cows rendered useless for breeding purposes, besides others thrown out of their regular course of breeding or proving barren—it must be apparent that most severe indirect losses have been sustained. With sheep, too, the disease was even more perplexing than with cattle, and were the indirect and consequential losses taken into consideration, the following estimate would be very largely increased.

SUMMARY.

ANIMALS attacked by Foot and Mouth Disease and recovered; also of Animals which died from the Disease, and estimated Loss sustained by the Stockowners of the County of Hereford during the Year 1873, as extracted from the Returns received:—

CATTLE.		Estimated Loss.	
		£.	s. d.
418	Bulls attacked and recovered, say 6l. each	2,508	0 -
9	Bulls died, average value, say 30l. each	270	0 -
8,978	Cows, in milk, attacked and recovered, say 2l. each	20,019	0 -
378	Cows died, average value, say 20l. each	5,560	0 -
4,550	Calves attacked and recovered, say 2l. each	9,100	0 -
1,306	Calves died, average value, say 6l. each	7,836	0 -
8,501	For Cattle attacked and recovered, say 2l. each	802	0 -
33	For Cattle died, average value, say 25l. each	27,845	0 -
13,038	Store Cattle attacked and recovered, say 2l. each	9,237	0 -
131	Store Cattle died, average value, say 17l. each		
34,212		£.	93,015 0 -
SHEEP.			
75,917	Sheep attacked and recovered, say 10s. each	36,958	10 -
1,046	Sheep died, average value, say 3l. each	3,138	0 -
81,966	Lambs attacked and recovered, say 10s. each	16,393	10 -
530	Lambs died, average value, say 30s. each	1,345	10 -
107,789		£.	67,389 10 -
PIGS.			
6,597	Pigs attacked and recovered, say 10s. each	8,248	10 -
1,328	Pigs died, average value, say 30s. each	1,523	0 -
8,925		£.	4,871 10 -
TOTAL LOSS.			
Total Number of Cattle attacked,	34,212;	Estimated Loss in Cattle	93,015 0 -
Ditto - ditto - Sheep - ditto	107,789;	Ditto - ditto - Sheep	67,389 10 -
Ditto - ditto - Pigs - ditto	8,925;	Ditto - ditto - Pigs	4,871 10 -
		£.	155,280 0 -

J. Rankin, Chairman.

Appendix, No. 15.

PAPERS handed in by Mr. Thompson.

— 1. —

STATISTICS OF ABERDEENSHIRE RINDERPEST ASSOCIATION.

	Number of Cattle.	Value.	Proceeds.	Loss.	Total Loss.	Compensation.
		£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.
Died - - - - -	84	013 10 -				
Killed and buried - - -	194	5,033 1 -				
Killed and sold - - - -	500	4,073 17	5,154 17 8	1,817 10 10	4,652 15 6	3,503 8 6
	580	7,916 8 -				

Disease introduced into county 18 times, and attacked cattle on 46 farms.

	£. s. d.
Amount collected by voluntary subscriptions of 1 d. in the pound - - - - -	4,730 - -
	£. s. d.
Watching, advertising, disinfecting, printing, and general expenses - - - -	022 2 7
Compensation for animals which died or were slaughtered - - - - -	3,503 8 6
	4,015 11 1
	£. 804 8 11

A B S T R A C T.

	£. s. d.
Total number of animals which died or were slaughtered, 580; value - -	7,916 8 -
Realised by animals sold - - - - -	5,154 17 8
Net Loss - - - - -	4,563 10 4
Compensation by association - - - - -	3,503 8 6
Amount lost by owners - - - - -	£. 1,370 1 10

— 2. —

LOCAL AUTHORITY OF THE COUNTY OF ABERDEEN.

ABSTRACT STATEMENT as to Outbreaks of PLEURO-PNEUMONIA.

I.—From 14th April to 31st December 1871.

Number of Farms on which Disease appeared.	Description of Animals.	Number of Cattle on Infected Places.	Value of Cattle on Infected Places.	Number of Cattle Slaughtered.	Value of Cattle Slaughtered.
			£. s. d.		£. s. d.
20	Bulls - - - -	12	200 5 -	4	101 - -
—	Cows - - - -	181	3,008 5 -	69	1,382 - -
—	Oxen - - - -	387	6,183 2 -	103	1,910 17 -
—	Heifers - - - -	153	2,335 - -	31	418 - -
—	Calves - - - -	154	949 8 -	95	152 - -
50		887	13,697 - -	207	3,943 17 -
Amount realised by sale of carcasses, hides, &c. - - - -					2,244 0 3
Loss on cattle - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -					1,669 7 4
Amount of compensation paid to owners by local authority - - - - £.					1,161 7 9

II.—For the Year from 31st December 1871 to 31st December 1872.

Number of Farms on which Disease appeared.	Description of Animals.	Number of Cattle on Infected Places.	Value of Cattle on Infected Places.	Number of Cattle Slaughtered.	Value of Cattle Slaughtered.
			£. s. d.		£. s. d.
24	Bulls - - - -	15	345 12 -	5	63 12 -
—	Cows - - - -	212	4,577 17 -	85	1,696 12 -
—	Oxen - - - -	430	8,177 17 -	127	1,900 13 6
—	Heifers - - - -	288	3,831 13 6	66	892 5 -
—	Calves - - - -	160	933 6 -	20	162 7 -
54		1,126	17,906 6 6	313	4,703 9 6
Amount realised by sale of carcasses, hides, &c. - - - -					2,174 2 1½
Loss on cattle - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -					2,831 7 4½
Amount of compensation paid to owners by local authority - - - - £.					1,777 18 -

Appendix, No. 15.

III.—GENERAL ABSTRACT of the foregoing STATEMENTS.

Number of Flows on which Disease appeared.	Description of Animals.	Number of Cattle on Infected Places.	Value of Cattle on Infected Places.	Number of Cattle Slaughtered.	Value of Cattle Slaughtered.
			£. s. d.		£. s. d.
54	Bulls - - -	28	703 17 -	0	184 12 -
—	Cows - - -	403	8,486 2 -	104	2,079 12 -
—	Oxen - - -	537	14,310 19 -	235	3,811 10 6
—	Heifers - - -	411	6,178 13 6	97	1,310 6 -
—	Calves - - -	314	1,925 14 -	55	234 7 -
64		1,993	31,505 5 6	500	8,649 6 6
Amount realised by sale of carcasses, hides, &c. - - - - -					4,418 12 0½
Loss on cattle - - - - -					4,280 14 8½
Amount of compensation paid to owners by local authority - - - £.					2,630 5 0

Aberdeen, 14 April 1873.

Nezall Burnett,
 Clerk of Supply.

Note.—In two cases the returns are slightly incomplete, and in other two the compensation, which is still unsettled, has been estimated.

— 3. —

ABSTRACT of the RECEIPT and EXPENDITURE by the Local Authority of *Aberdeenshire*, of the
 ASSESSMENT leviable from the County for the Year, from 15th May 1872 to 15th May 1873.

Cash from Commissioners of Supply. Assessment for the year is White-Sunday 1873 - - - - -	£. s. d.		1. Balance due to Bank on 15th May 1873 - - - - -	£. s. d.
4,000 - -				374 15 0
			2. Payments to Inspectors:	£. s. d.
			James Thomson, County Inspector, Salary to 15th May 1873 - - - - -	100 - -
			Salary Allowances, for special visits, as County and District Inspector, and travelling expenses - - - - -	227 7 7
			Payments to District Inspectors - - - - -	287 7 7
				608 15 5
			3. Compensation to Owners of Animals slaughtered while affected with Pleuro-Pneumonia - - - - -	1,025 1 -
				1,880 10 1
			4. Miscellaneous Payments:	
			J. D. Milne, Esq., Fiscal, Account for Proceedings under the Act - - - £ 115 5 6	
			Less, Penalties recovered - 50 7 -	
				34 18 6
			Clerk of Supply, for general trouble, agency, and meetings and correspondence with Inspectors, Owners of Diseased Stock, Commissioners of Parish Councils, and Privy Council checking Inspectors' Accounts, attending meetings, examining and checking Compensation Claims, framing Statements thereon, &c. &c. &c. - - -	208 1 -
			Printing, advertising, and incidents - - - - -	63 10 10
			George Macquie, Esq., for Auditing Account of Disbursements of the Local Authority for the year to White-Sunday 1873 - - -	5 5 -
			Portages, carriage of goods, exchange on remittances, &c. - - - - -	10 - 7
				431 15 11
			5. Balance in Bank, at 15th May 1873 - - - - -	336 10 5
£. 4,000 - -				£. 4,000 - -

I N D E X.

ANALYSIS OF INDEX.

LIST of the PRINCIPAL HEADINGS in the following INDEX, with the Pages at which they may be found.

	PAGE		PAGE
Aberdeenshire - - - - -	643	DEAD MEAT:	
Ballinacloe Fair (Ireland) - - - - -	643	1. As to the Import of Dead Meat, in form of	
Colons - - - - -	655	Less Cattle, from Abroad, and from	
		Ireland - - - - -	656
CATTLE PLAGUE:		2. As to the Conveyance of Dead Meat by	
1. Infectious and Incurable Nature of Cattle		Railway from Aberdeen to London, and	
Plague - - - - -	656	from the Ports to the Interior - - - - -	656
2. Spread of the Plague on the Continent - - - - -	656	Dealers and Sellers - - - - -	656
3. Case of the "Joseph Somers" Cargo, at		Deeferd Market (Foreign Cattle) - - - - -	656
the Port of Hull; measures adopted for		Disinfection - - - - -	656
Preventing the Introduction of Cattle		Drogheda (Cattle Ships) - - - - -	656
Plague thereby - - - - -	656		
4. Cases of Cattle Plague in Ireland - - - - -	656	FAIRS AND MARKETS:	
5. Regulations and Restrictions suggested for		1. Spread of Disease by Means of Fairs and	
Application when an Outbreak Occurs - - - - -	657	Markets - - - - -	670
6. Conclusions and Recommendations of the		2. Question of Reducing the Number of	
Committee - - - - -	657	Fairs as a Check to the Spread of	
		Disease - - - - -	670
CATTLE SHIPS:		3. Question of Stopping Fairs and Markets	
1. As to the Accommodation, Ventilation,		for a certain period of the year - - - - -	670
&c., in Cattle Ships generally, and the		4. Inspection - - - - -	670
Improvements required - - - - -	657	5. Disinfection - - - - -	671
2. As to the Cattle Boats from Ireland - - - - -	658	6. Suggestions for Improved Arrangements	
3. Question of Disease being Exaggerated or		and Accommodation, and for the Slaughter	
Provoked on board ship - - - - -	658	of Diseased Animals - - - - -	671
4. Disinfection - - - - -	659	Farmers - - - - -	671
5. Advantages of Vessels for Cattle exclusively		Fines and Penalties - - - - -	675
6. Inspection - - - - -	660		
Central Chamber of Agriculture - - - - -	660	FEET AND MOUTH DISEASE:	
Cheshire - - - - -	660	I. Introduction and Origin of the Disease:	
		1. Question as to the Introduction of	
COMPENSATION (COMPULSORY SLAUGHTER):		the Disease from Abroad - - - - -	676
1. Concurrence of Evidence as to the Ex-		2. First Outbreak of the Disease in	
pectancy of Compensation for Diseased		1839 - - - - -	677
Animals Slaughtered - - - - -	662	3. Several Outbreaks since 1839 - - - - -	677
2. Suggestions as to the Amount of Com-		4. Question of Spontaneous Origination	
pensation - - - - -	663		677
3. Sources whence Compensation should be		II. Character and Treatment of the Disease:	
Defrayed - - - - -	664	1. Exceedingly Infectious Nature of the	
4. Obstacles to Compensation as a very		Disease - - - - -	678
large scale - - - - -	664	2. Liability of the Same Animals to	
5. Conclusions and Recommendations of the		Several Attacks - - - - -	678
Committee - - - - -	665	3. Several kinds of Animals to which	
Cruelty (Shipment and Landing of Cattle)		the Disease may be Conveyed - - - - -	678
Dairies - - - - -	665	4. Period of Incubation - - - - -	679
		5. Treatment - - - - -	679

	PAGE
FOOT AND MOUTH DISEASE—continued.	
III. Conveyance of the Disease between Ireland and England and Scotland - - -	679
IV. Mortality from the Disease - - -	680
V. Deterioration and Pecuniary Loss; immense Sacrifice involved - - -	680
VI. Effect of the Act of 1869, and of the Cattle Plague restrictions, as regards the Amount of Disease - - -	681
VII. Suggestions on the Score of Isolation, Stoppage of Movement, Compulsory Slaughter, &c. - - -	681
VIII. Objections to Stringent Regulations - - -	682
IX. Conclusions and Recommendations of the Committee - - -	683
FOREIGN CATTLE:	
1. State of the Law as to Foreign Import previously to the Act of 1869 - - -	683
2. Regulations under the Act of 1869, as to Import from Scheduled Countries - - -	684
3. Amount of Import; prospect of Increase or Decrease - - -	684
4. Import of Disease with Foreign Cattle - - -	684
5. Increased Price of Cattle and of Meat on the Continent - - -	685
6. Expediency of International Regulations for the prompt Suppression of Disease in Foreign Cattle - - -	685
7. Conflicting Evidence upon the question of Slaughter at the Port of Arrival in England - - -	685
8. Suggested Return of Diseased Store Stock to the Exporting Country - - -	686
9. Other Details and Suggestions on various points - - -	686
10. Recommended Maintenance of the Provisions of the Act of 1869 - - -	686
<i>Forfeiture</i> - - - - -	687
<i>Glanders</i> - - - - -	690
<i>Horseflesh</i> - - - - -	693
<i>Holland</i> - - - - -	693
HULL:	
1. Representations as to the Want of Improved Accommodation and Improved Regulations at the Port of Hull - - -	694
2. Explanations submitted on the part of the Local Authority - - -	694
<i>Inflated Prices</i> - - - - -	695
<i>Isolation</i> - - - - -	696
INSPECTION:	
1. Functions and Remuneration of the two Chief Inspectors attached to the Central Department - - -	696
2. Functions and mode of Payment of the Veterinary Inspectors at the Ports; increased Staff required - - -	696

	PAGE
INSPECTION—continued.	
3. Large Number of Local Inspectors; mode of Payment of these - - -	696
4. Proposals for a Large Extension of the System of Central or Government Inspection, aided by a County or Local Inspection - - -	696
5. Suggested Inspection of Premises in the neighbourhood of Disease - - -	697
6. Character of the Inspection in Ireland; amendment required - - -	697
7. Question of Inspection at the Port of Shipment in Ireland, or at the Port of Arrival in England - - -	697
8. Exceptions taken to any System of Inspection - - -	698
9. Recommendations by the Committee - - -	698
IRELAND, AND IRISH CATTLE:	
I. Foot and Mouth Disease:	
1. Amount of Disease in the Country at different periods - - -	699
2. Conveyance of the Disease between Ireland and Great Britain - - -	699
3. Estimated Loss from the Disease in 1872 - - -	700
4. Regulations and Restrictions in operation - - -	700
5. Scheme of Professor Baldwin for Stamping-out the Disease, by stopping Fairs and Markets, and by preventing Movement of Cattle for two months in the year - - -	700
6. Sundry Objections to the foregoing Restrictions - - -	701
7. Suggested Removal of all Restrictions - - -	701
II. Pleuro-pneumonia - - -	702
III. Large Annual Loss from preventable Diseases - - -	702
IV. Source of Payment of Inspection, Compensation, &c. - - -	703
V. Duty of the Constabulary in reference to Cattle Disease - - -	703
VI. Amount of Export from Ireland to Great Britain; Statistics on the subject - - -	703
VII. General Condition of Irish Cattle sent to England - - -	703
VIII. Question of imposing Restrictions in the shape of Slaughtering, Detention, &c., at the Port of Arrival in England - - -	703
IX. Expediency of similar Restrictions generally in Ireland as in England - - -	704
X. Import of Foreign Cattle to Ireland - - -	704
XI. Model Agricultural Schools - - -	704
XII. Sundry Details and Suggestions on various points - - -	705
XIII. Returns and Statistics of Diseases - - -	705
XIV. Conclusions and Recommendations of the Committee - - -	705
<i>Lairs</i> - - - - -	707
<i>Licenses (Cattle Dealers, &c.)</i> - - -	709
<i>Liverpool</i> - - - - -	710

LOCAL AUTHORITIES:	PAGE	RAILWAYS (CATTLE TRUCKS):	PAGE
1. <i>Action of the Local Authorities under the Act of 1869</i> - - - - -	710	1. <i>Existing Accommodation and Arrangements as to Transit by Railway</i> - - -	727
2. <i>Evidence of a Reduction in the Number of Local Authorities, and of Uniformity of Action on their part</i> - - -	711	2. <i>Suggestions for the Adoption of an Improved System</i> - - - - -	727
<i>London, Part of</i> - - - - -	712	<i>Reports and Statistics (Cattle Plague)</i> - - -	728
<i>Lost from Disease</i> - - - - -	713	<i>Russia</i> - - - - -	731
<i>Meat (Diseased Animals)</i> - - - - -	713	<i>Schleswig-Holstein</i> - - - - -	731
<i>Meat Supply</i> - - - - -	713	<i>Scotland</i> - - - - -	731
<i>Metropolitan Cattle Market</i> - - - - -	714		
		SHEEP:	
MOVEMENT OF CATTLE:		1. <i>Foot and Mouth Disease</i> - - - - -	732
1. <i>Generally as to the Restrictions to be applied to Movement when Disease breaks out</i> - - - - -	716	2. <i>Sheep-pox</i> - - - - -	733
2. <i>Foot and Mouth Disease</i> - - - - -	717	3. <i>Sheep Scab</i> - - - - -	733
3. <i>Pleuro-pneumonia</i> - - - - -	717	4. <i>Restrictions upon Foreign Import generally</i> - - -	733
<i>Norfolk</i> - - - - -	718	5. <i>Sheep-breeding in Ireland and Scotland</i> - - -	733
		<i>Slaughter (Diseased Cattle)</i> - - - - -	738
PLEURO-PNEUMONIA:		<i>Spain and Portugal</i> - - - - -	739
1. <i>Source of Introduction of Pleuro-pneumonia</i> - - - - -	720	<i>Statistics</i> - - - - -	740
2. <i>Infectious or Contagious Nature of the Disease</i> - - - - -	721	<i>Store Cattle</i> - - - - -	741
3. <i>Period of Incubation</i> - - - - -	721		
4. <i>Treatment</i> - - - - -	721	VETERINARY DEPARTMENTS:	
5. <i>Mortality from the Disease</i> - - - - -	721	I. <i>England:</i>	
6. <i>Suggestions on the Score of Compulsory Slaughter</i> - - - - -	722	1. <i>Staff of the Department, and Duties discharged</i> - - - - -	745
7. <i>Suggestions on the Score of Isolation</i> - - - - -	723	2. <i>Salaries and Expenses</i> - - - - -	747
8. <i>Other Details and Suggestions generally</i> - - - - -	723	3. <i>Question of Transfer to the Local Government Board</i> - - - - -	747
9. <i>Conclusions of the Committee</i> - - - - -	723		
<i>Police</i> - - - - -	723	II. <i>Ireland:</i>	
<i>Ports (Foreign Cattle)</i> - - - - -	724	1. <i>Staff of the Department, and Duties discharged</i> - - - - -	748
<i>Prices</i> - - - - -	724	2. <i>Salaries and Expenses</i> - - - - -	748
<i>Privy Council</i> - - - - -	725		
<i>Publicity</i> - - - - -	725	III. <i>Conclusion of the Committee adverse to any change in the Constitution of the Department</i> - - - - -	748
<i>Quarantine</i> - - - - -	725	<i>Watering of Cattle (Railway Transit)</i> - - -	749
		<i>Wiltshire</i> - - - - -	750

I N D E X.

[*N.B.*—In this Index the Figures following the Names of the Witnesses refer to the Questions in the Evidence; those following App. to the Pages in the Appendix; and the Numerals following Rep. to the Pages in the Report.]

A.

ABATTOIRS (LONDON). Opinion that abattoirs in London would be better than private slaughterhouses, *Sinonds* 3101-3103.—*See also Slaughter-houses.*

ABERDEENSHIRE :

Statement of the duties imposed upon witness, and the salary of his office, as veterinary surgeon and principal inspector for the local authority in Aberdeenshire, *Thomson* 11169, 11170, 11369-11384.—Explanations in reference to the statistics of the Rinderpest Association of the county, of which witness is inspector, *ib.* 11171-11188.—Method adopted in disinfecting a farm upon which cattle plague had appeared, *ib.* 11187-11190.

Examination as to the prevalence of foot and mouth disease in Aberdeenshire and the loss therefrom during the last few years; the present freedom from this disease in the county is owing mainly to the stringency of the regulations which have been adopted, *Thomson* 11191-11211, 11217-11224, 11232-11234, 11476-11493, 11508, 11509.—Conclusion that the foot and mouth disease and pleuro-pneumonia were brought into the county by Irish cattle, *ib.* 11212-11216, 11310-11327, 11417-11425, 11471-11475, 11494-11498.

Explanation as to the rules and regulations in force in Aberdeenshire as regards foot and mouth disease; expediency of all local authorities being compelled to adopt the present regulations instead of making rules for themselves, *Thomson* 11225-11227, 11248, 11249.—Examination with regard to pleuro-pneumonia and the regulations with reference to that disease in Aberdeenshire; expediency of slaughtering the infected animals and isolating the remainder, *ib.* 11228-11231, 11250-11266, 11272-11281, 11328-11331, 11456, 11457, 11532.—Returns showing the numbers of cattle slaughtered upon certain farms, and the results as regards the cessation of disease, *ib.* 11291-11309.

Information as to the different local authorities of Aberdeenshire; satisfactory manner in which the county and borough authorities work together, *Thomson* 11332-11339, 11430-11433.—Absence of complaints with regard to the transit of live cattle from Aberdeen to London on the part of the dealers and butchers; desire for a speedier rather than an improved mode of transit, *ib.* 11345-11361, 11399-11406.—Particulars relative to a German establishment in Aberdeen for the manufacture of sausages, *ib.* 11361-11368.—The transport by sea of live cattle from Aberdeen to London is about one-fourth of the whole amount sent from the county, *ib.* 11385-11391.

Statement that the amount levied last year in Aberdeenshire for the purpose of working the Act of 1869 was 4,000 L.; return showing the expenses from 15th May 1872 to 15th May 1873, *Thomson* 11426-11429.—Evidence in support of the opinion that pleuro-pneumonia has been brought into Aberdeenshire from Ireland; reference hereto to the decreased import from Holland, *ib.* 11461-11470, 11510-11531.

Conclusion that the Aberdeenshire regulations for suppressing disease would be the most effectual and the most economical for general adoption; expediency of this system being adopted throughout the kingdom, *Goodlet* 11678-11685.

Statistics of the Aberdeenshire Rinderpest Association, showing the losses of cattle from the disease, the value represented thereby, and the amount of compensation paid by the association, *App.* 631.

Abstract statements as to outbreaks of pleuro-pneumonia for the period from 14th April to 31st December 1871, and for the year 1872, *App.* 637, 638.

ABERDEENSHIRE—continued.

Abstract of the receipts and expenditure by the local authority in Aberdeenshire in respect of the assessment leviable from the county for the year, from 15th May 1872 to 15th May 1873, showing the expenditure on account of cattle diseases, *App.* 838.

See also *Dead Meat*, 2.

Abortion (Foot and Mouth Disease). Injurious effect of the foot and mouth disease in causing abortion, more especially among the higher class of breeding stock; this does not apply to sheep, *Brown* 1392. 1908, 1909.—Serious extent to which abortion or barrenness is caused by the foot and mouth disease, *Stretton* 4513. 4751.—Considerable abortion resulting from the disease in the case both of sheep and cattle, *Fisher* 5145-5147.—Instances of cows aborting as an effect of the disease, *Morris* 5510.

Annual Reports (Veterinary Department). Obstacle to a yearly report being issued before the month of March, *Williams* 578, 679.—Advantage of an annual report including the veterinary inspectors' reports, *ib.* 679-681.—Difficulty as to an annual report on the score of expense; witness has long been desirous for an annual report, *ib.* 681. 701-703.

Recommendation by the Committee that annual reports be prepared by the secretary and inspectors of the central department, and laid before Parliament early in each year, *Rep.* v.

Aptian Disease. This disease is merely foot and mouth disease under another name, *Ferguson* 5544.

Australia (Foot and Mouth Disease). Instance of exportation of the foot and mouth disease to the Australian colonies from this country, *Duckham* 9893-9897.

See also *New South Wales*.

Australian Preserved Meat. Considerable diminution in the importation of Australian preserved meat in the last few months; opinion that the prospects of this trade are very bad at the present time, *Clarke* 8737-8743.

Austria. Constant liability to cattle plague in Austria, though it is less indigenous there than in Russia, *Williams* 185-189.—Much larger import than export of cattle in the case of Austria, *ib.* 896-900.—The importation of cattle into England from Austria, which used to be very considerable, has altogether fallen off, *Robinson* 10578.

Aylesbury. Information respecting an outbreak of foot and mouth disease in the district of Aylesbury in the year 1869, *Legger* 10781-10789. 10849-10852.

B.

Baldwin, Professor Thomas. (Analysis of his Evidence.)—Has been for eight years Superintendent of the Model Farms and Agricultural Schools of the Board of Education in Ireland, and has in other official capacities had considerable experience in reference to cattle diseases, 3766-3777.—There are about 200 model schools throughout the country, 3767, 3768.

Belief that both pleuro-pneumonia and foot and mouth disease are infectious, 3778, 3779.—Various forms in which witness has communicated the foot and mouth disease to healthy animals; particulars of experiments on the subject, 3780, 3781. 3784-3797.—Instances of the disease having been communicated by streams running from an infected to an uninfected farm, 3782, 3783. 3791.—Estimate of from 5 to 10 per cent. of the animals experimented upon by witness as impervious to infection, 3786-3789.

Means of propagating the foot and mouth disease by clothes; opinion that it is not so propagated ordinarily, 3792-3794.—Instance of the disease not having been communicated by a person who had been through infected herds in England and had then gone through herds in Ireland, 3794-3797.—Short distance for which the foot and mouth disease is conveyed through the air, 3798-3800.—Statement as to the disease having been propagated on Glasheen farm by the drainage water from land on which there were diseased cattle, 3799. 3926.

Proposition that all fairs and markets in Ireland for the sale of store stock be closed for six weeks or two months after the May fairs, as a means of destroying the foot and mouth disease, 3801-3811.—Belief that the disease or poison is a short-lived one, 3804-3806.—Absence of necessity for interfering with fat cattle, which do but little mischief, 3807-3809.—Expected co-operation on the part of stock-owners as regards the closing of all fairs for a time, 3811. 3833.—Suggestion that all animals subsequently showing the disease should be killed, the owners being compensated, 3812-3816.—Comparatively small cost involved in the compensation of owners for all animals killed, 3816, 3880, 3881.

Estimated

Baldwin, Professor Thomas. (Analysis of his Evidence)—continued.

Estimated loss of from 2,000,000 l. to 3,000,000 l. annually, from preventible diseases in Ireland; data for this calculation, 3817-3826, 3881.—Dissent from the view that foot and mouth disease is generated in ships crossing the Channel; belief that it is entirely of foreign origin, 3827-3832.—Statement as to diseased animals having never been imported from Spain or Portugal, 3830, 3831, 3849, 3850.—Opinion that the foot and mouth disease may be stamped out, although it has taken deep root in the country, 3832, 3833.—Strong objection to a proposal that Irish cattle discovered with disease in England should be sent back to Ireland, 3834-3837.

Grounds for the conclusion, as far as regards pleuro-pneumonia, that the poison of the disease is propagated by the breath, and not in any other way; experiments hereon adverted to, 3839-3848. 3865-3867, 3979-3983.—Varying period from seventeen to forty-four days for the incubation of pleuro-pneumonia, 3842-3846.—Liability of old dairy cows to the disease, 3847, 3852.—Less serious loss in Ireland from pleuro-pneumonia than from foot and mouth disease, 3852.

Proposition that every animal under the influence of pleuro-pneumonia be killed, and that adequate compensation be given to the owner, 3853-3864. 3870-3874, 3880, 4024-4028.—Death of fully 60 per cent. of the animals attacked with pleuro-pneumonia, 3856-3859.—Question considered whether the principle of self-interest would not be destroyed if the full value of the animals killed were given to the owners; advocacy nevertheless of full compensation, 3862-3864. 3886-3890.—Absence of the disease in the breeding districts, 3865.—Statement as to the market in Dublin being a hotbed of disease for the provinces, 3865, 4016.

Exemption of the public model farms from pleuro-pneumonia, except Glasnevin, 3865-3867.—Data for the conclusion that inoculation is useless as a means of getting rid of the disease, 3868, 3869.—Expediency of a centralised system of dealing with the disease rather than a localised system; failure of the latter in England, 3870-3875, 3879-4054-4058. 4062-4064. 4159-4168.—Conclusions as to the inadequacy of the Irish Veterinary Department, or of any system of inspection, as a means of keeping down cattle diseases, 3876-3882. 4054-4056.—Statement as to there having been from 15,000 to 20,000 centres of foot and mouth disease in Ireland in 1872; 3880, 4016, 4184.—Absence of sheep-pox in Ireland, 3883-3885.

Further statement as regards foot and mouth disease, that the movement of store cattle, as well as the holding of fairs, should be prevented for six weeks or two months, 3900-3916.—Existence of the foot and mouth disease in Ireland for the last thirty years; it was worse in 1872 than in any previous year, 3917, 3918, 4006.—Great decrease of the disease some few years ago, until it was re-imported, 3919.—Duty of owners to report to the police any outbreak of the disease, and to restrain any movement of cattle from the land; liability to fines for breach of these regulations, 3920-3926.—Advantage if cases went before paid magistrates, 3925, 3929.—Conclusion that under witness' scheme there would be no failure or difficulty as to the farmer reporting to the police, 3927-3932.

Very small staff required in connection with cases of pleuro-pneumonia, 3933-3936.—Introduction of pleuro-pneumonia into Glasnevin by cattle purchased at different fairs, 3938-3941.

Examination as to the data upon which witness estimates a loss of 1,500,000 l. in 1872 on account of the foot and mouth disease, though as a rule the disease does not kill; serious loss on the score of milk, the condition of the animals, &c., 3942-3974. 4065-4086.—Indirect way in which the disease may be propagated on board ship, 3975-3977.—Witness does not profess any scientific knowledge of cattle diseases, 3986-3989.—He is convinced that foot and mouth disease is of foreign origin, 3990, 3991.—Several animals to which the disease may be communicated; belief that hares and rabbits are among the number, 3992-3996.—Doubt as to the disease being often propagated by means of running water, 3997, 3998.

Dissent from the view of the Veterinary Department that in May and June 1871 there was no foot and mouth disease in Ireland, 3999, 4000.—Opinion that it is quite possible to get rid of the cattle plague by the means adopted for the purpose in England, 4001-4004.—Statement as to home-bred stock not being so liable as purchased stock to pleuro-pneumonia, though they are equally liable to foot and mouth disease, 4007-4013.—Greater liability to the spread of pleuro-pneumonia when an infected animal is with others on board ship than when it is in a field, 4014-4018.

Inefficiency of the Parliamentary limit of twenty-eight days as regards places infected with pleuro-pneumonia, 4019-4021.—Opinion as to the expediency of burying the carcasses of infected animals, though witness considers it very improbable that the dead animals can convey infection, 4022-4028.—Belief that the importation of diseases cannot be excluded by quarantine and inspection, 4029, 4030.—Advocacy of a system whereby the animals should be killed before shipment and imported as dead meat, 4031-4039.

Bullfinch, Professor Thomas. (Analysis of his Evidence)—continued.

Evidence to the effect that, as regards compensation, the justice of the case would be met by giving the farmer two-thirds of the value of each infected animal killed, and the full value of each animal in the first stage of infection, 4049-4053.—Payment of compensation in Ireland out of a public rate levied on the union, 4059.—Liability to a large proportion of disease in Norfolk, the stock being chiefly purchased, and not bred at home, 4060, 4061.—Severe foot and mouth disease last year in the case of sheep, 4067-4070.

Inadequacy of the system of inspection at Ballinasloe fair, 4087-4091. 4148-4150.—Impracticability of properly cleansing the trucks at Ballinasloe; an order on this subject has not been put into execution, 4092-4098. 4102, 4103. 4158-4161.—Very indifferent condition of the lairs and landing places around London, 4097-4103.—Explanation that witnesses would prohibit absolutely the movement of store cattle in Ireland during the period proposed for closing fairs, in order to extirpate the foot and mouth disease; fat cattle might be moved, but not without a license, nor without being branded, 4104-4105.—Undue number of jobbers in Ireland, 4108-4112.

Opinion that the importation of store stock into England may well be prohibited, and that meat should only come in as dead meat, 4126-4128.—Belief that foot and mouth disease is not carried by the wind, 4199-4201.—Conclusion that the agriculturists have not recouped themselves in the increased price of milk and meat for the loss sustained by cattle diseases; loss also to the public in being supplied with bad milk and bad meat, 4138-4140.—Interest of the public in giving adequate compensation for infected animals slaughtered; interest on the score of price as well as of quality, 4135-4141.

Conclusion as to the inadequacy of inspection at the port of embarkation in Ireland, or the port of arrival in England, as a means of preventing the spread of disease, 4142-4150. 4157.—Witness repeats that the most effectual plan is to stamp out the disease in Ireland, and that the farmers generally would approve of the means proposed by witnesses for the purpose, 4153-4157.—Belief that few of the inspectors themselves place much faith in inspection, 4157.

Expediency of some steps being taken towards disinfecting the tracks at Ballinasloe, though the difficulties are great, 4158-4161.—Statement as to some of the original orders for dealing with outbreaks of foot and mouth disease having been in advance of the time, 4162-4168.—Large export of fat stock from Ireland to England, 4169.—Result of the investigations of witnesses that pleuro-pneumonia and foot and mouth disease are of foreign origin and are not generated in Ireland, 4171-4191.—Far too many fairs in Ireland, restriction being advisable on sanitary grounds, 4184-4188.

Concurrence in the view that a systematic and scientific inquiry into the causes of cattle diseases is much to be desired, 4185-4192.—Further advocacy of a system of slaughter of cattle affected with pleuro-pneumonia, as well as of those animals in contact with diseased ones, 4193-4197.—Expediency of the compensation never exceeding the proper value of the animal killed, 4194.—Great fluctuation in the amount of foot and mouth disease, there being climatic and other modifying causes which legislation cannot touch, 4198-4204.

Expectation that by improved refrigeration, &c., dead meat may in course of time be much more extensively imported into England, 4205-4211.—Defence of the placing of some restriction, as by a license, upon small jobbers in Ireland of the farming class, 4212-4218. 4221-4224.—Objection to insisting upon the cattle from Ireland to England going as dead meat, though if the meat supply could come successfully in this shape generally it would be very desirable, 4218-4220.

Witness further advocates the closing of all fairs and markets in Ireland, and all transit of store stock, for six weeks, as a means of stamping out the foot and mouth disease; slaughter should be applied to any case that arose in spite of these restrictions, 4225-4241. 4293-4298.—Belief that the farmers would now approve of the proposed remedies; that is, if adequate compensation be awarded, 4233-4235. 4239, 4240. 4298.

Grounds for the conclusion as to the liability of hares and rabbits to be attacked with foot and mouth disease, 4242-4246. 4251-4253.—Concentration of disease in the dairies in Dublin, London, and other large towns, 4247-4250.—Relative accommodation on board the Irish cattle boats and the Spanish cattle boats; very defective ventilation in the former, 4254-4259. 4266-4270.

Examination to the effect that notwithstanding legislative restrictions in Ireland the foot and mouth disease was probably worse in 1872 than when there was no legislation on the subject, 4271-4285.—Further calculation as to the loss on the score of milk, &c., when there is an outbreak of foot and mouth disease, 4286-4292.—Explanation that in compensating for slaughtered animals, where there is pleuro-pneumonia, the value of the herd should be taken as that after the outbreak of the disease, 4299-4302.

[Second

Report, 1873—continued.

Baldwin, Professor Thomas. (Analysis of his Evidence)—continued.

[Second Examination.]—Statement that there is an agricultural school under witness in every county in Ireland, except Wexford, there being about 200 schools altogether, 4342-4346.—Practice of witness as to visiting the schools, and as to attending fairs and markets, so that he is brought much in contact with the farming class, 4347-4352.—Very small movement of cattle in Ireland, save in connection with fairs and markets, 4353-4357.

Witness further submits that much evil arises from jobbers, as regards the spread of cattle disease, and that this class should be licensed, 4358-4369.—Admission that many farmers are indifferent or are opposed to legislation as regards foot and mouth disease, these views have reference, however, to the present regulations, which are vexatious without being efficacious, 4364-4368. 4419-4420.—Conviction of witness that foot and mouth disease and pleuro-pneumonia are produced by infection only; examination hereon as to the various forms in which the infection may be conveyed, 4369. 4379-4383. 4410-4418. 4431. 4444-4446. 4497. 4498.

Repetition of arguments in favour of stopping all movement of store cattle, and closing all fairs for six weeks or two months; this would be necessary only once, and not yearly, 4369-4378. 4408 *et seq.*—Explanation as to the different modes in which foot and mouth disease may have been conveyed to the colonies; principle of infection necessarily involved, 4380-4383. 4415. 4416. 4497.—Grounds for the conclusion that no disease has been imported into Ireland from Spain or Portugal, 4394-4400.—Inefficiency of inspection further adverted to, 4401. 4465.—As to quarantine, witness is totally opposed to it, 4402.

Opinion that there is no large import of calves from England into Ireland, 4403-4407.—Advantage of applying witness' scheme to England as well as Ireland, though he has not considered the circumstances of the former country, 4408-4410.—Descent from the views of Professor Brown and other authorities as to the impossibility of stamping out the foot and mouth disease, 4410-4413.—Explanation that slaughtering should not be applied till after the disease had been stamped out; it should then be put upon the same basis as the cattle plague, 4411. 4416-4418. 4493-4498. 4447.

Suggestions for the employment of the constabulary as an effectual machinery for dealing with any outbreak of foot and mouth disease after all movement has been stopped for a certain period, 4423-4431.—Facility with which a case of cattle plague was stamped out at Enfield, in Month, as soon as it was discovered, 4431. 4474-4476.—Belief that no serious difficulty would be experienced in stopping, through the constabulary, all private sales and all movement during the months of June and July, 4439-4442.

Very limited extent to which infection might still be conveyed by running water, all movement of cattle being prohibited, 4443-4446.—Approval of June and July as the months in which to stop all movement, although in England the disease has been most prevalent in the autumn months, 4448-4450.—Opinion that the best treatment for pleuro-pneumonia is to give the animals plenty of water and to leave them alone, 4451-4463.

Belief as to large numbers of cattle and of sheep from Ballinacree fair having died from disease, 4454-4460.—Expediency of Professor Ferguson being well paid, and of his devoting all his time to the duties of the veterinary department; testimony to his efficient services, 4481.—Opinion that there is no real inspection in Ireland; estimate of from 10 to 20 per cent. of the cases as not reported, 4482-4479.

Impression that the large towns in England might be well supplied with meat, even though all foreign cattle were slaughtered at the port of landing, 4471-4473.—Anticipated failure of any legislation which does not proceed upon the basis of adequate compensation for animals slaughtered on the score of disease, 4477-4480.—Necessity of the administration of the law being in the hands of experts rather than of magistrates, 4481.

Practice of Irish jobbers as to buying diseased stock and sending it to England, 4482-4484.—Belief as to the inaccuracy of a return prepared by Professor Ferguson which states that only ten animals were slaughtered on account of pleuro-pneumonia in the Dublin dairies, 4485-4491.

Further expression of the opinion that the farmers of Ireland would support the measures proposed by witness, though they disapprove of existing restrictions, 4493-4494.—Respects in which the restrictions in England in reference to the cattle plague were at first very deficient; good results when they were sufficiently stringent, 4495. 4496.—Information relative to the origin of an attack of foot and mouth disease in Lambay Island; also on some enclosed land to which outside cattle had no access, 4497. 4498.

[Third Examination.] Explanation of an alternative scheme to that given in the previous evidence of witness; suggestions for dividing the country into police districts, and for carrying out the scheme of closing fairs and markets in the infected districts only, 4499-4506.

Report, 1873—continued.

Baldwin, Professor. Paper submitted by Professor Baldwin containing suggestions for an enactment to relieve Ireland of the loss now entailed by pleuro-pneumonia and foot and mouth disease, and to protect Great Britain from the exportation from Ireland of animals affected with these diseases, *App.* 592-595.

Ballinasloe Fair (Ireland). Entire inadequacy of the system of inspection at Ballinasloe fair; large number of infected animals at the fair in 1872, *Baldwin* 4087-4091. 4148-4150.—Impracticability of properly cleansing the trucks at Ballinasloe; an order on this subject has not been put into execution, *ib.* 4092-4095. 4102, 4103. 4158-4161.—Expediency of some steps being taken towards disinfecting the trucks at Ballinasloe, though the difficulties are great, *ib.* 4158-4161.—Belief as to large numbers of cattle and of sheep from Ballinasloe fair having died from disease, *ib.* 4454-4460.

Impracticability of inspecting all the animals going to Ballinasloe, *Ferguson* 4883.—The only course is to seize the diseased animals and to fine the owners, *ib.*—Great difficulty in preventing the spread of disease from animals sent to the fair; inexpediency of stopping the fair, *ib.* 4936-4941.

Statement with further reference to the number of animals with foot and mouth disease at Ballinasloe fair in the autumn of 1872, although there is a prohibition upon the movement of such animals, *Ferguson* 5408-5411.—Statement that the sheep at the last Ballinasloe fair were suffering from sheep rot and not from foot and mouth disease, *ib.* 5589-5595.

Considerable loss last year in Ireland from foot and mouth disease; opinion that this loss was caused by the cattle from Ballinasloe fair spreading the disease throughout the country, *Garnett* 6634, 6635. 6645-6652.

Instance of a black-faced ewe that was diseased when it was exhibited at Ballinasloe; probability of this disease having been imported from Scotland with the sheep, *Ferdon* 7952, 7953. 8017-8023.—Contradiction of a statement by Mr. Jenkins that Ballinasloe is a starting point from which to trace disease to England, *ib.* 7969-7971.

Bercley, Mr. Provisions suggested by Mr. Bercley for discovering and dealing with cattle plague, pleuro-pneumonia, and sheep pox, *App.* 587.

Belfast. Statement that the Belfast steamers are more suitable for the conveyance of cattle upon deck than those belonging to the Drogheda Company, *O'Neill* 6893-6899.

Belgium. Order in July 1872 relaxing the restrictions on cattle from Belgium and France, *Williams* 153, 154.—Much larger import than export of cattle by Belgium in 1870, *ib.* 892-895.

Bolton, William. (Analysis of his Evidence.)—Is Chairman of the Limerick and Clare Farmers' Club; is largely engaged in farming operations, 7278-7282. 7543-7550.—Examination as to the experience of witness as regard to foot and mouth disease; belief that the disease may be spontaneously generated, 7286-7291. 7300, 7301. 7378, 7379. 7412-7421. 7579-7585. 7652.

Contention that bad treatment of cattle as regards food and cleanliness will lead to attacks of pleuro-pneumonia, 7292. 7380-7382.—Circumstances under which pleuro-pneumonia has broken out in dairy stock owned by witness; opinion that the only treatment for that disease should be slaughter of the infected animals and isolation of the rest, 7293-7296. 7341-7343. 7360-7364. 7390. 7438-7449. 7653.

Disapproval of Professor Baldwin's suggestion for shutting up fairs and markets during the months of June and July; opinion that such a course would be ruinous to the Irish cattle trade, 7297-7299. 7330-7332. 7630.—Necessity for stringently carrying out the law as regards restrictions for preventing the spread of foot and mouth disease; expediency of more vigilance on the part of the police, 7302-7306. 7320, 7331. 7356, 7397. 7416-7421. 7478-7490. 7586-7600.—Instances of want of vigilance on the part of the police in permitting the removal of cattle affected with disease to the Limerick Market, 7395-7398. 7601-7604.

Expediency of instituting a cattle insurance company guaranteed by the Government; belief that such a company would not induce the farmers to be indifferent as to the health of their cattle, 7321, 7322. 7422-7437.—Calculation that the loss from foot and mouth disease in dairy cattle is 4 £ per cow, 7323. 7551, 7552.

Filthy state in which steamers and railway trucks for the carriage of cattle are allowed to remain; necessity of stringent regulations to prevent this, 7324-7327. 7339, 7340. 7344. 7517-7549. 7555, 7556.—Opinion that foot and mouth disease has no effect on the quality of the animal when slaughtered, 7327.

Statement that the crossing of Irish cattle with higher breeds has had the effect of weakening their constitutions, 7328, 7329. 7606, 7607.—Increasing character of the Irish cattle trade; large quantities of store cattle sent to the English market, 7323-7328. 7349-7354.

Objection

Belter, William. (Analysis of his Evidence)—continued.

Objection to the removal of foot and mouth disease out of the operation of the Act; opinion that the disease will die out in consequence of the restrictions which have been imposed, 7345-7347. 7477.—Belief that the losses from foot and mouth disease have been very nearly equal to the losses from pleuro-pneumonia, 7347.

Contention that the payment of full compensation to the farmers for compulsory slaughter would not induce recklessness as to disease, 7365-7370. 7391, 7394. 7442.—Evidence in favour of inoculation as a preventive of pleuro-pneumonia; description of the method advocated, 7371-7377. 7451-7476. 7608-7618.

Statement that the magistrates in Ireland are too lenient in imposing penalties for breaches of the law relating to cattle diseases, 7398-7401. 7587, 7588. 7641, 7642.—Dispositions on the part of farmers to conceal pleuro-pneumonia and not to conceal foot and mouth disease; reasons for this, 7403-7411.—Description of the symptoms of pleuro-pneumonia when it first attacks cattle, 7450. 7474-7476.

Mode of treatment of pleuro-pneumonia by the farmers in witness' district; sale of diseased animals to inferior butchers, 7491-7505. 7572-7574.—Further examination as to the compensation to be allowed for compulsory slaughter; opinion that no allowance should be made for the carcass, but that it should be bled, skinned, &c., 7506-7515.

Instance of an animal which would have died of pleuro-pneumonia being exhibited in a butcher's shop in Limerick, and marked "First Prize," 7509. 7601-7603.—Confirmation of the opinion that cows produce more butter and milk after having had foot and mouth disease, 7553-7555.

Resolution of the grand jury of the county of Limerick condemning the present restrictions and Orders in Council relating to the foot and mouth disease; disagreement of witness with this resolution, 7556-7564. 7619.—Inexpediency of leaving the repression of cattle diseases in the hands of the cattle dealers and the proprietors in Ireland, 7569-7571.

Further opinion as to the expediency of stringently carrying out the regulations as regards foot and mouth disease; possibility, however, of animals getting into a fair, notwithstanding the stringency of the regulations, 7620-7629. 7631-7640. 7643-7651.

Breeding Stock. Doubt as to the foot and mouth disease discouraging the production of breeding stock rather than of fat stock, *Brown* 2836, 2837. 2858-2868.—Greater risk of loss from disease in the case of a breeding stock than of a fattening stock, *Fisher* 5266-5271.—See also *Cattle*. *Store Cattle*.

Bristol. Frequent import of the foot and mouth disease from Ireland to the port of Bristol, whilst the local authorities have no facilities for detaining and isolating diseased animals and those herded with them, *Brown* 1339-1420.—Very unsatisfactory condition of Bristol market; the local inspector has, however, done his best, &c. 2034-2037.—Probable advantage if Irish cattle from Cork were landed at Milford Haven instead of at Bristol, &c. 2737-2740.—Separation of the healthy from the unhealthy cattle in Bristol market, whereas the farmers are not careful to select from healthy lots, &c. 2744-2748.

Frequent disease in the Bristol market, *Stretton* 4580.—Large import of Irish cattle to Bristol, disease being constantly picked up on board the boats, &c. 4705-4710.

See also *Cattle Ships*, 2. *Foot and Mouth Disease*, III.

Brown, Professor George Thomas. (Analysis of his Evidence).—Is a Professor in the Veterinary Department; has been connected with the department since its first formation, 1371-1373.—Existence of foot and mouth disease on the Continent for more than a century, 1374. 1375.—First appearance of the disease in England in 1839, when it is supposed to have been introduced from Holland, 1375-1379.—Total of six outbreaks of the disease in England, with varying intervals between each outbreak; belief that it has never entirely ceased during the whole period, 1380-1391.

Injurious effect of the disease in causing abortion, more especially among the higher classes of breeding stock, 1392.—Increased susceptibility of the higher bred animals to diseases generally, 1393-1395.—Peculiarly infectious character of foot and mouth disease, 1395, 1396.—Belief that the last outbreak of the disease is not in any way due to foreign import, 1397, 1398.—Frequent import of the disease from Ireland, especially to the port of Bristol, whilst the local authorities have no facilities for detaining and isolating diseased animals and those herded with them, 1399-1420.

Value of an efficient inspection at the port of departure in Ireland; that is, if there were a power of detention, 1421-1440.—Check to the import of disease from Ireland by strict regulations as to slaughtering; opinion that this would, however, practically stop the export of store animals to England, 1422, 1423. 1426-1437.—Prohibitory effect of quarantine if applied to store animals from Ireland, 1434, 1435.

Conclusion as regards foot and mouth disease, whether imported from Ireland or not that any restrictions, to be effectual, should be permanent, and should be similar to those

Brown, Professor George Thomas. (Analysis of his Evidence)—continued.

those for the eradication of the cattle plague, slaughter being excepted, 1438, 1439. 1442-1462—Belief, however, that such strict regulations as in the case of the cattle plague would never be tolerated in the case of foot and mouth disease, 1450, 1451—Stoppage of the disease when the movement of cattle was stopped during the cattle plague, 1452, 1455—Opinion that it would be useless to stop movement merely for six weeks, 1456, 1457—Conviction that the disease cannot be permanently stamped out by any regulations, 1459-1466.

Existence of pleuro-pneumonia in England since 1841, when it is supposed to have come from Ireland, and from Holland to Ireland, in the previous year, 1467-1472—Belief that the total stoppage of the import of foreign cattle would not now get rid of pleuro-pneumonia, 1473, 1474—Conclusion that this disease can only be communicated by association with a diseased animal, 1475-1477, 1483-1487—Mortality of about 80 per cent. of the animals attacked, 1478, 1488—Very long period of the disease in incubation, so that it is peculiarly difficult to deal with, 1479-1482.

Opinion that danger does not arise from the carcasses of animals slaughtered through having pleuro-pneumonia, 1489, 1490—Expediency of an interval of at least two months before an animal, after recovery from pleuro-pneumonia, is allowed to go upon a farm, 1491, 1492—Fewer diseased animals imported from Ireland than are moved from one part of England to another, 1493-1495—Bad condition in which cattle arrive from Ireland, owing to insufficient food before starting, 1497-1500.

Doubt as to the expediency of any more stringent regulations than at present as regards the import of pleuro-pneumonia, 1501-1504—Scheme proposed whereby pleuro-pneumonia may be kept under by a wholesale system of inspection on the farmers' premises throughout the country, under central supervision; large staff required, 1505-1527—Alternative scheme by giving full compensation for each animal that is diseased, provided it be at once slaughtered, 1528-1534—Insufficiency of thirty days as the interval or period for which an "infected place" shall continue in that category, 1540-1542—Disadvantage in regulations being differently applied in different counties, 1543, 1544.

Grounds for the conclusion, as regards cattle plague, that the local authority or the central department should have power to slaughter animals so far as might be deemed necessary round the infected area, 1545-1552—Adequacy of the present regulations as regards scab in sheep, if they were only carried out, 1553-1557—Favourable termination of foot and mouth disease when not interfered with, 1568, 1569—Great difficulty of any treatment of pleuro-pneumonia, 1570—Absence of any cure for the cattle plague, 1571.

Approval of the present arrangements at Deptford as to slaughtering, 1572, 1573—Very incomplete arrangements and accommodation at the outports generally, on the score of isolation and slaughtering, 1574-1594—Great want of improved arrangements at Hull, 1597-1598, 1599—Explanation of the course taken in destroying and throwing overboard at sea some infected animals which came to Hull; no danger arose from the carcasses coming ashore, 1577-1588—Question whether it is necessary to incur great expense at several outports in order to avoid the risk of cattle plague, there being power to prohibit import from any country where it exists, 1592-1599.

Information in detail relative to the arrangements for the conveyance of cattle in ships and the provisions made on the score of fittings, ventilation, &c.; improvements still required, 1600-1623—Satisfactory practice in landing cattle and pigs in the port of London, 1626—Statement of the arrangements for conveyance by railways, more especially as regards water supply; on a journey of twelve hours, or so, food and water are not needed, 1630-1656—Very imperfect arrangements for the cleansing of railway trucks; entire insufficiency of the staff of inspectors for enforcing this duty, 1657-1663.

[Second Examination.] Expediency of still leaving the foot and mouth disease in the Act of 1869, although it is better on the whole not to apply stringent regulations on the subject, 1664, 1665, 1718-1721, 1743, 1744—Explanation on the subject of disinfection being carried out on board the Irish vessels to Liverpool, 1666-1674—Check upon unnecessary cruelty in the loading of animals if an inspector were always present, 1676-1677—Difficulty in deciding whether there is overcrowding on board the Irish vessels to Bristol, &c., 1678.

Further consideration of the arrangements as to transit by railway, more especially as regards the supply of water during the journey; difficulties on this score, 1679-1697, 1727-1737—Opinion that in winter cattle might comfortably go for twenty-four hours without water; long period for which they would live without water, 1681-1686, 2048-2051—Abuse at times through cattle being delayed at railway sidings, 1698, 1699—Approval of the companies being required to facilitate the transit on long journeys, 1700-1704—Impracticability of ensuring comfort at sea, 1704-1706—Conviction that

Report, 1873—continued.

Brown, Professor George Thomas. (Analysis of his Evidence)—continued.

that disease is not engendered nor promoted by the hardships during transit, 1707-1709.

Difficulties as regards inspection at the Irish ports with a view to the detention of all animals likely to spread disease, 1710-1717. 1783-1785. 2025-2028.—Inadequacy of the present inspection at Waterford and Cork, 1715, 1716. 1783-1785.—Further statement as to the want of a power to destroy all cattle within a certain area where there is an outbreak of cattle plague, 1722-1725.—Want of more stringent regulations as to slaughtering in the case of sheep-pox, 1738-1742.—Further evidence as to the decrease of foot and mouth disease in consequence of the decreased movement of cattle, whilst its occasional increase arises from natural laws, irrespectively of foreign imports, 1745-1754.

Reference to an outbreak of cattle plague in the north of Ireland, and the steps taken by witness for the stamping out of the disease, 1755-1759.—Statement as to foot and mouth disease not having been in Ireland when the cattle plague was there, and as to its having been twice introduced into Ireland, by cattle or calves from Bristol, 1760-1772.—Import of disease from Ireland chiefly with the small store cattle sent from Waterford and Cork, 1773-1782.—Necessity of the disinfection of inspectors after they have been among infected cattle, 1786, 1787.

Examination upon the further question as to the spontaneity of cowpox or foot and mouth disease, witness contending that neither in cattle nor sheep is its origin spontaneous, 1788-1798.—Conclusion that elaborate restrictions against the spread of the disease are not advisable, and that legislation should only apply to the exposure of diseased animals, 1799-1802. 1891-1895.—Bed fittings and bad ventilation on board the Irish cattle boats, but without originating or seriously promoting infectious disease, 1803-1813. 1814-1861. 2193.—Immense quantity of cattle consumed who have had foot and mouth disease, there being no reason to believe that the meat is unfit for food, 1814.—Inquiry made into the question of children catching the disease from drinking the milk of diseased cows; this has not been proved, 1815-1821.

Objection to a proposal for imposing a license upon cattle dealers or jobbers in Ireland, 1816-1820.—Appearance of the foot and mouth disease in England long before it was known in Ireland, 1822-1826.—Much better accommodation and ventilation in the ships from Spain than in those from Germany, Ireland, &c., 1827-1828.—Absence of hays at the landing-place at Liverpool, there being, however, very good hays at the railway station, 1830-1832.—Statement that witness has not now any power to inspect private lairs, 1873-1878.

Belief as to the calves exported from England to Ireland being for breeding purposes, 1880-1882.—Doubt as to foot and mouth disease extending to any other animals but cattle, sheep, pigs, and poultry, 1883-1890.—Improbability of any treatment much mitigating the loss of condition from the disease, 1891-1899.—Liability of the same animals to be attacked two or three times, 1900-1903.—Instances of the disease having affected cows' udders, 1904-1907.—Considerable extent to which abortion amongst cows is due to the disease; this does not apply to sheep, 1908, 1909.

Examination in detail relative to the port of Hull, and the extent to which any complaints lie against the local authorities, or their officers, as regards the defined area, &c., 1910 et seq.—Explanation with special reference to the case of the "Joseph Soames," and the action respectively of the local authorities and of witness in the disposal of the carcasses of the infected animals, 1976-1998.—Conclusion that disease was not spread by the carcasses when washed upon shore, 1999-2001.—Anxiety invariably evinced by the local authorities of the port to do what was possible for the prevention of disease, 2012.

Particulars of the cattle plague outbreak in Ireland in 1866, and the summary and successful steps taken by Professor Ferguson and witness for its extermination, 2016-2020.—Data for the conclusion that pleuro-pneumonia is imported to England from Ireland, 2030.—Large import of Irish foot and mouth disease at Liverpool as well as at Bristol, 2031-2033.—Very unsatisfactory condition of Bristol market; the local inspector has, however, done his best, 2034-2037.

Conclusion as regards Ireland that the stringent regulations necessary for stamping out the foot and mouth disease would be most prejudicial to the grazing interests of the country, 2038-2047. 2187-2198. 2194.—Desire of the graziers in Ireland that Irish store cattle should not have a good reputation in England, so as better to keep them at home for fattening, 2038. 2052-2056.—Nature of the evidence upon which it is assumed that foot and mouth disease had been brought from Holland into England and Ireland, 2057-2067. 2108-2111.—Inference as to pleuro-pneumonia having been introduced into Ireland from Holland, 2052-2067.—Alleged import of the disease from Ireland into the London dairies in 1841; 2058-2073.

Less prevalence of foot and mouth disease in Ireland than in England, 2074-2078.—Rare existence of disease among the Spanish cattle imported into Ireland, 2079-2081.—Probability

Brown, Professor George Thomas. (Analysis of his Evidence)—continued.

Probability that the cattle plague in Ireland was communicated by persons who had recently been in contact with diseased animals in Scotland, 2082-2086.—Inadequacy of the most stringent restrictions upon import to ensure exemption from cattle plague, 2087, 2088.

Further statement to the effect that stringent regulations as to foot and mouth disease would never be observed by farmers, and that legislative interference is not expedient, 2089-2100. 2194-2229.—Opinion that sheep-pox is a very serious disease, and that the present restrictions should be increased, 2101-2105.—Legislative interference is also required in the case of pleuro-pneumonia; system of slaughtering contemplated, 2101, 2108. 2230-2233.

Total of thirty-two ports in Great Britain where cattle may be landed, there being twenty-one of such ports with defined ports, 2112-2115.—Information as to the extent of the present import of live cattle from different foreign countries, and as to the proportion of store stock, 2116-2133.—Value of the guarantees given by the scheduled countries that they will not allow the import or transit of cattle without certain restrictions, 2133-2139.—Probable shock to the trade by any sudden prohibition of import from any country, except for immediate slaughter, 2140-2146.

Approval of general slaughtering at the port if there were good grounds for concluding that the import trade would not suffer in consequence, 2147, 2148.—Statement to the effect that the price of meat fell rather than rose after the slaughtering orders of the Privy Council were put in force, 2149-2160.—Excellent quality of the meat of foreign fat stock; belief that foreign cattle are bought by all the butchers in London, with a few exceptions, 2165-2173.—Very large percentage of the foreign cattle which come to London, 2174-2176.

Reference to an official paper as showing that from 1842 to 1867 the losses from imported disease were about three-fifths of the cattle imported; the losses, except from cattle plague, were about one per cent. of the whole stock in the country, 2177-2181. 2185, 2186.—Exceptions taken to certain calculations by Professor Guiseppe as to the loss from disease in different years in proportion to the import, 2182-2184.

Advantage of a proper system of inspection of the private lairs or places where cattle are kept, 2195-2201.—Doubt as to cattle and sheep being ever put in the same truck, 2202, 2203.—Approval of increased inspection in order to see that railway trucks are disinfected, 2204-2206.—Expediency of maintaining the system of scheduled countries, 2207, 2208.

Importance of limiting the number of ports for cattle from scheduled countries, and of improving the accommodation and arrangements, by providing at each port a proper defined area, &c., 2209-2225.—Practical obstacles at Liverpool to the provision of a suitable defined area, 2213-2218.—Space of ground at Hull available for the carrying out of improved regulations, 2222-2224.

Additional charge for conveyance if the railway companies be required to make better provision for the supply of water, &c., 2234-2236.—Further statement as to the good accommodation on board the Spanish ships, and as to the expediency of improved ventilation, &c., in foreign ships generally, though not as any preventive of disease, 2237-2246.

[Third Examination.] Further statement as regards the watering of cattle on railways that it is better not to detain for the purpose if the journey does not exceed thirty-six hours, 2247-2251.—Improvement if the cattle trucks were covered over and were open at the sides, 2252-2254.—Absence, in witness' experience, of any case of human disease from eating diseased meat, 2255, 2256.

Conclusion further expressed in disapproval of stringent regulations as to foot and mouth disease; prospect of the disease becoming milder, 2257-2263.—Approval, however, of continued prohibition upon the movement of animals actually infected with the disease, checks being still applied also as regards foreign supply, 2261. 2264-2266.—Great variation in the amount of loss per head from the disease, the loss sometimes being considerable in the case both of milch cows and fat stock, 2267-2277.—Average of about ten days as the length of an ordinary attack, 2268, 2269.

Expediency, in connection with inspection at the ports, of arrangements for slaughtering all animals affected with pleuro-pneumonia, 2278-2280.—Question considered whether detention at the port of shipment should not apply to the whole lot amongst which there is any case of foot and mouth disease, 2281-2286.—Check to some extent upon the export of cases of disease from Ireland if there were inspectors at the port of shipment; probable effect upon the price in Ireland, 2287-2293.—Almost insuperable obstacles to effectual experiments for proving whether disease is generated on board the ships from Ireland; conviction that this is not so, 2304-2309.

Examination to the effect that cattle plague, pleuro-pneumonia, and foot and mouth disease

Brown, Professor George Thomas. (Analysis of his Evidence)—continued.

disease have doubtless been imported from abroad, and have caused considerable losses to farmers, 2310-2334.—Obstacles to a dead meat trade between Tonnage and London; considerable trade however between Aberdeen and London, the voyage being only a few hours shorter, 2335-2344.—Great importance attached to the prompt report of all cases of disease by the farmers or by local inspectors, it being expedient for this purpose to make it to the interest of the farmer not to make any concealment of disease, 2345 *et seq.*

Consideration of the detailed arrangements desirable on the score of compensation for the slaughter, respectively, of diseased animals and of those heided with them, 2394-2395. 2681-2686.—Advantage of testing incipient pleuro-pneumonia by means of the thermometer, and of at once isolating all animals which show a slight rise in temperature, 2371-2376.—Suggestions as to the powers and duties to be vested in the local authorities relative to slaughtering in the case respectively of cattle plague, pleuro-pneumonia, and sheep-pox, 2397-2410.

Explanations in connection with the proposal for stopping all movement out of an infected place for thirty days after the last case of outbreak; careful supervision required, 2411-2424.—Suggested requirement of a certificate in the event of movement for two months after the prohibited interval of thirty days in the case of pleuro-pneumonia, 2412-2415.—Approval of a radius of one mile as the area of an "infected place" where there is an occurrence of cattle plague, 2416-2418.—Belief that in about two years, with active measures and strict supervision, pleuro-pneumonia might be almost exterminated, 2425, 2426.—Necessity of considerable cost at first in respect of slaughtered animals, 2427-2430.

Improvement in several respects by reducing the number of local authorities in each county, 2436-2441.—Expediency of compulsory restrictions being applied by the local authority as to the arrangements in fairs and markets, 2437-2444.—Advantage of one chief inspector for each county; facility thereby for obtaining reliable statistics, 2447-2450.—Expediency of effectual supervision of the local authorities by the Privy Council, and the officers of the Department, 2457-2464.

Considerable difficulty in respect of pleuro-pneumonia in the London dairies; obstacles to any satisfactory inspection, 2465-2479.—Advantage of a cordon round the metropolis as a means towards isolating pleuro-pneumonia in the country; great opposition apprehended, 2480-2485.—Means of marking animals by cutting hair from the end of the tail, so as to identify them for slaughtering, 2486-2493.

Approval of a requirement that the occupant of a farm where any horned animal dies or is slaughtered should report the same within three days, 2494-2499.—Approval also of veterinary surgeons being required to certificate disease, on payment of a fee, 2500.—Expediency of clear power in the local authority as to the seizure of infected animals in fairs or on highways, 2501-2504.

Very convenient arrangements at Deptford market, all that is required being direct railway communication; belief that the corporation do not get a good return for their outlay on the market, 2507-2510. 2805-2810. 2880-2881.—Doubt as to there being much import of foot and mouth disease from Hamburg to Deptford Market at the present time, 2511-2515. 2811, 2812.—Difference of 1 d. per pound between the price of foreign beef and of English beef in the Metropolitan Market, 2516-2518.

Long period for which, and indirect way in which, the virus of cattle plague can be communicated; introduction into England and Ireland ascribed to Ireland, 2518-2520. 2537-2541.—Doubt as to pleuro-pneumonia being communicable save by direct contact, 2541-2543.—Facility of transmission of foot and mouth disease without contact, 2544-2546.—Less difficulty in stamping out pleuro-pneumonia or cattle plague, than foot and mouth disease, 2547, 2548.—Probable introduction of the latter disease in the first instance from abroad, 2549. 2535, 2536. 2542.—Question whether the disease may not have been imported with foreign hides and hoofs, 2530-2534.

Conclusion as to the foot and mouth disease not arising spontaneously; examination hereon with reference to the great fluctuation in the extent of the disease since it first appeared, witness submitting that it has never entirely ceased to exist, 2543-2574.—Decided risk of the import of the disease from abroad notwithstanding the present restrictions, 2575-2576.—Difficulty in proving that the bad ventilation and limited space in the Irish cattle boats promote liability to infectious diseases; increased danger however of the conveyance of pleuro-pneumonia if it exists on board, 2586-2593.

Inability of witness to explain a certain table or calculation relative to the proportion of home cattle and of foreign cattle that have disease, 2594-2600.—Reasons for the great spread of pleuro-pneumonia through the London dairies, 2601-2607.—Examination in denial that the Act of 1861 has been a failure as regards pleuro-pneumonia, the failure arising rather from the provisions of the Act not having been carried out, and from the movement of diseased animals to fairs and markets not having been stopped by the local authorities, 2607-2651.

Brown, Professor George Thomas. (Analysis of his Evidence)—continued.

Grounds for the statement that farmers really care nothing at all about the foot and mouth disease, and are not anxious for stringent regulations on the subject, 2652-2665, 2744-2755—Increased prevalence of glanders; neglect of owners in not giving notice of the disease, 2666-2671—Usefulness to some extent of notice being given to the police relative to foot and mouth disease, 2672, 2673—Difficulty in compelling notice by the owner to his immediate neighbours, 2674, 2675.

Instances of the serious loss sometimes accruing from foot and mouth disease, 2676, 2677—Further reference to the increased susceptibility to disease in the case of highly-bred stock, 2678-2680—Consideration of the question of inoculation for pleuro-pneumonia; inaccuracy of a statement that a large number of cases has been caused by inoculation, 2687-2697—Approval of inoculation for sheep-pox under certain circumstances, 2698, 2699—Expediency of a system of compulsory slaughter in the case of sheep-pox, 2700-2702.

Result of witness' experience that dogs, hares and rabbits, and birds, are not subject to the foot and mouth disease; explanation hereon as to his not having made conclusive experiments on the subject, 2703-2716, 2757—Reference to the foot disease in sheep as the same as the foot and mouth disease in cattle, 2709, 2710—Statement as to the relative character of the present and former outbreaks of the disease among sheep; considerable fatality of an outbreak near Harrow in 1862; 2717-2722, 2734, 2735—Doubt as to the development of the disease in the mouth of sheep not having been as great in former years as at present, 2719-2721, 2839-2885—Instances of second and third attacks of cattle in former outbreaks, though such attacks have recently become more frequent, 2723.

Arrangement for the temporary employment of veterinary surgeons by the Privy Council in the event of extensive outbreaks of disease, 2726-2728—Salary of witness adjoined to; relative duties and salary of the chief clerk, 2729-2736—Probable advantage if Irish cattle from Cork were loaded at Milford Haven instead of at Bristol, 2737-2740—Further reference to the obstacles to watering the cattle during railway transit, 2741-2743.

Further statement as to the import of cattle plague *via* Hull, and as to the indirect way in which it was conveyed into the country, 2756-2762—Evidence with further reference to the landing and market accommodation at Hull, and the arrangements for treating diseased foreign cattle, 2763-2784—Conclusion that nothing short of extreme restrictions in England would effectually prevent the import of disease from Ireland, 2785-2790—Approval of the system of central supervision in Ireland, there being, however a great paucity of officers, 2791-2796.

Further reference to the data for inferring that pleuro-pneumonia was introduced into Ireland from Holland, 2797, 2798—Indirect manner in which foot and mouth disease must have been conveyed into Lambay Island, 2799-2802—Contagious character of pleuro-pneumonia further adverted to in connection with a certain experiment by witness on the subject, 2813-2817—Exceedingly small mortality from foot and mouth disease, the treatment being moreover unscientific, 2822-2824—Belief as to the disease being now fixed in this country, though save by contagion, it is difficult to say how it originated, 2825-2833.

Unwillingness of stockowners to publish the existence of foot and mouth disease among their cattle, 2834, 2835—Doubt as to the disease diminishing the production of breeding stock rather than of fat stock, 2836, 2837, 2858-2868—Further reference to the watering of cattle on railways as not attended with nearly so much cruelty as is represented, 2838-2842—Increased cost to the consumer by increased outlay in disinfection of steamers, &c., 2843, 2844—Want of better disinfection of railway trucks, 2845, 2846—Approval of tolerably close packing in trucks and on steamers, 2847, 2848—Very good Irish of the London and North Western Railway Company at Liverpool, 2849, 2850.

Public prejudice owing to which foreign fat cattle fetch a lower price than English cattle, 2851-2853—Disputed question whether slaughtering at the port tends to raise the price of meat, 2854-2857—Desire of farmers to import dairy stock chiefly, 2869, 2870—Limited salary of witness as compared with the income of many men in the profession, 2871-2873—Responsible duties of the chief clerk, 2874-2876—Rare absence of the secretary from the office, 2877-2879.

Expediency of preventing the movement from one part of a farm to another, across a road, of an animal under an attack of foot and mouth disease, 2886-2888—Beneficial effect of the increased inspection of fairs and markets under recent action of the local authorities, 2889-2891.

Brown, William. (Analysis of his Evidence).—Has been a butcher and cattle dealer at Salford for about twenty-four years, 13851, 13852—Large amount of cattle purchased by witness; about one-half of these are slaughtered and sold in carcasses, 13853-13857—Chief consumption of this meat is Stockport and in surrounding towns, 13858, 13859—Statement

Brown, William. (Analysis of his Evidence)—continued.

Statement as to the manner in which the dead meat is conveyed away from the markets; considerable deterioration of the meat conveyed from Hull caused by the staking it undergoes by rail, 13860-13862, 13886-13898, 13919-13931, 13982-13984, 13997-13998—Disapproval of the system of inspection adopted at the Liverpool market; opinion that this system is a means of spreading the disease among other cattle, 13863-13876—Opinion that the inspection at the Stanley market has brought down the supply to nearly one-half of what it was, 13872-13876.

Examination as to the difference in the price of meat between London and Lancashire; considerable increase of price in Yorkshire and Lancashire of late years, 13877, 13878, 13881-13885, 13944-13953, 13975-13981, 13985-13991.

Opinion that nothing will prevent attacks of foot and mouth disease; expediency of there being no restrictions as regards this disease, 13879, 13880—Insufficiency of scab in sheep, 13899, 13900—Unsatisfactory nature of the cattle farming in Cheshire, 13901-13905—Absence of competition between the live cattle trade and the dead meat trade, 13906-13911.

Information as to the rise of prices of meat on the Continent, 13932-13942—Reasons for the high price of meat at the present time, 13954-13962, 13985-13991—Further statement that the foreign trade should be unrestricted, unless from countries where rinderpest exists, 13965-13968, 13974-13977—Expediency of severe restrictions as regards pleuro-pneumonia, 13969-13974.

Butchers. See *Dead Meat.* *Prices.*

C.

Calves. Belief as to the calves exported from England to Ireland being for breeding purposes, *Brown* 1880-1882—Statement showing the danger of supplying calves with the milk of a cow affected with the foot and mouth disease, *Sims* 3400—Opinion that there is no large import of calves from England into Ireland, *Baldwin* 4403-4407—Considerable import of calves into Ireland from England, *Ferguson* 5342-5345, 5357—Importation of foot and mouth disease into Ireland with some calves from Bristol in April or May 1871; the country was then all but free from the disease, *ib.* 5345-5348—Careful treatment of the calves sent from England to Ireland; less mortality than among home bred calves, *ib.* 5358-5360—Witness repeats that there is a large import of English calves into Ireland, and that much disease is thus introduced into the latter country, *ib.* 5358-5343.

Statement that foot and mouth disease may be fatal among calves when it is not so among full grown stock, *Ferson* 7188—Serious effect of the foot and mouth disease upon the breeding of cattle; great mortality among calves from diseased milk, *Duckham* 9813-9821, 9875, 9876—Limited extent to which English calves are purchased by witnesses at the present time on account of their unhealthy state, *Goslett* 11699-11701—Inexpediency of stopping the supply of calves to Ireland from England, *Lambert* 13741-13744.

Return showing the import of calves into Ireland from England in each month in 1871 and 1872, *App.* 572.

Canada. Healthy character of the cattle imported into Canada; statement that the foot and mouth disease which was recently in that colony has now totally died out, *Ganger* 9719-9722.

Carcases (Diseased Animals). Importance of facilities near the ports for the burial of carcases of infected animals, *Williams* 719-732—Doubt as to the expediency of infected foreign cattle being transferred from the ships to barges, and of the carcases being destroyed on board the latter, *ib.* 918—Opinion that danger does not arise from the carcases of animals slaughtered though having pleuro-pneumonia, *Brown* 1489, 1490—Opinion as to the expediency of burying the carcases of infected animals, though witness considers it very improbable that the dead animal can convey infection, *Baldwin* 4022-4028—Belief that when a diseased animal has died, the danger of contagion is in a great measure removed from the carcase, *Rigby* 8781.

Cattle Insurance Company. Expediency of instituting a cattle insurance company guaranteed by the Government; belief that such a company would not induce the farmers to be indifferent as to the health of their cattle, *Belster* 7321, 7322.

CATTLE PLAGUE:

1. *Infectious and Incurable Nature of the Cattle Plague.*
2. *Spread of the Plague on the Continent.*
3. *Case of the "Joseph Soames" Cargo at the Port of Hull; Measures adopted for preventing the Introduction of Cattle Plague thereby.*
4. *Cases of Cattle Plague in Ireland.*
5. *Regulations and Restrictions suggested for Application when an Outbreak occurs.*
6. *Conclusions and Recommendations of the Committee.*

1. *Infectious and Incurable Nature of Cattle Plague:*

Absence of any cure for the cattle plague, *Brown* 1871—Inadequacy of the most stringent restrictions upon import to ensure exemption from cattle plague, such is its infectious character, *ib.* 1087, 1088—Long period for which, and indirect way in which, the virus of cattle plague can be communicated; introduction into England and Ireland adverted to hereon, *ib.* 2518-2520, 2537-2541—Check desirable as regards the propagation of cattle plague by running water, *Simonds* 3469, 3470—Instance of the rudest not having been communicated by a person who had been through infected herds in England, and had then gone through herds in Ireland; witness does not say, however, that it is not communicable by a person's clothes, *Baldwin* 3794-3797.

2. *Spread of the Plague on the Continent:*

Increased distribution of cattle plague on the continent during the last few years, partly in consequence of the war, *Williams* 196-198, 218-220.

3. *Case of the "Joseph Soames" Cargo, at the Port of Hull; Measures adopted for preventing the Introduction of Cattle Plague thereby:*

Concurrence in the view of Professor Brown as to the cattle plague having been introduced last year from the "Joseph Soames," at the port of Hull, *Williams* 278-280—Statement as to the prompt and summary measures taken by the Central Department for preventing the spread of the disease, *ib.* 281-295—Belief that an attempt was made to disfect the persons who were in contact with the "Joseph Soames" cargo, *ib.* 289.

Further information generally in relation to the cargo of the "Joseph Soames," and the action of the Government inspector in the matter, witness referring, however, to Professor Brown as competent to explain the circumstances in detail, *Williams* 1256-1275.

Explanation with special reference to the case of the "Joseph Soames," and the action, respectively, of the local authorities and of witness in the disposal of the carcasses of the infected animals; concludes that no danger arose from the carcasses coming ashore, *Brown* 1577-1588, 1976-2001—Further statement as to the import of cattle plague into Hull, and as to the indirect way in which it was conveyed into the country, *ib.* 2758-2762.

Conclusion as to the cattle plague having been imported into Hull from the "Joseph Soames," though the cattle were never landed, *Simonds* 3057-3060, 3049-3048—Particulars as to the part taken by witness and Professor Brown, and by the local authorities in reference to the "Joseph Soames" case, *ib.* 3052-3055.

Grounds for the opinion that the cattle plague was imported into England by the cargo of the "Joseph Soames," *Jenkins* 5059-5059, 6014-6019—Circumstances under which the ship "Joseph Soames" arrived at Hull with cattle plague on board; difficulty as to defining in what manner the contagion was transmitted to the cattle on shore, *Clarke* 8657-8657.

Examination as to the case of the "Joseph Soames"; statement that the Customs were responsible for permitting this vessel to enter the docks with infected cattle on board, *Roberts* 13185-13187, 13190-13209—The operation of the local authority begins only after the cattle are landed; repudiation by the local authority of any responsibility with regard to the "Joseph Soames," *ib.* 13188, 13189, 13207-13209—Legal proceedings threatened against the Hull corporation by the owner of the cattle destroyed on board the "Joseph Soames"; refusal of the corporation to pay on the ground that it did not order the cattle to be slaughtered, *ib.* 13290, 13291.

4. *Cases of Cattle Plague in Ireland:*

Reference to an outbreak of cattle plague in the north of Ireland, and the steps taken by witness for the stamping out of the disease, *Brown* 1735-1750—There were about fifty animals lost altogether on this occasion, *ib.* 1757—The outbreak was first confined to the north of Ireland, and then suddenly appeared in Munster, *ib.* 1758.

Further particulars of the cattle plague outbreak in Ireland in 1866, and the summary and successful steps taken by Professor Ferguson and witness for its extermination, *Brown* 2016-2029—Probability that the cattle plague in Ireland was communicated by

CATTLE PLAGUE—continued.**4. Cases of Cattle Plague in Ireland—continued.**

by persons who had recently been in contact with diseased animals in Scotland, *Brown* 5052-5056.—Facility with which a case of cattle plague was stamped out at Enfield in Meath as soon as it was discovered, *Baldwin* 4431, 4474-4476.

Conviction of witness that there was an outbreak of cattle plague in Meath in 1866, though he cannot account for its introduction, *Ferguson* 5500-5503.

Instances of cattle plague in 1865 among some stock of witness which he had sent to Scotland, *Morrow* 5515-5521.

5. Regulations and Restrictions suggested for Application when an Outbreak occurs:

Proposition as regards cattle plague, that in addition to existing precautions there should be power in the central department, through its inspectors, to compel the slaughter of animals headed with infected ones; difficulty and delay at present on this point, *Williams* 296-311.

Grounds for the conclusion as regards cattle plague that the local authority or the central department should have power to slaughter animals so far as might be deemed necessary round the infected area, *Brown* 1545-1562, 1722-1728.—Approval of a radius of one mile as the area of an infected place where there is an occurrence of cattle plague, *ib.* 2416-2418.

Varying symptoms of cattle plague; scientific knowledge required for its detection, *Sims* 3001-3005.—Enlarged powers of slaughter desirable in reference to cattle plague, *ib.* 3086, 3087.—Opinion that it is quite possible to get rid of the cattle plague by the means adopted for the purpose in England, *Baldwin* 4001-4004.—Respects in which the restrictions in England in reference to the cattle plague were at first very deficient; good results when they were sufficiently stringent, *ib.* 4493, 4496.

Approval of discretionary slaughtering power in the Privy Council inspectors as regards the cattle plague, *Stratton* 4527-4531, 4594-4596.—Better prevention of the spread of cattle plague by giving to the local authority increased power of slaughter, and by there being adequate compensation, *Fisher* 5091-5096.

Value of the thermometer in discovering incipient cases of cattle plague; explanation as to its use, *Gosger* 9471, 9472.—Opinion that the most stringent measures should be taken under the Act with reference to milderpest, *Lambert* 13395-13397.

6. Conclusions and Recommendations of the Committee:

Recommendation that the Privy Council should continue to order the slaughter at the landing places of all foreign animals imported from countries in which cattle plague exists, or from which there is reason to fear it might be introduced, *Rep.* ii.—Conclusion that the outbreak of cattle plague in the East Riding of Yorkshire was due to a cargo which came to Hull, *ib.*

Recommended obligation upon the local authority to order the slaughter of any animal which has been in contact with an animal affected with cattle plague, *Rep.* ii.—Proposed discretion in the local authority to order the slaughter of any animal on any premises adjoining those in which the disease exists, *ib.* iv.

See also *Aberdeenshire*. *Cheshire*. *Compensation*. *Foot and Mouth Disease*, VI. *Foreign Cattle*. *Gallies*. *Hull*. *Infected Places*. *Reports and Statistics*. *Russia*. *Yorkshire*.

CATTLE SHIPS:

1. *As to the Accommodation, Ventilation, &c. in Cattle Ships generally, and the Improvements required.*
2. *As to the Cattle Boats from Ireland.*
3. *Question of Disease being engendered or promoted on board Ship.*
4. *Disinfection.*
5. *Advantage of Vessels for Cattle exclusively.*
6. *Inspection.*

1. *As to the Accommodation, Ventilation, &c. in Cattle Ships generally, and the Improvements required:*

Room for improvement in the fittings and ventilation of the cattle ships, *Williams* 239.—Improvement as regards disinfection, ventilation, space, &c. in the case of cattle vessels from abroad, owing to the transit regulations of the Veterinary Department, *ib.* 501-509.

Information in detail relative to the arrangements for the conveyance of cattle in ships, and the provisions made on the score of fittings, ventilation, &c.; improvements still required, *Brown* 1600-1638.—Great difficulty in improving the ventilation in the ships from abroad, *ib.* 1605-1610.—Good treatment of the cattle in the vessels from Denmark

CATTLE SHIPS—continued.

1. *As to the Accommodation, Ventilation, &c. in Cattle Ships, &c.—continued.*

mark, *Brown* 1622, 1623; *Simonds* 3120—Impracticability of ensuring comfort at sea, *Brown* 1704-1706—Much better accommodation and ventilation in the ships from Spain than in those from Germany, Ireland, &c., *ib.* 1827-1846.

Further statement as to the good accommodation on board the Spanish ships, and as to the expediency of improved ventilation, &c. in foreign ships generally, though not as any preventive of disease, *Brown* 2237-2246.

Better provision made for foreign cattle on board ship since the issue of the transit orders of the Privy Council, *Simonds* 3104, 3105, 3111—Considerable difficulty still experienced as to the ventilation of some of the vessels coming to the Thames, *ib.* 3106, 3107—Less satisfactory accommodation in the vessels to the exports than to London, *ib.* 3122-3124.

Further statement relative to the arrangements as to ventilation, &c. in the cattle ships coming to different ports; difficulty of improvement, *Simonds* 3316-3322—Attention of witnesses drawn to a certain apparatus as effectually ventilating the holds of cattle ships, *ib.* 3543-3547.

Want of much improvement in the ventilation of cattle ships, *Stratton* 4534-4536—General condemnation by the Agricultural Chambers of the ventilation of the holds of ships, *Clarke* 8252—Decided opinion that cattle which are imported should be conveyed on the decks of vessels and not in the holds, *Adams* 10047-10049.

2. *As to the Cattle Boats from Ireland:*

Steps taken also with a view to the disinfection, ventilation, &c. of Irish vessels, *Williams* 510-518—Satisfactory arrangements on the whole on board the vessels from Ireland, especially to Bristol, *Brown* 1631-1638—Difficulty in deciding where there is overcrowding on board the Irish vessels to Bristol, &c., *ib.* 1678.

Relative accommodation on board the Irish cattle boats and the Spanish cattle boats; very defective ventilation in the former, *Baldwin* 4234-4236, 4266-4270—Very bad accommodation and treatment of cattle in the boats from Ireland to Bristol; approval of six hours' rest on arrival, *Stratton* 4541-4546, 4705-4707—Statement of the arrangements for the conveyance of witness' cattle from Ireland to Scotland; they are fed and watered before they leave, *Morrow* 5579, 5580, 5708-5714, 5812-5815—Conveyance of witness' cattle from Belfast to Glasgow chiefly on deck; advantage of this arrangement, *ib.* 5579, 5580.

Useful factory accommodation on board the vessels from Ireland to England, *Jenkins* 5930-5943—Difference in ventilation in the holds of vessels when at sea and when coming up the Avon into Bristol; reasons for this, *ib.* 6115-6122.

Information as to the season for shipment of cattle to England, *Gair* 6343-6350—Favourable opinion as to the arrangements made for the transit of cattle by steamers from Ireland to England; belief that the boats employed do not form a nucleus of disease, *Garnett* 6450-6464, 6504-6509, 6514, 6515—Method of carrying cattle in the holds of the steamers; statement that they are properly decks and not holds, *Dent* 7206-7212.

Disagreement with Mr. Jenkins as to his unfavourable reports upon the Irish cattle steamers; opinion in favour of holds as compared with decks, for the carriage of cattle, *Verde* 7972, 7973, 8021-8061—Satisfactory condition of the cattle steamers between England and Ireland, *Wolke* 8114—Great sufferings of cattle from want of ventilation in coming from Ireland to Scotland, *McBride* 9120-9128—Cleanliness of the cattle ships between Waterford and Bristol, *Owens* 10029—Capital accommodation for cattle on board the Irish steamers, *Lambert* 13224-13226.

3. *Question of Disease being engendered or promoted on board Ship:*

Possibility of foot and mouth disease being caught on board the vessels from Ireland, if they have not been disinfected, *Williams* 542, 543—Conviction that disease is not engendered nor promoted by the hardships during transit, *Brown* 1707-1709—Bad fittings and bad ventilation on board the Irish cattle boats, but without originating or seriously promoting infectious disease, *ib.* 1803-1813, 1844-1861, 2193—Almost insuperable obstacles to effectual experiments for proving whether disease is generated on board the ships from Ireland; conviction that this is not so, *ib.* 2304-2309—Difficulty in proving that the bad ventilation and limited space in the Irish cattle boats promote liability to infectious disease; increased danger, however, of the conveyance of pleuropneumonia if it exists on board, *ib.* 2554-2560.

Doubt as to the foot and mouth disease being caught to any extent on board the vessels from Ireland, *Simonds* 2994—Dissent from the view that when animals have been for several hours confined on board ships, there is an increased tendency to infectious disease, *ib.* 3610-3614.

Dissent from the view that foot and mouth disease is generated in ships crossing the channel; belief that it is entirely of foreign origin, *Baldwin* 3827-3832—Indirect way

Report, 1873—continued.

CATTLE SHIPS—continued.

3. Question of Disease being engendered on board Ship—continued.

way in which the disease may be propagated on board ship, *Baldwin* 3975-3977—Greater liability to the spread of pleuro-pneumonia when an infected animal is with others on board ship than when it is in a field, *ib.* 4014-4018.

Unsatisfactory nature of the arrangements made for the cattle traffic between England and Ireland; likelihood in many cases of the animals taking the disease in the steamer, *Jenkins* 5930-5943—Opinion that there is not the same danger of infection when the cattle are carried on deck as when they are placed in the ships' holds, *ib.* 6123.

Examination as to the evils attendant on transit of cattle by sea; prevention of foot and mouth disease to a great extent by proper treatment on board vessels, and when being conveyed by railway, *Odum* 10003-10029. 10031-10036. 10047-10049. 10060-10066. 10141-10143—Personal experience of witness as regards the diseases incident to Irish cattle; probability of their being free from disease when shipped, but inflammation follows from their being jammed together in transit, *ib.* 10050-10055.

4. Disinfection:

Impracticability of disinfecting all the sailors of cattle ships, *Williams* 1002—Careful disinfection on board the vessels to London, *Brown* 1624, 1625—Difficulty as to the disinfection of Irish vessels, *ib.* 1637—Explanation on the subject of disinfection not being carried out on board the Irish vessels to Liverpool, *ib.* 1660-1674.

Considerable difficulty as to the disinfection of the vessels, more especially from Ireland; want of a system of central inspection for this purpose, *Simonds* 3158-3162—Satisfactory regulations now in force in Ireland for the disinfection of cattle trucks and steamboats, *Ferguson* 5306. 5311. 5514-5517. 5561, 5562—Opinion that the boats are not so thoroughly disinfected as they ought to be, *Jenkins* 6199.

Information with regard to the disinfection and whitewashing of the vessels as laid down by the Order in Council; strong objection to whitewashing on account of the injury occasioned to the ironwork thereby, *O'Neill* 6684-6698. 6735-6746. 6795-6805. 6815-6822. 6850-6861—Deputation to the Chief Secretary with a view to the abolition of whitewashing; high commercial standing of the gentlemen forming this deputation, *ib.* 6862, 6863.

Evidence in further support of the deleterious effect of whitewash upon iron; efficacy of carbolic acid and water as a disinfectant, *O'Neill* 6877-6881. 6908-6911. 6954-6980. 6982-6985—Impracticability of using a hose for the purpose of whitewashing the vessels, for the reason that it must be of a certain thickness to stick on the sides, *ib.* 6972-6978—Statement as to the difference between the system of cleansing laid down by the Order in Council and that previously adopted by witness; strong objection to the former, more especially as regards the want of control in its application, *Dent* 7200-7201. 7213-7222. 7270-7277—Considerable deterioration of the ironworks of the ships by the injudicious use of whitewash; explanation in detail as to the injurious effect of this process of cleansing, *ib.* 7202-7205. 7208-7210. 7237-7244. 7259. 7260. 7267-7269—Impracticability of strictly carrying out the Order in Council, *ib.* 7202. 7207.

Examination as to the manner in which the Order in Council as to whitewashing the vessels is carried out; evasion of the Order in Council in certain cases, *Dent* 7225-7236. 7245-7251—Impossibility of using the whitewash by means of an engine, *ib.* 7247—Circumstances under which the Steamship-owners' Association were consulted on the subject of whitewashing, *ib.* 7252-7253—Injudicious policy of treating vessels after the fashion of cattle trucks; careless manner in which it is absolutely necessary to keep ships, *ib.* 7262-7265—Contention that if the cleansing system of whitewash is continued, owners of ships will charge much higher rates to recoup themselves for the injury done to the vessels, *ib.* 7270, 7271.

Filthy state in which steamers and railway trucks for the carriage of cattle are allowed to remain; necessity of stringent regulations to prevent this, *Bolton* 7324-7327. 7338. 7340. 7344. 7517-7518. 7566.

Letter from the Superintendent, London and North Western Railway Steamboat Department, Halybroad, dated 7th May 1873, relative to the mode of disinfection of the boats carrying cattle, *App.* 604.

5. Advantage of Vessels for Cattle exclusively:

Decided improvement if cattle were not mixed with other cargo, *Williams* 272-277—Less difficulty as to boats for cattle exclusively, if the number of ports be reduced, *ib.* 280-283—Improved accommodation and ventilation in vessels used exclusively for cattle, *Simonds* 3107-3110—Difficulty as to the cleansing and disinfection of vessels in which cattle are only part of the cargo, *ib.* 3457, 3468—Desirability of sending special steamers for the importation of store cattle and milch cows from Germany; reasons for separating the fat from the store cattle, *Gebhardt* 12759-12761.

6. Inspection:

CATTLE SHIPS—continued.**6. Inspection :**

Advantage if the inspectors under the Privy Council had power to go on board the cattle ships, and see to the fittings, &c., *Williams* 704-707.—Once thrown occasionally upon the local authority as to enforcing the cleansing of cattle boats, *ib.* 846-849.—Inspection daily applied to the cleansing of the boats in the foreign trade, *ib.* 854, 855.

Importance attached to a system of central inspection of cattle boats, *Simonds* 3152-3169.—Explanation that witness has not inspected any of the Irish vessels, *ib.* 3602.

Recommended inspection by officers under the central authority of the vessels in the Irish and coming as well as in the foreign trade, *Rep.* vi.

See also *Bristol. Cruelty. Disinfection. Drogheda. Inspection.*

Cattle Tracks. See *Railways.*

Causes of Disease. Concurrence in the view that a systematic and scientific inquiry into the causes of cattle diseases is much to be desired, *Baldwin* 4185-4192.—Desirability of the veterinary department undertaking experiments with regard to foot and mouth disease, its origin, &c., *Jenkins* 6147, 6148.—Statement as to the small progress made during the last two years in regard to the knowledge of contagious diseases of cattle; this is mainly owing to the absence of Government assistance, *McDermid* 9133-9135, 9343-9354.

See also *Cattle Plague. Foot and Mouth Disease. Pleuro-Pneumonia.*

Central Chamber of Agriculture. Concurrence in the recommendations of the Central Chamber of Agriculture for dealing with cattle diseases, *Stratton* 4517 et seq.—Resolutions adopted by the Chamber of Agriculture on 4th of February in the present year; explanation hereon as to the constitution and numbers of the society, *Clarke* 8189-8193, 8230-8236.—Recommendations of the Chamber of Agriculture as regards sheep-pox and cattle plague, *ib.* 8212-8216.

Report of the Contagious Diseases (Animals) Committee of the Central Chamber of Agriculture, as adopted and amended by the Council on Tuesday, 4th February 1873; sundry recommendations therein for preventing the import and spread of disease, *App.* 575, 576.

Centralisation. Approval of centralisation so far as seeing that the regulations are carried out, *Williams* 1152-1166.—Expediency of a centralised system of dealing with cattle diseases rather than a localised system; failure of the latter in England, *Baldwin* 3870-3875, 3879, 4054-4058, 4082-4084, 4155-4158.—Respects in which the Irish system of dealing with cattle diseases is preferable to the English system, the former being worked entirely from central sources, *Ferguson* 4965-4968.

See also *Inspection. Local Authorities. Privy Council. Veterinary Departments.*

CHESHIRE :

Good grounds for a certain complaint from Cheshire as to the want of improved regulations in regard to cattle from Ireland, *Williams* 1336-1339.—Favourable opinion as to the management of the farms in Cheshire, *Jenkins* 6034-6040.—Evidence in support of the opinion that Cheshire is not remarkable for an advanced state of agriculture, *Verdon* 7187, 7190, 7278-7280.—Superiority of many of the Irish counties in agriculture, and general management over Cheshire, *ib.* 7187, 7190.

Examination as to the course adopted in Cheshire in relation to the cattle plague; erroneous statements made by Mr. Verdon with reference to the farmers and lamina of Cheshire, *Rigby* 8754-8757, 8839-8859, 8915-8933, 8995-9014, 9020-9026.—Statement that in Cheshire the cattle plague has been worse than in any county in England; calculation that the losses incurred amounted to 700,000 £. or 800,000 £., *ib.* 8758-8762, 9015.—The disease was first brought into the county by some Dutch cattle sent from the Metropolitan Market, *ib.* 8763-8766.

Detailed statement of the average loss in Cheshire from the foot and mouth disease and from pleuro-pneumonia during the last three years and a-half, *Rigby* 8832-8838, 8881-8885.—Pamphlet written by witness in which are discussed the causes and reasons why Cheshire should have been exceptionally injured by the cattle plague, *ib.* 8855-8859, 8892-8909.—Large numbers of calves born in Cheshire; ultimate destination of these, *ib.* 8886-8891.

Opinion that Cheshire will always be severely visited by the cattle plague on account of being so very largely stocked with cattle; the only way to make the county secure is to stamp out the disease whenever it first appears, *Rigby* 8902-8905.—Belief that the farmers in Cheshire would cordially agree to slaughtering the cattle, if the plague were to break out again, *ib.* 8939-8944.—Large numbers of cattle slaughtered in Cheshire

Report, 1873—continued.

CHESHIRE—continued.

for which no compensation was given; opposition to the slaughter ceased to a considerable extent upon compensation being made, *ibid.* 9015-9019.

Witness, as chief constable of Cheshire, refers to the Orders in Council in regard to the cattle plague which have been carried out under his superintendence, *Smith* 10150, 10151—Absence of co-operation between the boroughs in the county as to carrying out the orders; expediency of a county board upon which the local authorities could be represented, *ib.* 10152-10154—Strict manner in which the Act has been carried out in Cheshire; increase of foot and mouth disease in the county, notwithstanding this stringency, *ib.* 10155-10158, 10394-10398.

Explanation as to the means adopted by the police in carrying out the provisions of the Act; proceedings taken by the local authorities upon the discovery of cases of disease, *Smith* 10155, 10160, 10161, 10166-10171, 10181-10184, 10229-10243, 10314-10323, 10412-10427—Statement that Cheshire is more free from pleuro-pneumonia at the present time than it has been at any previous period, *ib.* 10154, 10159—Considerable losses suffered by the farmers during the time of compulsory slaughter, for which they received no compensation from Government, *ib.* 10188-10204, 10304.

Information as to the introduction of pleuro-pneumonia into Cheshire; difficulty of detecting the disease until it has arrived at an advanced stage, *Smith* 10278-10285, 10309-10313—Further examination as to the introduction of diseased cattle into Cheshire from Ireland; distinctive difference between the appearance of Welsh and Irish cattle, *ib.* 10329-10410, 10421, 10422—Opinion that there must be some predisposing cause for the prevalence of cattle diseases in Cheshire, of which there is no positive knowledge, *ib.* 10411-10415, 10423.

Unsatisfactory character of the Cheshire cattle farming, *Lambert* 13587-13575, 13645-13647; *W. Brown* 13901-13905.

Memorial of the court of quarter sessions for the county of Chester to the Privy Council, dated 18th February 1873, relative to the want of sundry precautions against the import of disease from Ireland, *App.* 574.

Clarke, John Algernon. (Analysis of his Evidence.)—Is a farmer in Lincolnshire, and Secretary to the Central Chamber of Agriculture, 8187, 8188—Resolutions adopted by the Chamber of Agriculture on the 4th of February in the present year; explanation hereon as to the constitution and numbers of the association, 8189-8193, 8230-8236.

Examination as to the expediency of slaughter or quarantine for the prevention of the spread of contagious diseases; necessity for legislative enactment on the subject, 8195-8205, 8238-8267, 8380-8390, 8310-8314, 8378-8395, 8511-8515, 8553-8573, 8584-8588—Decided expediency of the discretion to slaughter or to admit animals on their arrival in the country being left to the Privy Council; grounds for this opinion, 8199-8204, 8248-8262, 8355, 8379-8398.

Desirability of extending to Ireland the same regulations as are in force in England, 8211, 8242—Recommendations of the Chamber of Agriculture as regards sheep-pox and cattle plague, 8212-8216—Insufficiency of the present regulations for the disinfection of public conveyances; dirty railway trucks are a frequent source of spreading disease, 8217-8221, 8556-8558, 8589-8592.

Expediency of stopping fairs and markets in the months of June and July in counties where foot and mouth disease exists; reasons for the selection of these two months, 8222-8224, 8317-8323—General condemnation by the Agricultural Chambers of the ventilation of the holds of ships, 8225—Desirability of there being two places of loading at ports in case one should be infected, 8226-8229.

Existence of the foot and mouth disease in England since the year 1839; statement that the disease was re-introduced into England in the year 1869 by foreign cattle, 8269-8279—Belief that the disease was mainly exterminated during the cattle plague regulations in 1866 and 1868; 8276-8279.

Contention that there should be no more restriction upon the importation of Irish cattle into England than detention for six hours, and certificates of health from the port of embarkation, 8291-8294—Stricter regulations required with regard to animals coming from Holland than those coming from Ireland; reasons for this opinion, 8295-8300, 8315, 8316—Machinery for stamping out the disease in Ireland which does not exist in Holland; expediency of a system of isolation of foreign cattle to be enforced by means of inspectors, 8300-8309, 8324-8337.

Difficulties of carrying out the regulations as to isolation and slaughter on account of the farmers hoping to remove disease by medical treatment, 8310-8313—Opinion that the stoppage of the movement of cattle for two months in June and July, would produce a marked repression of the foot and mouth disease, 8317-8323.

Examination as to the means to be employed for giving effect to the regulations with regard to the stamping out of the disease; expediency of the appointment of qualified

Clarke, John Algernon. (Analysis of his Evidence)—continued.

inspectors throughout the country by the Privy Council, 8338-8347. 8459-8472. 8491-8510.—Necessity of uniformity of action on the part of the inspectors, 8341, 8342.

Means by which the local inspectors would discover the existence of foot and mouth disease; belief in the willingness of the farmers to submit to these regulations for the prevention of the spread of the disease, 8347-8355.—The time during which a fair or yard should be liable to be termed an "infected place" should be decided by the Privy Council, 8357-8367.

Reasons for not including Scotland in the proposed regulations as to the cattle arriving from Ireland in England, 8368-8372.—Efficacy of a week's quarantine in breaking many of the acute cases of pleuro-pneumonia, though it would not intercept the disease from entrance into the kingdom, 8374-8377.—Desire for slaughter or quarantine is based more upon foot and mouth disease than upon pleuro-pneumonia, 8376-8378.

Statement that pleuro-pneumonia has not done one-fourth of the mischief that has resulted from foot and mouth disease; examination as to the losses of witness from attacks of pleuro-pneumonia and foot and mouth disease, respectively, 8376, 8439-8453. 8472-8484. 8518-8535.—Practicability of providing sufficient lairage at the ports to quarantine a considerable number of animals, 8399-8401.

Doubtful propriety of permitting fat and store cattle to be imported at the same ports, 8402, 8403.—Contention that store cattle would become plentiful in England if foreign cattle were kept out, 8404-8407.—Opinion that the slaughter of fat cattle at the port of debarkation would not be a hindrance to the trade in meat, 8410-8415.

Diminution of store stock in the United Kingdom owing principally to the prevalence of contagious disease and also to the droughts of 1868 and 1870; 8416-8423.—Approval of slaughtering all animals that are affected with pleuro-pneumonia in England and allowing full compensation; expediency of isolating those adjacent and inoculating them, 8451-8455.

Further examination as to carrying out the regulations with respect to foot and mouth disease; necessity that the inspector appointed by the Privy Council, should be totally independent of the local authorities, 8458-8472.—Additional explanation as to the selection of the months of June and July for prohibiting movements of cattle, 8473-8476.

Information as to the probable good effects of inoculation in cases of pleuro-pneumonia; method by which inoculation is effected, 8485-8490. 8537-8541.—Illustrations of absence of uniformity between counties and boroughs, 8503-8506.—Expediency of making the Privy Council Orders compulsory and not permissive, 8506-8509.—Opinion that in the event of disease breaking out in a quarantine establishment the whole of the animals should be slaughtered immediately, 8511-8515. 8528.

Privations suffered by cattle upon long journeys as regards food and water; instances of show cattle belonging to Mr. Walter Gulbey being without food or water for more than twenty hours, 8516-8531.—Expediency of the system of slaughtering all foreign cattle upon debarkation being made permanent for the purpose of keeping out disease; contention that this regulation would greatly increase the quantity of meat and so tend to reduce the price, 8532-8535.

Circumstances under which the ship "Joseph Soames" arrived at Hull with cattle plague on board; difficulty as to defining in what manner the contagion was transmitted to the cattle on shore, 8557-8567.—Examination as to the meat supply of the country; contention that the repression of contagious disease among our own stock is the safest way to add to the supply, 8574-8581. 8642-8647. 8704-8718. 8734. 8743.

Period of incubation of the foot and mouth disease is about four or five days; personal experience upon which the opinion is founded, 8593-8598.—Further examination as to the date at which foot and mouth disease first appeared in this country; total absence of restrictions with a view to repressing the disease between the years 1839 and 1865; 8609-8614.—Statement that foot and mouth disease has the effect of preventing the production of store cattle on account of its killing so many calves, and deterring the farmers from breeding, 8614-8627.

Examination as to the loss which the country has sustained by the recent outbreak of foot and mouth disease; calculation that it has amounted to 13,000,000 *l.* or 14,000,000 *l.* in one year, 8643-8686.—The amount of animal food consumed in England per year is about six and a half stone weight per head, 8657.—Opinion that a butcher in buying an animal would not take into account the fact that it had suffered previously from the foot and mouth disease, but would give the present value of it, 8687-8692.

Evidence in further support of compulsory slaughter or quarantine as regards cattle coming into this country from foreign countries; opinion that this course would encourage importers to send more animals than they do at present, 8694-8703. 8719. 8746.—Decrease in the amount of meat imported in the year 1873; the probable reason is that the

Report, 1873—continued.

Clarke, John Algerson. (Analysis of his Evidence.)—continued.

the foreigner has been also suffering from foot and mouth disease, and has not had the meat to send, 8727-8731.—Considerable diminution in the importation of Australian preserved meat in the last few months; opinion that the prospects of this trade are very bad at the present time, 8737-8743.

Clarke, J. A. Letter from Mr. Clarke to the Chairman of the Committee, dated 17th June 1873, in explanation of certain evidence relative to the importation of foot and mouth disease, *App.* 598.

Clode, William. (Analysis of his Evidence.)—Is Secretary of the Census Department, and also one of the Superintendents of the Registrar General's Department, 9397, 9398.—Was in charge of the Statistical branch of the Cattle Plague Department in 1866-67, and found it in much confusion; he left it in better working order, 9399-9403.—Compilation by witness of the Statistical Report for the Cattle Plague Department in 1867, which was published as an Appendix to Dr. Williams's Report, 9404-9407.—Opinion that the present Veterinary Department might with advantage be transferred to the Local Government Board; reasons for this conclusion, 9411-9417, 9424.—Information as to the position which Dr. Farr holds in the office of the Registrar General, 9418-9423.

[Second Examination.]—Additional statement as to the special duties devolving upon Dr. Farr, the Superintendent of Statistics, 10444-10448.—Comparison drawn between the salaries of the officers of the Veterinary Department and those of the Registrar General's Department; contention that the salaries of the latter department are not so high as those of the former, 10449-10463, 10469-10480, 10503, 10504.

Examination in support of the statement that Dr. Williams was not justified in delaying for three years the report drawn up by witness on the subject of the cattle disease, 10464-10468, 10481-10502.—Complaint by witness as to the limitation by Dr. Williams of his duties in connection with the information to be given as to the progress and extent of the Cattle Plague, 10486-10502.

Colonies. Explanation as to the different modes in which foot and mouth disease may have been conveyed to the Colonies; principle of infection necessarily involved, *Baldwin* 4390-4393, 4415, 4416, 4497.—See also *Australia. Canada. New South Wales.*

COMPENSATION (COMPULSORY SLAUGHTER):

1. *Concurrence of Evidence as to the Expediency of Compensation for Diseased Animals slaughtered.*
2. *Suggestions as to the Amount of Compensation.*
3. *Source whence Compensation should be defrayed.*
4. *Obstacles to Compensation on a very large Scale.*
5. *Conclusions and Recommendations of the Committee.*

1. *Concurrence of Evidence as to the Expediency of Compensation for Diseased Animals slaughtered:*

Effect of compensation in inducing owners of infected cattle to report the cases of disease, *Williams* 830.—Policy of simple compensation of farmers for slaughtered animals, as otherwise the cases of infection will probably not be reported, *ib.* 877-887.

Comparatively small cost involved in the compensation of owners for all animals killed on account of foot and mouth disease, *Baldwin* 3816, 3834, 3831.—Concurrence in the view as to the expediency of compensation for animals slaughtered in respect of pleuro-pneumonia, *Baldwin* 3855-3864, 3870-3875, 4024-4028; *Haunting* 4302, 4303-4308; *Wells* 8081-8083, 8110-8113; *Clarke* 8451-8456.

Interest of the public in giving adequate compensation for infected animals slaughtered; interest on the score of price as well as of quality, *Baldwin* 4136-4141.—Anticipated failure of any legislation which does not proceed upon the basis of adequate compensation for animals slaughtered on the score of disease, *ib.* 4177-4180.

Approval of a fair compensation being paid for cattle in the case of compulsory slaughter, *Garnett* 5501, 5502.—Expediency of giving compensation to owners who should report as to disease, *O'Neel* 6720, 6721.—Necessity for a liberal compensation for slaughtered animals with a view to an early discovery of disease, *Smith* 10266-10273.—Unwillingness of the farmers to report the existence of disease, obviated by allowing a liberal compensation, *Goslett* 11829, 11830, 11874-11877, 11880.

2. *Suggestions as to the Amount of Compensation:*

Opinion that the full value should not be paid as compensation in all cases where animals are slaughtered for cattle plague, *Williams* 312-317.—Check to pleuro-pneumonia by giving full compensation for each animal that is diseased, provided it be at once slaughtered, *Brown* 1558-1559.—Consideration of the detailed arrangements desirable on the score of compensation for the slaughter, respectively, of diseased animals

Report, 1873—continued.

COMPENSATION (COMPULSORY SLAUGHTER)—continued.

2. Suggestions as to the Amount of Compensation—continued.

animals, and of those herded with them. *Brown* 2364-2365. 2681-2682—Liberal compensation suggested in cases of slaughter on account of cattle plague, *Simonds* 3066-3070.

Question considered whether the principle of self-interest would not be destroyed if the full value of the animals killed were given to the owners; advocacy nevertheless of full compensation, *Baldwin* 3692-3694. 3885-3899—Evidence to the effect that as regards compensation, the justice of the case would be met by giving the farmer two-thirds of the value of each infected animal killed, and the full value of each animal killed in the first stage of infection, *ib.* 4040-4053—Expediency of the compensation never exceeding the proper value of the animal killed, *ib.* 4194—In compensating for slaughtered animals where there is pleuro-pneumonia, the value of the herd should be taken as that after the outbreak of the disease, *ib.* 4599-4601.

Explanation of witnesses' views as to the amount of compensation to be awarded when animals are slaughtered as a check to the spread of cattle plague, *ib.* *Stanton* 4688-4677—Expediency of the full value being paid when animals in contact with cattle plague are slaughtered, whilst three-fourths should be paid for those actually diseased, *Fisher* 5080-5087. 5244-5249—Opinion that half value or compensation should be given when an animal suffering from pleuro-pneumonia is slaughtered, and that full value should be given for any animal slaughtered which have only been in contact with the disease, *Murray* 5781-5790.

Expediency of giving larger compensation than at present in the case of compulsory slaughter, *Jenkins* 6136-6140—Undoubted necessity of giving high compensation for compulsory slaughter; opinion that the full value should not be given as it might lead to jobbery, *Garry* 6740-6743. 6308-6311—Contention that the payment of full compensation to the farmers for compulsory slaughter would not induce recklessness as to disease, *Baldwin* 7365-7370. 7391. 7392. 7442—Further examination as to the compensation to be allowed for compulsory slaughter; opinion that no allowance should be made for the carcass, but that it should be buried, skin and all, *ib.* 7508-7515.

Expediency of giving full compensation for compulsory slaughter, *Ferriss* 7821-7824; *Lepper* 10815-10818—Compensation should be paid for animals which have been slaughtered to the extent of two-thirds or three-fourths of their value, *Ridgely* 8774—Further statement as to the compensation to be paid to owners of slaughtered animals; expediency of compensating in proportion to the amount of loss, *ib.* 8960-8968.

Desirability, in the case of slaughter, of giving full compensation for healthy, and half compensation for diseased animals; contention that an arrangement of this character would induce farmers to report all cases of disease, *McBride* 9114. 9115. 9228-9238—Expediency of liberal compensation in the case of compulsory slaughter; belief that full compensation would not induce the farmers to be reckless of the disease, *Goodlet* 11597-11600. 11619. 11675—Opinion that the owner should be compensated for compulsory slaughter to the extent of only about one-half of the value, *Stewart* 11773-11778. 11890-11893.

Expediency of giving compensation to the extent of three-fourths of the value for compulsory slaughter, *Miles* 12126-12128—Suggested compensation to the extent of two-thirds of the value in the case of compulsory slaughter; belief that without such compensation farmers will not report the existence of disease, *Lambert* 13452-13454—Decided expediency of awarding a high rate of compensation for the purpose of inducing an early discovery of disease in the case of cattle attacked with pleuro-pneumonia, *Thomson* 11887-11871. 11280-11290. 11458-11460.

3. Scarce when Compensation should be defrayed:

Conclusion that slaughter being for the national good the compensation should be paid by the Exchequer, *Fisher* 5088-5090—Expediency of paying compensation out of the Imperial Exchequer, or out of a poll rate upon every head of cattle in Great Britain, *Smith* 10201. 10304—Examination upon the question of compensation for compulsory slaughter and the source of payment; expediency of Government giving compensation conjointly with an insurance society, *Denchfield* 11027-11034. 11045-11055.

4. Obstacles to Compensation on a very large Scale:

Difficulty as to the provision of compensation on a large scale for slaughtered animals, *Ferguson* 4923. 4949. 4950—Further consideration of the difficulty on the score of compensation under a system of compulsory slaughter, *ib.* 5060-5064.

Evidence in further explanation of witnesses' objections, on the score of compensation, to an extensive system of slaughtering for pleuro-pneumonia; admission however that the spread of the disease can best be checked thereby, *Ferguson* 5431-5434. 5443-5446. 5534-5537.

5. Conclusions

COMPENSATION (COMPULSORY SLAUGHTER)—continued.

5. *Conclusions and Recommendations of the Committee:*

Recommendations by the Committee to the effect that compensation be given for animals slaughtered in respect of cattle plague, pleuro-pneumonia, and sheep-pox, *See* iv.—Conclusion as to the expediency of a higher rate of compensation for animals slaughtered for foot and mouth disease, *ib.* v.—Recommendation that the local authority be empowered to grant compensation to an extent not exceeding three-fourths of the loss sustained by the owner, provided that it does not exceed 25*l.* for any animal, *ib.* v.

Compulsory Slaughter. See Compensation. *Cattle Plague.* *Foot and Mouth Disease.* *Pleuro-pneumonia.* *Slaughter.*

Concealment of Disease. See Compensation. *Fines and Penalties.*

Confiscation (Diseased Animals). Respects in which a power of confiscation of diseased cattle at the port of landing would be exceedingly salutary, *Ferguson* 5447-5454, 5489-5493.—Disapproval of the confiscation of any animal which was found diseased at the shipping port in Ireland, *Gale* 6228-6230.—Objection to the regulation by which an animal found to be diseased on landing is declared contraband and seized by the Customs, *O'Neill* 6759-6769, 6885-6887, 6981, 6986.

Connacht. Singularly healthy character of the cattle in the province of Connacht, *Vardon* 7983-7985.—Connacht is the principal rearing place for stock, *Wadd* 8159, 8153.

Consuls' Reports. Useful reports from the consuls abroad as to the existence of cattle plague; check thereby upon selected cargoes, as in the case of Russia, *Williams* 856-861.

Contagion or Infection. See Cattle Plague, I. *Foot and Mouth Disease*, II, 1-3. *Pleuro-pneumonia*, I.

Corwall. Considerable importation of cattle into Cornwall from Ireland and from Spain, *Duckham* 9791-9795.

County Authorities. See Local Authorities.

Cruelty (Shipment and Landing of Cattle). Check upon unnecessary cruelty in the handling of animals if an inspector were always present, *Brown* 1675-1677.—Evidence relative to the ill-treatment of Irish cattle during the process of shipment and of debarkation; satisfactory result of the measures adopted for preventing the barbitism formerly practised, *Ferguson* 5326-5341.—Presence of police when Irish cattle are being shipped; check thereby to cruelty, *ib.* 5327-5332.—Cruel character of cattle drovers, *ib.* 5371.

Copy of report on cruelty to animals on their being shipped, sent to constabulary and Dublin metropolitan police for their information and guidance, *App.* 625-627.

Police reports in September and October 1870, relative to the treatment of cattle on shipment at North Wall, *App.* 627, 628.

See also Cattle Ships. *Drovers.* *Railways.* *Watering of Cattle.*

Customs Officers. Slight advantage of compulsory notice to the local veterinary inspector upon the arrival of each cargo; duties of the Customs officers adverted to hereon, *Williams* 774-788, 917.—Valuable check, through the veterinary inspectors and through the Customs officers, upon diseased animals being passed into the country from the outports, *ib.* 993-1001.

D.

Dairies. Considerable difficulty in respect of pleuro-pneumonia in the London dairies, obstacles to any satisfactory inspection, *Brown* 2455-2479.—Reasons for the great spread of pleuro-pneumonia through the London dairies, *ib.* 2601-2607.

Liability of old dairy cows to pleuro-pneumonia, *Baldwin* 3847-3852.—Concentration of disease in the dairies in Dublin, London, and other large towns, *ib.* 4247-4250.—Belief as to the inaccuracy of a return prepared by Professor Ferguson, which states that only ten animals were slaughtered on account of pleuro-pneumonia in the Dublin dairies, *ib.* 4481-4491.

Evil of town dairies as centres for the propagation of pleuro-pneumonia, *McBride* 9116-9119; *Gangoo* 9430, 9440.

See also Foot and Mouth Disease. *Pleuro-pneumonia.*

DEAD MEAT:

1. *As to the Import of Dead Meat, in lieu of Live Cattle, from Abroad and from Ireland.*
2. *As to the Conveyance of Dead Meat by Railway from Aberdeen to London and from the Ports to the Interior.*

DEAD MEAT :**1. As to the Import of Dead Meat, in Skin of Live Cattle, from Abroad and from Ireland :**

Probable tendency to reduction of price if dead meat were imported instead of the live animal, *Williams* 1813.—Consideration of the statistics as to the import of dead meat of different kinds; large increase of Australian preserved meat, *ib.* 1297-1314.—Obstacles to a dead meat trade between Toning and London; considerable trade however between Aberdeen and London, the voyage being only a few hours shorter, *Brown* 1325-1344.—Disapproval of all import being confined to dead meat, *Simonds* 3099, 3100.

Advocacy of a system whereby the animals should be killed before shipment and imported as dead meat, *Baldwin* 4031-4033.—Opinion that the exportation of store stock into England may well be prohibited, and that meat should only come in as dead meat, *ib.* 4126-4128.—Expectation that by improved refrigeration, &c., dead meat may in course of time be much more extensively imported into England, *ib.* 4205-4211.—Objection to insisting upon the cattle from Ireland to England going as dead meat, though if the meat supply could come successfully in this shape generally it would be very desirable, *ib.* 4218-4220.

Advisability of a dead meat market in consequence of the risk to graziers and breeders of loss by transit from Ireland to England, *Gerry* 6231-6234.—Endeavours of witnesses for several years past to introduce fresh meat transport with a view of doing away with importation of live animals, *Gauges* 9493-9498.—Countries from which dead meat would be imported in the event of the live trade being stopped; means by which dead meat would be preserved upon long voyages, *ib.* 9765-9778.—Desirability of turning the whole of the foreign trade into a dead meat trade; great loss resulting from the transit of live cattle from the ports of landing to their destination, *Odgers* 10002, 10082.

Large amount of dead meat imported from the Continent; statement that this trade could not be carried on with advantage when the voyage is longer than thirty-six hours, *Robinson* 10603-10612, 10659-10663, 10702-10705.—The tendency of the London trade is towards the dead meat trade; expediency for that reason of all the foreign cattle being sent to Deptford, *ib.* 10745-10757.

Examination with regard to the importation of dead meat from abroad; statement that the supply depends a good deal upon the period of the year, *Gebhardt* 12939-12953.—Additional examination with reference to the dead meat trade; disadvantage at Deptford in killing the animals in hot weather, whilst they will not keep over Saturday night, *ib.* 12978-12994, 13011-13043.

2. As to the Conveyance of Dead Meat by Railway from Aberdeen to London and from the Ports to the Interior :

Examination as to the comparative cost of sending up live cattle and dead meat from Aberdeen to London; comparison of the charges by sea and rail, *Thomson* 11345-11361, 11392-11405, 11897-11911, 11926-11934.—Large quantities of dead meat sent to London from Aberdeen by the butchers; danger of the meat suffering depreciation during very hot weather, *ib.* 11912-11925.—Evidence in favour generally of sending to London dead meat instead of live animals, *ib.* 11935-11947.

Losses incurred in sending dead meat into the interior of the country in the summer weather; impossibility of making the best of the offal, *Hudgetts* 12610-12617, 12622-12625, 12628-12637, 12702, 12703, 12712-12716.—Statement that a change from the live animal to the dead meat trade would not do for the West Bromwich district at all, *ib.* 12638-12688, 12696-12698, 12712-12716.

Great difficulty in carrying dead meat from the port of entry into the interior on account of the bad condition of the cattle upon landing; expediency of cattle being fully rested before being slaughtered, *Gebhardt* 12752-12754.—Strong disapproval of compulsory slaughter at the ports of arrival; considerable losses incurred from sending dead meat into the interior after slaughter at the ports, *ib.* 12766-12780.—Irregularity of railway trains an additional difficulty in the way of sending meat into the interior, *ib.* 12810-12813.

Statement as to the loss which results from sending dead meat by rail in the hot weather, *Roberts* 13299-13310.—Conclusion that it costs twice as much to transport a head dead by rail as it does when alive, *Feedcock* 13806-13809, 13838.—Statement as to the manner in which the dead meat is taken away from markets and is conveyed by rail from Hull, &c.; considerable deterioration, *W. Brown* 13860-13862, 13888-13898, 13912-13931, 13932-13984, 13997-13995.—Absence of competition in Lancashire between the live cattle trade and the dead meat trade, *ib.* 13906-13911.

See also *Foreign Cattle*. *Lancashire*. *Liverpool*. *Meat Supply*. *Offal*. *Prices*. *Sheffield*.

Dealers and Jobbers. Objection to a proposal for imposing a license upon cattle dealers or jobbers in Ireland, *Brown* 1816-1820.—Examination as to the grounds for witnesses' apprehensions

Dealers and Jobbers—continued.

apprehensions as to Irish dealers exporting infected cattle to England, in the absence of stringent regulations on this side, *Simonds* 3662-3675, 3680, 3681.

Undue number of jobbers in Ireland, *Baldwin* 4108-4110.—Defence of the placing of some restriction, as by a license, upon small jobbers in Ireland of the farming class, *ib.* 4212-4218, 4221-4224.—Witness further submits that much evil arises from jobbers, as regards the spread of cattle disease, and that this class should be licensed, *ib.* 4358-4363.

Practice of Irish jobbers as to buying diseased stock and sending it to England, *Baldwin* 4432-4484; *Jenkins* 6027-6033.—Expediency of jobbers and dealers being licensed, *Fisher* 5166-5173.—Propriety of licensing cattle dealers after the same manner as horse dealers, *Lepper* 10837, 10863-10876, 10887.

See also *Licenses*.

Denchfield, John. (Analysis of his Evidence.)—Is a grazier living near Aylesbury, and also carries on the business of a salesman in London, 10969-10972, 10990.—Considerable experience of witness as regards the foot and mouth disease; suggestions as to the correct treatment of animals suffering from the disease, 10973-10988, 10991-10997, 11073-11080, 11102, 11103, 11147-11149, 11150-11158.

Decided opinion that foot and mouth disease can be exterminated in this country by the adoption of stringent regulations for stopping the movement of diseased animals, 10988, 10989.—Calculation that the loss from foot and mouth disease is about 4 l. per head on the carcass; considerable loss in milk, 10990-10995, 11056-11072, 11135-11138.

Regulations necessary for preventing the spread of foot and mouth disease; expediency of isolation as a means to this end, 10998-11006, 11118-11128.—Opinion that pleuro-pneumonia is on the decrease; expediency of slaughtering the animals affected with this disease, 11007-11025, 11035-11042.—Contention that pleuro-pneumonia is a disease of foreign origin, 11021-11025.

Examination as to giving compensation for compulsory slaughter; expediency of giving compensation conjointly with an insurance society, 11027-11034, 11045-11055.—Statement that the Metropolitan Market has been of late comparatively free from foot and mouth disease; opinion that where foot and mouth disease has appeared in the market, it has developed itself after the animals left the waste-lands, 11081-11096.

Belief that all large markets are centres of foot and mouth disease, 11097-11099.—Violent character of the outbreak of foot and mouth disease in Germany in the year 1872; effect of this outbreak upon English cattle, 11104-11112, 11139-11146, 11150-11159.—Notice given in the county to the police to stop the movement of infected cattle; opinion that there is not much concealment of disease in the country, 11129-11134.

Fallacious character of the treatment which allows foot and mouth disease to cure itself without some remedial process, 11180, 11185.

Denmark. Careful treatment of cattle in the vessels from Denmark, *Brown* 1622, 1623; *Simonds* 3120.—Import of 12,543 cattle from Denmark in 1872, as compared with an import of 6,815 in 1871, *Gebhardt* 13105.

Deet, Captain Charles. (Analysis of his Evidence.)—Is Marine Superintendent for the London and North Western Railway Company's Steamers between Dublin and Holyhead, 7198, 7199.—Statement as to the difference between the system of cleansing laid down by the Order in Council and that previously adopted by witness; strong objection to the former, more especially as regards the want of control in its application, 7200-7202, 7212-7213, 7270-7277.—Considerable deterioration of the iron work of the ships by the injudicious use of whitewash; explanation in detail as to the injurious effect of this process of cleansing, 7202-7205, 7208-7210, 7237-7244, 7259, 7260, 7267-7269.—Importance of strictly carrying out the Order in Council, 7202-7207.

Method of carrying cattle in the holds of the steamers; statement that they are properly decked and not held, 7206-7212.—Examination as to the manner in which the Order in Council as to whitewashing the vessels is carried out; evasion of the order in certain cases, 7205-7236, 7245-7251.—Impossibility of using the whitewash by means of an engine, 7247.—Circumstances under which the Steamship Owners Association were consulted on the subject of lime-washing, 7253-7258.

Injudicious policy of treating vessels after the fashion of cattle trucks; careful manner in which it is absolutely necessary to keep ships, 7262-7265.—Explanation as to the materials of which lime-wash and whitewash are composed, 7265, 7266.—Contention that if the cleansing system with whitewash is continued, owners of ships will charge much higher rates for cattle to recoup themselves for the injury done to the vessels, 7270, 7271.

Report, 1873—continued.

DEPTFORD MARKET (FOREIGN CATTLE):

Twofold inspection of foreign cattle at Deptford, *Williams* 323, 334—Conclusion as to Deptford not paying well as an investment, *ib.* 963, 965-968.

Approval of the present arrangements at Deptford as to slaughtering, *Brown* 1572, 1573—Very convenient arrangements at Deptford, all that is required being direct railway communication; belief that the Corporation do not get a good return for their outlay in the market, *ib.* 2507-2510, 2805-2810, 2880-2882—Doubt as to there being much import of foot and mouth disease from Hamburg to the Deptford Market at the present time, *ib.* 2511-2515, 2811, 2812.

Doubt as to the sending of scheduled cattle to Deptford having had any effect on the price, *Simonds* 3327-3330—Improvement desirable at Deptford by bringing railway communication into the market, *ib.* 3545-3546.

Witness as clerk of the Deptford Market explains the capacity of the market as regards oxen and sheep respectively, *Paikar* 4311, 4312—He is not aware that importers are dissatisfied with the market, *ib.* 4311, 4312—Increased railway communication with the market is desirable; particulars hereon, *ib.* 4313-4341—No inconvenience arises as regards the carrying away of the offal, *ib.* 4334-4336.

Improper manner in which the regulations as to disinfection are carried out in Deptford, *Gwyer* 9316, 9570-9574, 9725—Absence of country buyers at Deptford on account of the disadvantage in carrying dead meat, *Gibbards* 19915-19919—Statement that the cattle imported by witness in the year 1866 were not killed at the landing place as a result of the restrictions, but were brought into the market, *ib.* 12920-12925—Information as to the average expenses at the Metropolitan Market at Deptford, *ib.* 12927-12937—Evidence in support of the objection to making Deptford a dead meat market, *ib.* 12978-12994, 13011-13043—Foot and mouth disease always present in the Deptford Market on account of its being never clean, *ib.* 13092-13098.

Statement of the amount of tolls, dues, and payments received at the Foreign Cattle Market at Deptford during the year 1872, *App* 580.

Disinfection. Practice as to disinfecting the landing-places where diseased cattle have been disembarked, *Williams* 1003, 1004—Necessity of the disinfection of inspectors after they have been among infected cattle, *Brown* 1780, 1787—Increased cost to the consumer by increased outlay in disinfection of steamers, &c., *ib.* 2843, 2844—Expediency of a double disinfection of railway trucks, steamboats, lairs, &c., *Stratton* 4545, 4546, 4577, 4578, 4630, 4638.

Regulations recently carried out in Ireland for enforcing the disinfection of railway trucks and vessels; legal proceedings lately taken on the score, *Fergusson* 5306, 5311, 5514-5517, 5561, 5563—Statement that the Order in Council as to whitewashing applies to railway companies as well as to steam companies; this regulation not so rigidly enforced in the case of railways as of cattle vessels, *O'Neill* 6752, 6833.

Decided opinion that railway trucks and steam vessels should be thoroughly disinfected each time that they convey cattle or sheep, *Fordun* 7124—Injurious effect of linowash when used as a disinfectant, *ib.* 7125, 7126—Explanation as to the materials of which linowash and whitewash are constituted, *Dent* 7266, 7268.

Insufficiency of the present regulations for the disinfection of public conveyances; dirty railway trucks are a frequent source of spreading disease, *Clarke* 8589-8590—Expediency of appointing a Government inspector to see to the proper disinfecting of railway trucks, and also of markets and fairs, *McBride* 9105-9110; *Duckham* 9898-9931, 9913-9920—Expediency of power being given under the Act for disinfecting premises, and separating diseased from healthy animals, *Stewart* 11868-11872.

Approval generally by the Committee of the present Orders in Council on the score of disinfection, *Rep.* 11.

See also *Cattle Ships*, 4. *Fairs and Markets*, 2. *Railways*.

Downshire. Very good cattle sent from the county Down to Carlisle, *Marrow* 5818, 5819.

Drogheda (Cattle Ships). Description of the ships employed by the Drogheda Steam Packet Company for cattle transit; servants of the company sent with each ship to look after the cattle shipped, *O'Neill* 6664-6669, 6755-6758, 6944-6950—Examination as to the method adopted in stowing cattle in the holds of the vessels; statement that the holds are preferable to the deck for the conveyance of cattle, *ib.* 6670-6679, 6708, 6746-6754, 6806-6811, 6829-6838, 6893-6900—Average number of sailings per week of the vessels; general character of the passage between Ireland and England, *ib.* 6680-6683, 6823-6828, 6953.

English markets to which the cattle conveyed from Drogheda are exported, *O'Neill* 6699, 6700—Statement that no animals suffering from pleuro-pneumonia have been sent from Drogheda within the last five years; possibility of cases in an incipient stage of disease escaping notice, *ib.* 6711, 6712, 6770-6777—Animals affected with foot and mouth

Drogheda (Cattle Ships)—continued.

mouth disease are never permitted to approach the premises of the company: belief that no grazier having a regard for his own interest would send an animal so affected for shipment, *O'Neill* 6713, 6722, 6723.

General inaccuracy of Mr. Jenkins' report as regards the Drogheda Steam Packet Company, *O'Neill* 6724-6734, 6812-6814.—Description of the cattle exported by the steamers of the company; different rates charged for store and fat cattle, *ib.* 6756-6758, 6778-6794, 6995, 6996.—Examination as to the mode of shipping cattle on board the steamers; unloaded statements as to ill-treatment when getting the cattle on board, *ib.* 6868-6876, 6927, 6928.—There is no export of store cattle from Drogheda to Liverpool as a final destination, *ib.* 6923-6928.

Abstract statement of the number of live stock shipped from the port of Drogheda to Liverpool for the three years ending 1st January 1873, *App.* 602.

Drovers. Question considered whether there should not be some better regulations for the disinfecting of drovers who come with cattle from dangerous countries, *Williams* 781-789.—Cattle drovers have about as much humanity as slave dealers, *Ferguson* 5371.

See also *Cruelty*.

Dublin. Statement as to the market in Dublin being a hotbed of disease for the provinces, *Baldwin* 3865, 4016.—Filthy state of some of the cattle lairs at the North Wall, Dublin, *Ferguson* 4882.—Satisfactory character of the lairs in Dublin belonging to the London and North Western Railway Company, *Jenkins* 6127, 6128.

See also *Cattle Ships*. *Cruelty*.

Duckham, Thomas. (Analysis of his Evidence).—Is a farmer in Herefordshire, and editor of the "Hereford Herd Book," 9785-9787.—Returns of the foot and mouth disease in the county during the last year, 9788.—Absence of foot and mouth disease in places where there is no importation of Irish and foreign cattle, 9789.—Opinion that the disease becomes less virulent and less general as it extends from the infected parts, 9790.

Considerable importation into Cornwall from Ireland and from Spain, 9791-9795.—Belief that foot and mouth disease and pleuro-pneumonia are of foreign origin, 9796-9799.—Inefficiency of the regulations in Herefordshire on account of there being no one to see them carried out; inexpediency of a multiplication of local authorities in the same county, 9800-9804, 9859-9862, 9877-9881.

Willingness of the farmers in the district to submit to more stringent regulations with regard to foot and mouth disease, 9805-9808.—Opinion that the county was perfectly free of the foot and mouth disease when the cattle plague came to an end; re-introduction of the disease from Bristol, 9809-9812, 9839-9843.—Serious effect of the disease upon the breeding of cattle; great mortality among calves from sucking diseased milk, 9813-9821, 9875, 9876.

Instance of exportation of the disease to the Australian Colonies from this country, 9822-9827.—Expediency of appointing a Government inspector to see to the proper disinfecting of railway trucks, and also of markets and lairs, 9828-9831, 9923-9926.—Decided opinion in favour of slaughtering all animals infected with pleuro-pneumonia, and of isolating the rest of the herd, 9832-9838, 9908.

Figures showing the numbers of cattle, sheep, and pigs attacked with foot and mouth disease in Herefordshire in the last year, 9843-9845, 9863, 9864, 9908-9912.—Calculation that the total loss in England from this cause has amounted to 13,471,394 *l.*, and in England and Ireland to 19,510,707 *l.*, 9866-9867.—Larger importation of cattle into Herefordshire than there used to be; reasons for the opinion that foot and mouth disease would die out in the county were it not for fresh seeds of disease being brought in, 9891-9896.

Expediency of slaughtering all foreign cattle immediately upon their landing in this country, 9896-9904.—Desirability of there being but one county board for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the Cattle Diseases Act, 9921-9930, 9934.

Dundalk. Excellent accommodation at Dundalk for the reception of cattle before shipment, *O'Neill* 6709, 6710.

Dutch Cattle. See *Holland*.

E.

Eardley Wilnot, Charles. (Analysis of his Evidence).—Has been chief clerk to the Veterinary Department since December 1866; had previously held various appointments in the public service, 3682-3684.—Explains the circumstances under which his salary has been fixed at 600 *l.* a year, 3685-3691.—Supplies particulars relative to his duties in the matter of correspondence, Orders in Council, &c., whilst he is in fact responsible (under the secretary) for the whole work of the office, 3692-3721.

Eardley Wilmet, Charles. (Analysis of his Evidence)—continued.

Discontinuance at the end of 1871 of the statistics of foot and mouth disease, five clerks having been dispensed with in consequence; particulars hereon to the effect that these statistics were not so laborious as they may appear to be, 3705-3707, 3758-3765—Considerable labour involved in the preparation of the "Handbook" of the department, 3709-3715—Extensive correspondence of witness with railway companies; willingness avowed by them to meet the wishes of the department, 3718, 3719—Process pursued in the office as regards all papers of any importance; receipt of over 5,000 papers or letters yearly, 3720, 3721.

Necessity of the clerks frequently working beyond the regular office hours, without always receiving extra pay; testimony moreover to their efficiency, 3723-3734—Explanation relative to the expenses of the department on the score, respectively, of postage, legal expenses, and stationery, 3735-3749—Reduction in the work of the department by a reduction in the number of local authorities, and by the substitution of a small number of superior inspectors for the inferior class now in communication with the department, 3750-3757.

Entry to Premises. Right of entry of the police in Ireland to farms; this is frequently used, *Ferguson* 4935, 4976, 4977—Approval of veterinary inspectors being empowered to enter private premises; that is, under certain conditions, *ib.* 5414-5416.

Recommendation by the Committee that the power of entry be extended to all contagious diseases, except foot and mouth disease, *Rep.* v, vi.

F.

FAIRS AND MARKETS:

1. *Spread of Disease by means of Fairs and Markets.*
2. *Question of reducing the Number of Fairs as a Check to the Spread of Disease.*
3. *Question of stopping Fairs and Markets for a certain Period of the Year.*
4. *Inspection.*
5. *Disinfection.*
6. *Suggestions for improved Arrangements and Accommodation, and for the Slaughter of Diseased Animals.*

1. *Spread of Disease by means of Fairs and Markets:*

Reference to the Dublin market as being a hotbed of disease for the rest of Ireland, *Baldwin* 3865, 4016—Information relative to the parks or pasture fields near Falkirk and other fairs or markets, to which cattle are sent before going into the markets; liability to the spread of disease in these places, *Morrow* 5737, 5747-5754—Large numbers of cattle shown in markets while suffering from foot and mouth disease, *Verden* 7663-7669—Belief that all large markets are centres of foot and mouth disease, *Deverfield* 11097-11099.

2. *Question of reducing the Number of Fairs as a Check to the Spread of Disease:*

Expediency of a check upon the movement of infected animals to fairs rather than upon the number of fairs, though there would doubtless be less danger if the latter could be reduced, *Williams* 970-972—Convenience to farmers in Ireland in having fairs near their farms, *Morrow* 5755—More harm than good resulting from the multiplicity of small fairs in the country, *Jenkins* 6081-6083.

3. *Question of stopping Fairs and Markets for a certain Period of the Year:*

Expediency of stopping fairs and markets in the months of June and July in counties where foot and mouth disease exists; reasons for the selection of these two months, *Clarke* 8222-8224, 8317-8323—Considerable amount of inconvenience, which would result from stopping fairs or markets; opinion that such a course need not be taken if stringent measures are taken as to slaughter and isolation, *Ridley* 8943-8945—Inutility of stopping all fairs and markets at particular periods; this regulation counteracted by effecting private sales, *Smith* 10188, 10353-10355.

4. *Inspection:*

Doubt as to the expediency of the inspectors of the central authority visiting the markets in order to enforce the regulations, *Williams* 841-845—Beneficial effect of the increased inspection of fairs and markets under recent action of the local authorities, *Brown* 9880-9891—Entire inadequacy of any system of market inspection, *Fisher* 5179, 5180—Necessity of inspection of fairs and markets for the purpose of obtaining information, *Gangee* 9448.

Question considered as to the requirement of more stringent regulations as regards the inspection of markets and the prohibition of removal, *Webb* 10951-10961—Expediency of all markets and stock fairs being placed under government inspection; belief that the local inspector has not got sufficient authority to regulate the markets, *Walker* 12186-12194.

Recommendations

FAIRS AND MARKETS—continued.

4. Inspection—continued.

Recommendations by the Royal Dublin Society for the better regulation and inspection of fairs and markets, *App.* 588.

Recommendation by the Committee for the inspection of fairs and markets by officers under the central authority, *Rep.* vi.

5. Disinfection:

Necessity of the disinfection of fairs and markets where there has been disease; this is more important than the stopping of fairs and markets, *Fisher* 5174, 5175, 5180, 5442, 5443.—Unsatisfactory state of fairs and markets as regards the means taken for disinfection; expediency of appointing a Government inspector to see to this matter, *M'Brade* 9105-9110; *Ducklow* 9828-9831, 9913-9920.

6. Suggestions for improved Arrangements and Accommodation, and for the Slaughter of Diseased Animals.

Expediency of compulsory restrictions being applied by the local authority as to the arrangements in fairs and markets, *Brown* 2437-2444.—Want of clear power in the local authority as to the seizure of infected animals in fairs or on highways, *ib.* 2501-2504.

Appropriateness of the continued prohibition upon the exposure of diseased animals in fairs and markets, *Steads* 1957, 2968.—Advisability of all diseased animals discovered at fairs being slaughtered, and the owners punished for sending them, *Jenkins* 6007, 6004, 6088-6090, 6133-6135.—Advantage of having all cattle fairs in Ireland held in well-drained fields; desirability of tolls or customs levied off the animals being paid upon their entry into and not upon their leaving the fairs, *Garnett* 6402-6405.

Examination as to the character of the fairs in Ireland, and the treatment of the cattle exhibited; statement that English fairs would contrast very unfavourably with Ballinacree, *Fordos* 7911-7922.—Opinion that subdivision of pens in cattle fairs and markets would be quite impracticable, *ib.* 7974, 7975-7989, 7992.

Examination as to the propriety of having separate markets for fat and store cattle; contention that fat cattle, though quite fit for the butcher, may be very dangerous to put with store animals, *Walker* 12195-12205.—Favourable opinion as to the management of the fairs in Ireland, *Lombert* 13513-13519.

See also *Ballinacree Fair*. *Ireland L.* 5, 6. *Weyhill Fair*.

Farcy. Omission of farcy from the Act of 1859, whereas it is a very contagious disease and produces glanders; it is, in fact, a peculiar form of glanders, and should be subject to the same restrictions, *Hanley* 4757-4766, 4777, 4779, 4820-4834.—Suggestions as regards farcy that compensation might be allowed when horses are slaughtered, as the disease is curable, *ib.* 4833-4836.

Similitude of farcy to glanders; the former is not so incurable, but still should be placed under close restrictions, *Ferguson* 5352, 5353, 5355.

See also *Glanders*.

Farmers. Grounds for the statement that farmers really care nothing at all about the foot and mouth disease, and are not anxious for stronger regulations on the subject, *Brown* 2652-2665, 2744-2756.—Carelessness of farmers in former years as to the existence of foot and mouth disease, *Simonds* 3127, 3218, 3232, 3233.

Admission that many farmers in Ireland are indifferent or are opposed to legislation as regards foot and mouth disease; these views have reference, however, to the present regulations, which are vexatious without being efficacious, witness believing that the farmers would generally approve of the restrictions proposed by him, *Baldwin* 4153-4157, 4233-4235, 4239, 4440, 4508, 4564-4568, 4419-4420, 4492-4494.—Strong feeling amongst agriculturists that the foot and mouth disease should be more stringently and effectually dealt with; belief that generally, as in Wiltshire, farmers would support the increased restrictions proposed, *Stratton* 4533, 4547, 4548, 4557, 4574, 4575, 4577-4582, 4716-4721.

Reluctance of farmers and graziers in Ireland to report cases of pleuro-pneumonia, through dread of the consequent restrictions; less difficulty, however, since the orders have been modified, *Ferguson* 4868-4872, 4911.—Strong disapproval by farmers and graziers in Ireland of any such restrictions as those proposed by Professor Baldwin, *Morrow* 5654-5656, 5693-5697.—Disposition upon the part of farmers in Ireland to conceal foot and mouth disease; reasons for this, *Bolton* 7403-7411.—Difficulties in carrying out the regulations as to isolation and slaughter on account of the farmers hoping to remove disease by medical treatment, *Clarke* 8310-8313.

Opinion that it would not be necessary to trouble the farmers with regard to foot and mouth disease for the reason that if foreign importation be stopped the disease will die out, *Ganger* 9607-9612.—Willingness of the farmers in Herefordshire to submit to

Report, 1873—continued.

Farmers—continued.

more stringent regulations as regards foot and mouth disease, *Duckham* 3805-3808.—Opinion that the farmers in Scotland would willingly submit to any regulations that were made for the stamping out of pleuro-pneumonia and foot and mouth disease, *Affine* 12115, 12116, 12120.

See also the *Headings generally throughout the Index.*

Fat Stock (Generally). See the *Headings generally throughout the Index.*

Fat Stock (Ireland). Absence of necessity for interfering with fat cattle in Ireland, which do but little mischief as regards the propagation of foot and mouth disease, *Baldwin* 3807-3809.—Large export of fat stock from Ireland to England, *ib.* 4169.

See also *Ireland.*

Ferguson, Professor Hugh. (Analysis of his Evidence.)—Is Director General of the Veterinary Department of Ireland; has conducted the Department since its institution, 4537-4840.—Statement of the staff of the office, 4841.—Explanation as to witnesses having continued the employment of three clerks without the authority of the Treasury; deny that if these had been discharged, 4841, 4842. 4570.—Description of the duties of the department, and the amount and character of work which is performed, 4842-4853.

Information relative to the duty of the constabulary throughout Ireland as to detecting cases of contagious disease and reporting them to the veterinary department; efficient discharge of these duties on the whole, though many cases doubtless escape detection, 4853-4860. 4554-4559.—Very few veterinary surgeons throughout Ireland; no made of their services by witness' department, 4661-4805. 4578-4581.—Reliance of farmers and graziers to report cases of pleuro-pneumonia, through dread of the consequent restrictions; less efficiently, however, since the orders have been modified, 4868-4872, 4911.

Sufficient penalty for securing that cases of pleuro-pneumonia are reported, if only the penalty were properly enforced; comment upon the action of the magistrates in the matter, 4873-4877. 4897-4899.—Serious spread of disease in Ireland through the railway trucks not being disinfected; deny that fault rests with witness' department in this matter, 4878-4881. 4888.—Filly sale of some of the cattle lost at the North Wall, Dublin, 4882.—Impracticability of inspecting all the animals going to Ballinacree fair, 4883.—Way in which disease would be checked and outbreaks more readily reported, if there were authority at once to send professional inspectors to the locality, 4884-4889.

Statistics relative to the amount of foot and mouth disease in Ireland in 1872, and the mortality therefrom, in the case respectively of cattle, sheep, and swine, 4900-4903.—Inability of witnesses to estimate the loss to farmers from the disease, 4909. 5029.—Advantage of the discontinuance of the former vexatious restrictions imposed by the Privy Council, 4911.—Comparatively few cases in which veterinary inspectors were sent from the central department in 1872 to inspect cases of foot and mouth disease, 4912.—Probability of a great number of diseased animals having been sent to England in 1872, though many were not sent intentionally, 4913.

Grounds for the conclusion that a system of inspection at the port of embarkation would not be any adequate check to the export of animals under the influence of foot and mouth disease, 4914-4921.—Impracticability of a system of quarantine at the port of embarkation, 4922, 4923.—Difficulty as to the provision of compensation on a large scale for slaughtered animals, 4923. 4949, 4950.—Belief that foot and mouth disease can be and is sometimes propagated otherwise than by contagion; data for this conclusion, 4924-4927.

Efficiency of Mr Baldwin's plan for the extirpation of disease, if the obstacles from the stoppage of movements and from slaughter and compensation are not found to be impracticable; witness would be sorry to propose such stringent measures, 4928-4934. 4944-4950. 4960-4964. 4997-5000.—Difficulty in fixing a time which would suffice, for stopping all movement of cattle, for stamping out the foot and mouth disease, 4931-4934. 4957-5000.—Right of entry of the police to farms; this is frequently used, 4935-4976. 4977.—Prohibition at present upon the movement of any animal affected with foot and mouth disease, 4936.—Great difficulty in preventing the spread of disease from animals sent to Ballinacree fair; ineffectuality of stopping the fair, 4936-4941.—Statement that much of the alleged foot and mouth disease in sheep at large fairs was nothing more than foot-rot, 4937. 5021, 5021*.

Decided objection to the abolition of all inspection, 4939.—Advantage of a staff of veterinary inspectors, with power to seize diseased animals, and to act with the police, *ib.*—Circumstance of foot and mouth disease having been recently imported to Dublin with some Spanish or Portuguese cattle; summary measures adopted in this case, 4947. 4948. 5022, 5023.—Suggestion for preventing the wilful export of diseased animals from Ireland to England, 4943-4945.—Opinion that the quantity of diseased cattle sent from Ireland to England is very much exaggerated, 4943.

Grounds

Ferguson, Professor Hay. (Analysis of his Evidence)—continued.

Grounds for the conclusion that pleuro-pneumonia sometimes occurs in Ireland otherwise than by infection or contagion, 4951, 4952—Means of stopping the spread of pleuro-pneumonia by complete isolation, and by the prevention of movement, 4953, 4954—Subsidiary regulations now in force in Ireland relative to this disease; relaxation of the imperative restrictions in force in 1871; 4955-4957—Very few cases of the disease now reported, 4958, 4959—Great decline also in the number of cases of foot and mouth disease, &c.,—Excessive inconvenience by stopping all movement of cattle to fairs in Ireland in May and June, or in June and July, 4960-4962, 5003-5004, 5007.

Respects in which the Irish system of dealing with cattle diseases is preferable to the English system, the former being worked entirely from central sources, 4965-4968—Drawback in England through the local authorities not acting in unison, 4968—Great facility with which simultaneous action may be taken throughout Ireland by means of the Comptrolery, &c.

Failure of the steps taken in Ireland as well as in England, for checking the spread of foot and mouth disease, 4969-4977—Number of cases of the disease in Donegal and in Kerry in 1872; no county was exempt, 4982-4984—Incomplete character of the returns as to the amount of the disease, 4985-4988—Very much larger mortality of swine from the disease than of sheep or cattle, 4989-4991—Illustrations of the want of professional inspectors, in lieu of the necessity of sending them to the localities from Dublin, 4992-4996.

Suggestion that the import of foreign cattle into Ireland might be stopped altogether, the amount being trifling, 5014—Very injurious effect of a withdrawal of the present restrictions as to foot and mouth disease, 5025-5028—Information as to the orders in force in Ireland at different times for the disinfection of railway trucks, 5030-5037—Steps taken by witness, in consequence of representations from England, for the inspection of cattle at certain points, with a view to the detection and confiscation of diseased animals; disease, likewise, of the power of confiscation, 5038-5052.

Explanations in connection with the general rate to be levied throughout Ireland for working the Cattle Diseases Acts; expediency of a general rate, rather than of local rates, 5055-5060—Further consideration of the difficulty on the score of compensation under a system of compulsory slaughter, 5060-5065.

[Second Examination].—Sundry details in further explanation of the staff and duties of the Veterinary Department in Dublin, and the remuneration of the several employees, 5072 et seq.—Considerable increase of clerical staff really required, the Treasury now allowing witness only three clerks, and two more being kept on at his own risk, 5077-5083, 5095, 5096, 55-9—Defrayment of the office expenses by the Treasury, a general rate-male being liable for outside expenses, such as inspection, compensation, &c., 5084-5091—Reduced salary of witness, whereas his present duties are onerous to the extreme; moreover, he was without salary for about two years, 5092-5098, 5367—Total cost of salaries, incidental expenses, rent, &c., 5290-5304.

Regulations recently carried out for enforcing the disinfection of railway trucks and vessels; legal proceedings lately taken on this score, 5306-5311—Further statement as to the nominal and inadequate fines inflicted by the magistrates for non-compliance with the Council Orders; frequent representation made by witness on this subject, but without effect, 5308-5317—Considerable dissatisfaction if the expenses of a proper administration of the Act of 1859 in Ireland were to fall upon the ratepayers, 5318-5320—Exceedingly economical working of the Act in Ireland, as compared with the expense in England, 5321-5323—Further reference to the diverse action of local authorities in England, 5324, 5395.

Evidence relative to the ill-treatment of Irish cattle during the process of shipment and of debarkation; satisfactory result of the measures adopted for preventing the barbarities formerly practised, 5326-5341—Presence of poison when the cattle are being shipped; check thereby to cruelty, 5327-5332—Causes of the impoverished condition of some of the Irish store cattle which go to England, 5343—Large import of calves into Ireland from England, 5342-5345, 5357—Importation of foot-and-mouth disease into Ireland with some calves from Bristol in April or May 1871; the country was then all but free from the disease, 5345-5348.

Explanation that witness does not believe in the spontaneous generation of cattle plague, foot-and-mouth disease, or pleuro-pneumonia, though in the latter case the disease cannot always be traced to contagion or infection, 5348-5351, 5356—Large majority of cases of glanders which are not the result of infection or contagion, 5351—Absence of any reliable cure for glanders, slaughter being desirable, 5352, 5354—Similarity of fury to glanders; the former, however, is not so incurable, but still should be placed under close restrictions, 5354, 5355-5356.

Careful treatment of the calves sent from England to Ireland; low mortality than among home-bred calves, 5358-5360—Very indirect way in which foot and mouth disease may be introduced into the country, even though strict inspection were applied,

Ferguson, Professor Hugh. (Analysis of his Evidence)—continued.

5361—Exceptions taken to the proposed detention of Irish cattle for six hours at the port of debarkation, 5362, 5369—Further suggestions relative to the watering and feeding of Irish cattle; approval of this being done at Liverpool or Holyhead, 5362-5371—Risk of injury to health by watering before the sea voyage, 5369-5374.

Probable accuracy of an estimated mortality of eighty per cent. of the attacks of pleuro-pneumonia, though the returns in Ireland show a mortality of only sixty per cent., 5370-5374-5382, 5383—Average of about sixteen per cent. of the cattle attacked with this disease when it appears on a farm, 5375-5377—Doubt as to any real cure of the disease, there being, moreover, a great deterioration of the animals apparently recovered, 5378-5381, 5384-5386—Conclusion that whatever the origin of the introduction of pleuro-pneumonia into Ireland, it should be dealt with as entirely contagious or infectious, 5387-5392.

Further explanation of witness' reasons for concluding that any inspection of Irish cattle should be at the port of landing in England, and not at the port of shipment in Ireland, 5393-5403—With regard to the long-entrenched practice formerly of sending diseased cattle to England, this system no longer exists, and the movement of diseased cattle in Ireland is now prohibited, 5397, 5400-5407—Statement with further reference to the number of animals with foot and mouth disease at Ballinacree fair in the autumn of 1872, although there is a prohibition upon the movement of such animals, 5408-5417.

Approval of veterinary inspectors being empowered to enter private premises; that is, under certain conditions, 5414-5416—Grounds for objecting to the existence of disease on any farm being advertised, though, on its becoming known to the police, publicity would soon result as among the neighbours, 5417-5419—Very little pleuro-pneumonia now in Ireland, 5428-5430, 5555, 5556—Circumstance of this disease ever being very prevalent when foot and mouth disease is rare; probable increase of the former as a result of decrease of the latter, 5430, 5557-5559.

Nature of witness' objections, on the score of compensation, to an extensive system of slaughtering for pleuro-pneumonia; admission, however, that the spread of the disease can best be checked thereby, 5431-5434, 5443-5446, 5534-5537—Increased facilities desirable as regards the slaughter and sale for food of animals in the earlier stages of pleuro-pneumonia; undue restrictions at present under the Sanitary Act, 5434-5448—Respects in which a power of confiscation of diseased cattle at the port of landing would be exceedingly salutary, 5447-5454, 5489-5493.

Expediency of the same check in Ireland as in England upon the import of diseased foreign cattle; very small foreign import to Ireland, so that it might be prohibited altogether, 5455-5460—Means for ensuring the disinfection of vessels at Irish ports if the magistrates would impose adequate penalties, 5461, 5462—Explanation that witness would not stop the export of a cargo of animals, one of which had been discovered to be diseased; undue interference with trade thereby, 5463-5468.

Obstacle to the enforcement of a general prohibition upon movement for a given time, the magistrates objecting to impose penalties, 5469-5475—Doubt as to the inefficiency of a period of two months during which to stop all movement in reference to foot and mouth disease; doubt as to the time required, 5476, 5518-5519—Conclusion, moreover, as to the inexpediency of the proposed restriction, on account of its great interference with the farming and grazing interests of the country, 5477, 5478, 5481, 5518-5528.

Data further submitted for the conclusion that, irrespective of further restrictions, foot and mouth disease has rapidly diminished, and will probably die out altogether, 5479-5486, 5529—Reluctance further expressed by witness to approve the compulsory slaughter of animals not actually attacked with the disease, 5487, 5488, 5534-5537—Authority for the statement that hares and rabbits and dogs are liable to the disease, 5494-5499—Conviction of witness that there was an outbreak of cattle plague in Meath in 1868, though he cannot account for its introduction, 5500-5503.

Objection to the detention or quarantine of Irish cattle at the port of arrival in England, 5504—Explanation on the subject of communication between witness' department and the department in London, 5505-5508—With sufficient staff witness would soon apply an effectual check to the spread of contagious diseases, 5508, 5545-5447—Statement on the subject of the peculiar prevalence of foot and mouth disease among sheep in 1872; 5510-5512.

Argument that much has been done under witness' department to arrest the movement of animals with foot and mouth disease, and to check the spread of the disease, though as regards fairs but little has been effected, 5512, 5545-5554—Advantage of a minimum fine for not reporting cases of disease to the police, 5513—Satisfactory regulations now in force for the disinfection of cattle trucks and steamboats, 5514-5517, 5561, 5562.

Witness repeats that there is a large import of English calves into Ireland, and that much disease is thus introduced into the latter country, 5538-5543—Further statement that the sheep at Ballinacree fair were suffering from sheep rot, and not from foot and mouth disease, 5563-5566.

Ferguson, Professor Hugh. (Analysis of his Evidence.)—continued.

[Third Examination.]—Further explanations as to the course pursued by the Irish Government in dealing with the railway companies; searching official inquiry instituted as to the validity of the objections urged against the Orders in Council by the companies, 6187, 6188.

Fines and Penalties. Sufficient penalty for securing that cases of pleuro-pneumonia in Ireland are reported, if only the penalty were properly enforced; comment upon the action of the magistrates in the matter, *Ferguson* 4873-4877, 4897-4899.—Further statement as to the nominal and inadequate fines inflicted by the magistrates for non-compliance with the Council Orders; frequent representation made by witnesses on this subject, but without effect, *ib.* 5308-5317.—Advantage of a minimum fine for not reporting cases of disease to the police, *ib.* 5613.

Contention that the punishment for infringing the Order in Council as to moving cattle that are diseased should be real, instead of being nominal, as it is now, *See also* 5890-5894, 6005.—Frequent neglect upon the part of graziers in Ireland to report the existence of foot and mouth disease upon their farms; desirability of inflicting substantial fines for breaches of this regulation, *ib.* 6043-6050.

Frequent fines imposed in Ireland upon persons for permitting cattle to stray upon the highway, *Guiry* 6115-6118.—Absence of convictions of persons for contravening the Orders in Council as regards contagious diseases in Ireland; instance in which the Drogheda Steam Packet Company was summoned for not whitewashing, *ib.* 6235-6240.—Statement that the magistrates in Ireland are too lenient in imposing penalties for breaches of the law relating to cattle diseases, *Boister* 7398-7401, 7567, 7568, 7641, 7642.

Expediency of proceeding against any person who would knowingly sell animals affected with pleuro-pneumonia, *Fordos* 7737-7738, 7800, 7881.—Suggestion that farmers be obliged to report every case of disease, and that in the absence of such report they should be fined heavily, *Lepper* 10835, 10877-10886.—Advisability of uniformity of action in imposing fines for violating the Act in driving animals suffering from disease over a highway, *ib.* 10880-10886.

Examination as to the enforcement of penalties under the Act; necessity for a minimum as well as a maximum fine which should be rigidly enforced, *Walker* 12170, 12171, 12286-12291.—Information with regard to cases of penalties for not reporting the existence of pleuro-pneumonia in the neighbourhood of Edinburgh; difficulty of discovering the disease, *ib.* 12234-12251.

Particulars of fines imposed in Ireland in 1871 and 1872, *App.* 571.—Total of 56*l.* 15*s.* 2*d.* levied in fines in 1871, and of 230*l.* 4*s.* 5*d.* in 1872, *ib.*

Table showing the number of instances in which cattle disease Council Orders have been contravened in each province in Ireland, and in which proceedings have been taken; also the result of each prosecution for the years 1871 and 1872, *App.* 654.

See also Norfolk. Publicity.

Fisher, Robert. (Analysis of his Evidence.)—Is largely engaged as a farmer in Yorkshire and Rutland, and is chairman of the East Riding Chamber of Agriculture, 5063-5070.—Statement as to cattle plague having been introduced through Hull to Pocklington and Bridlington, and as to the local authorities at those places having done all that was possible to stamp out the disease, 5071-5080, 5105-5109.—Expediency of the full value being paid when animals in contact with cattle plague are slaughtered, whilst three-fourths should be paid for those actually diseased, 5080-5087, 5144-5149.—Conclusion that slaughter being for the national good, the compensation should be paid by the Exchequer, 5088-5090.

Better prevention of the spread of cattle plague by giving to the local authority increased power of slaughter, and by there being adequate compensation, 5091-5096.—Serious after loss in the shape of grass, &c. after an attack of cattle plague, or of foot and mouth disease, 5097-5099, 5256-5258.—Strong objection to foreign fat stock and store stock being imported at the same port, as at Hull, 5100-5111.—Suggestions for the quarantining of all foreign store stock at one place, if possible, 5111-5113, 5119-5127.

Disinfection necessary in the case of foreign sheep after quarantining; conveyance of foot and mouth disease in the wool, 5114-5118.—Very serious losses of witness from the disease among his sheep: large losses throughout the East Riding, 5118-5145, 5199-5205.—Considerable abortion resulting from the disease in the case both of sheep and cattle, 5145-5147.—Twofold attack of witness' cows during the summer of 1872, 5147, 5148.—Stop put to the disease by the cattle plague restrictions, 5149, 5150.—Conclusion that the disease is not spontaneous, and is not directly produced by bad treatment during transit, 5152-5155.

Proposition that no person should move cattle from any farm without signing a declaration that they had not been in contact with diseases; expected willingness of farmers

Fisher, Robert. (Analysis of his Evidence)—continued.

farmers to comply with this regulation, 5196-5198, 5181, 5232-5242, 5250-5255.—Expediency of jobbers and dealers being licensed, 5166-5173.—Necessity of the disinfection of fairs and markets where there has been disease; this is more important than the stopping of fairs and markets, 5174, 5175, 5180, 5242, 5243.—Importance of compulsory action on the part of the local authorities, 5176, 5177.—Entire inadequacy of any system of market inspection, 5178, 5180.

Absence of check to foot and mouth disease by detaining for six hours the animals from Ireland, 5182, 5183.—Effect of the great loss of animals from disease in enhancing the price of meat: this loss, in fact, is far greater than is generally supposed, 5184-5196.—Great variation in the loss per head from foot and mouth disease: calculations hereon, 5196-5205, 5210-5223.—Instances of cattle attacked with the disease three times in six months, 5206, 5215-5228.

Suggestion as regards pleuro-pneumonia that animals in contact with the disease be isolated, whilst those diseased should be slaughtered, 5200-5209.—Facility desirable as regards publicity of disease in the locality, 5209, 5210.—Proposal that animals in contact with, but not actually suffering from, foot and mouth disease be at once sent to the nearest slaughter-house, so that they may be used as food, 5210, 5211.—Inadequacy of a mere stoppage of foreign importation as a preventive of disease, 5230, 5231.

Disapproval of Irish cattle being quarantined, or of their export to England being otherwise modestly checked, the Irish supply being of great value to this country, 5259-5264.—Similar restrictions desirable as regards both Irish and English cattle on the score of transit, &c., 5259, 5262-5264.—Contemplated watering of Irish cattle on arrival in England, but not on the railway, 5264, 5265.—Greater risk of loss from disease in the case of a breeding stock than of a fattening stock, 5266-5271.

Food Supply. See *Dead Meat.* *Foreign Cattle.* *Meat (Diseased Animals).* *Meat Supply.*

FOOT AND MOUTH DISEASE:

I. Introduction and Origin of the Disease:

1. Question as to the Introduction of the Disease from Abroad.
2. First Outbreak of the Disease in 1830.
3. Several Outbreaks since 1830.
4. Question of Spontaneous Origin.

II. Character and Treatment of the Disease.

1. Exceedingly Infectious Nature of the Disease.
2. Liability of the same Animals to several Attacks.
3. Several kinds of Animals to which the Disease may be conveyed.
4. Period of Incubation.
5. Treatment.

III. Conveyance of the Disease between Ireland and England and Scotland.

IV. Mortality from the Disease.

V. Deterioration and pecuniary Loss; Immense Sacrifice involved.

VI. Effect of the Act of 1869, and of the Cattle Plague Restrictions as regards the Amount of Disease.

VII. Suggestions as to the Score of Isolation, Stoppage of Movement, Compulsory Slaughter, &c.

VIII. Objections to Stringent Regulations.

IX. Conclusions and Recommendations of the Committee.

I. Introduction and Origin of the Disease:

1. Question as to the Introduction of the Disease from Abroad:

Belief that the presence of foot and mouth disease in this country is not largely owing to foreign export; practice as to inspection and slaughtering at the ports adverted to hereon, *Witnesses* 324-334.—Circumstance of there having been a very malignant attack of the disease in 1840 and 1841, before foreign cattle were imported, *ib.* 1058-1063.

Existence of foot and mouth disease on the Continent for more than a century, *Brown* 1374, 1375.—Belief that the last outbreak of the disease was not in any way due to foreign import, *ib.* 1397, 1398.—Probable introduction of the disease in the first instance from abroad, *ib.* 2057-2067, 2530-2536.

Difficulty of accounting for the original introduction of the disease into England, foreign cattle not having been then imported; it probably was brought in by ships' stores, *Simonds*

FOOT AND MOUTH DISEASE—continued.

I. Introduction and Origin of the Disease—continued.

1. Question as to the Introduction of the Disease from Abroad—continued.

Sinonds 2925, 2926. 2932-2937.—Varying period for which the disease has existed in Europe, whilst at present it is spread almost over the globe, *ib.* 2927, 2928.—Doubt as to the prevalence of the disease in 1872 having been chiefly owing to foreign import, *ib.* 2949.

Witness is convinced that foot and mouth disease is of foreign origin, *Baldwin* 3990, 3991.—Very indirect way in which foot and mouth disease may be introduced into the country, even though strict inspection were applied, *Ferguson* 5361.—Information with regard to the progress of foot and mouth disease; considerable amount of the disease in Dutch cattle, *Jenkins* 5499-5504, 5520-5525, 5508-5525, 5641, 5642, 5107, 5408.

Existence of the foot and mouth disease in England since the year 1839; conclusion that the disease was re-introduced into England in the year 1869 by foreign cattle, *Clarke* 8259-8269.—Further examination as to the date at which foot and mouth disease first appeared in this country; total absence of restrictions with a view to repressing the disease between the years 1839 and 1865; *ib.* 8304-8314.

Absence of foot and mouth disease in places where there is no importation of Irish or foreign cattle, *Duckham* 9789.—Belief that foot and mouth disease, and pleuro-pneumonia are of foreign origin, *ib.* 9796-9799.—Opinion that foot and mouth disease would die out in the country were it not for fresh seeds of disease being brought in, *ib.* 9891-9895.

Decided opinion that foot and mouth disease is entirely of foreign origin; the disease has been brought into Aberdeenshire by means of Irish cattle, *Thomson* 11212-11216, 11247, 11471-11475, 11494-11498.—Decided opinion that foot and mouth disease is a disease of English as well as of foreign origin; belief that the disease will not be got rid of by shutting out foreign cattle, *Gebhardt* 12762-12765.

2. First outbreak of the Disease in 1839:

Original appearance of the disease in England in 1839, when it is supposed to have been introduced from Holland, *Brown* 1376-1379, 2057-2059, 2106-2111.

First experience of witness as to the foot and mouth disease in 1839, when it was conveyed to a farm near Laleham by some suckling calves from the Metropolitan market, *Sinonds* 2904-2910.—Conclusion as regards the outbreak of foot and mouth disease at Langley in Norfolk in November 1839, that the disease was conveyed thither from London rather than from Yarmouth or Lowestoft, *ib.* 3265-3273.—The disease first appeared in August 1839 in the immediate neighbourhood of London, *ib.* 3366.

Original outbreak of foot and mouth disease in London in 1839, further adverted to as not being positively traceable to any source, *Sinonds* 3361-3366.

3. Several Outbreaks since 1839:

Total of six outbreaks of the disease in England, with varying intervals between each outbreak; belief that it has never entirely ceased during the whole period, *Brown* 1380-1391.

Prevalence of the disease in 1840 and 1841; serious outbreaks also in 1845, 1862, and 1869, *Sinonds* 2907-2910, 2916-2918.—Examination to the effect that since 1839 the disease has never really died out in England or Ireland; difficulty, however, in accounting for the periodical violence of the disease, *ib.* 3274-3284.—Periodical outbreaks of foot and mouth disease further adverted to in connection with the gradual decline of the disease after each outbreak, *ib.* 3361, 3362, 3369-3379.

4. Question of Spontaneous Origination:

Explanation in connection with a statement by witness in the report of 1871, that the origin of the foot and mouth disease in England remained to be proved; belief however that it does not arise spontaneously, and is propagated by contagion, *Widmer* 682-689.—Statement in further support of the view that foot and mouth disease does not arise spontaneously, *ib.* 1055-1057, 1139-1146.

Examination upon the question as to the spontaneity of scrota or foot and mouth disease, witness contending that neither in cattle nor sheep is its origin spontaneous, *Brown* 1788-1798.—Further conclusion as to the disease not arising spontaneously; examination begun with reference to the great fluctuations in the extent of the disease since it first appeared, witness submitting that it has never entirely ceased to exist, *ib.* 2543-2574.—Belief as to the disease being now fixed in this country, though save by contagion it is difficult to say how it originates, *ib.* 2825-2833.

Belief that foot and mouth disease does not arise spontaneously, *Sinonds* 3008-3010.—Conclusion that the disease is not spontaneous and is not directly produced by bad treatment during transit, *Fisher* 5152-5155.

FOOT AND MOUTH DISEASE—continued.

I. Introduction and Origin of the Disease—continued.

4. Question of Spontaneous Origination—continued.

Examination as to the experience of witnesses in regard to foot and mouth disease; belief that the disease may be spontaneously generated, *Bohler* 7286-7291, 7300, 7301, 7374, 7379, 7412-7411, 7579-7585, 7652.—Consideration of the opinions held by Professor Simonds as to spontaneous generation of foot and mouth disease, *Gompes* 9657-9676.

II. Character and Treatment of the Disease:

1. Exceedingly Infectious Nature of the Disease:

Peculiarly infectious character of foot and mouth disease, *Brown* 1395, 1396.—Facility of transmission of the disease without contact, *ib.* 2524-2526.—Less difficulty in stamping out pleuro-pneumonia or cattle plague than foot and mouth disease, *ib.* 2527, 2528.

More infectious character of foot and mouth disease than of pleuro-pneumonia, *Simonds* 3180-3182, 3200, 3221, 3302-3306.—Propagation of the disease by means of the morbid matter contained in the breath, *ib.* 3389-3393.—Conclusion that the disease is not merely an epidemic, *ib.* 3518-3570.—Further statement as to the extremely infectious character of the disease; illustrations to this effect, *ib.* 3570-3575.

Instances of the disease having been communicated by streams running from an infected to an uninfected farm, *Baldwin* 3784, 3785, 3791.—Estimate of from five to ten per cent. of the animals experimented upon by witnesses as susceptible to infection, *ib.* 3785-3789.—Means of propagating the disease by clothes; opinion that it is not so propagated ordinarily, *ib.* 3792-3794.—Short distance for which the disease is conveyed through the air, *ib.* 3795-3800.—Doubt as to the disease being often propagated by means of running water, *ib.* 3967, 3968.—Belief that the disease is not carried by the wind, *ib.* 4129-4131.

Conviction of witnesses that foot and mouth disease and pleuro-pneumonia are produced by infection only; examination hereon as to the various forms in which the infection may be conveyed, *Baldwin* 4369, 4379-4393, 4410-4418, 4431, 4444-4446, 4497, 4498.

Belief that foot and mouth disease can be, and is sometimes propagated, otherwise than by contagion; data for this conclusion, *Ferguson* 4924-4927.—The disease is of all others the most infectious, *ib.* 5394.

Impossibility of discovering by what means foot and mouth disease is conveyed; decided opinion that it is not conveyed by running water, *Garnett* 6384-6389.—Mysterious character of the disease as regards infection, *Wahl* 8120-8126.—Belief that animals which have recovered from the disease will carry the contagion with them for a considerable time, *McBride* 9136-9139.

Opinion that the disease becomes less virulent and less general as it extends from the infected parts, *Duekham* 9790.—Explanation that foot and mouth disease is nothing more than fever brought on by privation, *Adams* 9951.—Mysterious character of the foot and mouth disease in Cheshire as regards the suddenness with which it comes and goes; similarity of the disease to cholera in this respect, *Smith* 10215-10225, 10245, 10246-10251, 10348-10352.

Opinion that the disease might be conveyed from field to field by hares, without their being themselves infected with it, *Stewart* 11747-11750.—Inexpediency of permitting men or dogs to pass from field to field where there are diseased animals; infection undoubtedly conveyed by birds, hares, and other living animals, *Lambert* 13421-13424, 13621-13626, 13770-13774.

2. Liability of the same Animals to several attacks:

The same animals are liable to be attacked two or three times, *Brown* 1900-1903.—Instances of second and third attacks of cattle in former outbreaks, though such attacks have recently become more frequent, *ib.* 2723.—Instances many years ago of the same animals having had the disease several times in succession, *Simonds* 3202-3231.—Increased virulence of foot and mouth disease; frequency of the same animals being twice attacked, *Stratton* 4549-4556.—Twofold attack of witnesses' cows during the summer of 1872, *Fisher* 5147, 5148.—Instances of cattle attacked with the disease three times in six months, *ib.* 5206, 5225-5228.

3. Several kinds of Animals to which the Disease may be conveyed:

Doubt as to foot and mouth disease extending to any other animals but cattle, sheep, pigs, and poultry, *Brown* 1883-1890.—Result of witnesses' experience that dogs, hares, rabbits, and birds are not subject to the foot and mouth disease; explanation hereon as to his not having made conclusive experiments on the subject, *ib.* 2703, 2716, 2757.

FOOT AND MOUTH DISEASE—continued.

II. Character and Treatment of the Disease—continued.

3. Several kinds of Animals to which the Disease may be conveyed—cont.

Statement as to sheep, pigs, and domestic poultry being susceptible of foot and mouth disease; belief that dogs, hares, and rabbits, and birds generally, are not liable to the disease, *Simonds* 2906, 2919, 2938-2941.

Various forms in which witness has communicated the foot and mouth disease to healthy animals; particulars of experiments on the subject, *Baldwin* 3790, 3781, 3784-3797, 3992-3995—Grounds for the conclusion as to the liability of hares and rabbits to be attacked with foot and mouth disease, *Baldwin* 3990-3995, 4242-4246, 4251-4253; *Ferguson* 5424-5430—Doubt as to hares and rabbits propagating the disease, *Morrow* 5625-5637.

4. Period of Incubation:

Average of about ten days as the length of an ordinary attack, *Brown* 2868, 2869—Incubation period of foot and mouth disease from forty hours to three days, *Simonds* 2993—Great variation in the time for which an animal under the disease would continue to throw off infection, *ib.* 3499, 3500—Belief that the disease or poison is a short-lived one, *Baldwin* 3804, 3806—The period of incubation of the disease is about four or five days; personal experience upon which this opinion is founded, *Clarke* 8693-8698.

A. Treatment:

Favourable termination of foot and mouth disease, when not interfered with, *Brown* 1068, 1069—Improbability of any treatment much mitigating the loss of condition from the foot and mouth disease, *ib.* 1896-1899—Consensus that the best treatment for foot and mouth disease is to let it run its course and to take care of the animal, *Smith* 10209-10211.

Rapid recovery of fat cattle from foot and mouth disease, if left alone and not disturbed; instance of an animal suffering from this disease that afterwards took the first prize at the Manchester Show and was sold for 70 l. 10 s., *Perdon* 7119, 7120—Evidence in further support of the statement that animals affected with the disease will recover rapidly if allowed to remain quiet and undisturbed, *ib.* 7740-7745, 8019-8023.

Considerable experience of witness as regards the foot and mouth disease; suggestions as to the correct treatment of animals suffering from the disease, *Denchfield* 10973-10988, 10991, 10997, 11108, 11103, 11147-11149, 11160-11168—Fallacious character of the treatment which allows foot and mouth disease to cure itself without remedial process, *ib.* 11160, 11165—Method adopted in *Forfarshire* in the treatment of animals affected with the foot and mouth disease; good nursing preferable to any system of treatment, *Goodlet* 11558-11567—Rapid recovery of milch cows from foot and mouth disease if left undisturbed and at rest, *Lambert* 12406-12410.

III. Conveyance of the Diseases between Ireland and England and Scotland:

Large import of foot and mouth disease from Ireland at the ports of Bristol and Liverpool, though the disease is said to have been first introduced into Ireland from England, *Williams* 460-469—Absence of any check to the movement of Irish cattle from the ports into the interior, so that foot and mouth disease is easily spread in England; obstacles to the diseased animals being detained and isolated at the place of landing, *ib.* 479-499.

Statement as to foot and mouth disease not having been in Ireland when the cattle plague was there, and as to its having been twice introduced into Ireland by cattle or calves from Bristol, *Brown* 1760-1762—Appearance of the disease in England long before it was known in Ireland, *ib.* 1820-1826—Large import of Irish foot and mouth disease at Liverpool as well as at Bristol, *ib.* 2031-2035.

Appearance of the disease in Ireland, in 1839, since which year there have been several outbreaks, *Simonds* 2922-2924—Probability of a great number of diseased animals having been sent to England in 1873, though many were not sent spontaneously, *Ferguson* 4913—Opinion that the number of diseased cattle sent from Ireland to England is very much exaggerated, *ib.* 4943—With regard to the frequent practice formerly of sending diseased cattle to England, this system no longer exists, and the movement of diseased cattle in Ireland is now prohibited, *ib.* 5397, 5400-5407.

Export by witness of about 2,500 cattle to Glasgow and other places in the last six years; in only one lot of this large supply was there foot and mouth disease, *Morrow* 5574-5578—Particulars as to an outbreak of disease among some cattle sent by witness to Falkirk; this was on the fourth day after their departure from Ireland, and there was then no disease among them, *ib.* 5581-5591, 5590-5592—Instances of disease having broken out among Irish cattle in Scotland, through infection in the railway trucks or in the markets, *ib.* 5593-5595.

FOOT AND MOUTH DISEASE—continued.

III. *Conveyance of the Disease between Ireland and England and Scotland—contd.*

Means by which foot and mouth disease is transmitted from Ireland to England, *Jealies* 6051-6056.

Decided opinion that the statement that Irish cattle have brought disease into England is very much exaggerated; absence of complaints as to disease in animals when landed from the company's steamers, *O'Neill* 6865-6867. 6901.—Examination as to the prevalence of foot and mouth disease in Ireland; decided opinion that the disease has been brought from England into Ireland, *Verdon* 7026. 7033-7040. 7081-7083. 7095. 7098-7114. 7904. 7905. 8037-8040.—Evidence in support of theory that foot and mouth disease originates in the east and travels westward in Ireland, *ib.* 7801-7813.

Statement that Irish cattle are the healthiest that are brought to England, *McBride* 9394-9396.—Opinion as to the healthy character of Irish store cattle; necessity of protecting Irish cattle from disease, from England, *Gauger* 9448.

Examination as to the introduction of diseased animals from Ireland; opinion that though the stoppage of the import of cattle from Ireland would not give immunity from disease, it would have the effect of cutting off a main source, *Smith* 10153-10203. 10330-10337. 10355-10361. 10363-10365. 10379-10393.—Prevalence of foot and mouth disease in the Irish cattle which come to Perthshire, *Stewart* 11841.

Inaccuracy of statements that Ireland is the source of supply of foot and mouth disease in England, *Lambert* 12570-12578.

IV. *Mortality from the Disease :*

Comparatively small number of deaths from foot and mouth disease, *Williams* 897. 898.—Exceedingly small mortality from the disease, the treatment being moreover unscientific, *Brown* 9398-9399.—Considerable fatality from the disease in 1840-41, owing very much to its treatment having been misunderstood, *Simonds* 2911-2914.—Average of about one per cent. as the mortality from the disease, *ib.* 3017.—Very small mortality from the disease, *Morrow* 5605.

V. *Deterioration and Pecuniary Loss ; immense Sacrifice involved :*

Immense sum represented by the deterioration in value through foot and mouth disease, as estimated at 2 l. per head, *Williams* 1289-1294. 1336-1338.

Great variation in the amount of loss per head from the disease, the sacrifice sometimes being considerable in the case both of milch cows and of fat stock, *Brown* 2267-2277.—Instances of the serious loss sometimes accruing, *ib.* 2676, 2677.

Belief that the average loss is nothing like 2 l. per head upon the total number of animals affected with the disease, *Simonds* 3018, 3019.—Several ways in which the disease causes loss of condition, *ib.* 3178, 3179.—Witness repeats that, save in the case of milch cows, the average loss from foot and mouth disease is nothing like 2 l. a head, *ib.* 3336-3339.

Calculation as to the loss on the score of milk, &c., when there is an outbreak of foot and mouth disease, *Baldwin* 3950-3956. 3966-3974. 4085-4086. 4271-4285.

Liability of witness' dairy cows to the disease; estimated loss of from 3 l. to 4 l. per head in the summer of 1872, through diminution of milk and other causes, *Stratton* 4509-4513. 4751.—Opinion that the losses to farmers from foot and mouth disease exceed those from all other contagious diseases, *ib.* 4514-4516.—Varying loss per head upon witness' fat stock from foot and mouth disease, *ib.* 4611, 4612.—Estimated average loss of 2 l. per head upon all classes of cattle attacked with the disease, *ib.* 4784-4789.

Great variation in the loss per head from foot and mouth disease; calculations hereon, *Fisher* 5196-5205. 5212-5223.—Calculations as to the deterioration in value through the disease, *Morrow* 5606-5609.—Reduction of price to be required by witness if he were to buy animals with the disease, *ib.* 5088-5091.—Examination as to the estimated loss from the disease, *Jealies* 6149-6154.—Decided opinion that the losses from foot and mouth disease have been greatly exaggerated, *Gentry* 6200-6203. 6281-6289.

Calculation that the loss from the foot and mouth disease in dairy cattle is 4 l. per cow, *Boleter* 7323. 7551, 7552.—Belief that the losses from the disease have been very nearly equal to the losses from pleuro-pneumonia, *ib.* 7347.—Contradiction of the opinion that cows produce more butter and milk after having had foot and mouth disease, *ib.* 7553-7555.

Opinion that foot and mouth disease does not in any way affect the price of fat cattle when the animal is to be slaughtered immediately, *Verdon* 7656-7659.—Calculation as to the amount of depreciation in price of cattle suffering from a severe attack of the disease, *ib.* 7746-7752.

Examination as to the loss which the country has sustained by the recent outbreak of foot and mouth disease; calculation that the sacrifice has amounted to 13,000,000 l.

Report, 1873—continued.

FOOT AND MOUTH DISEASE—continued.

V. *Deterioration and Pecuniary Loss; immense Sacrifice involved—continued.*

or 14,000,000 l. in one year, *Clarke* 8648-8686.—Opinion that a butcher in buying an animal would not take into account the fact that it had suffered previously from the foot and mouth disease, but would give the present value of it, *ib.* 8687-8693.

Calculation that we have lost millions upon millions every year for the last thirty years by foot and mouth disease; grounds upon which this calculation is based, *Gangey* 9441. 9443-9445. 9540-9568.—Witness estimates that the total loss in England has amounted to 13,071,392 l., and in England and Ireland to 19,510,707 l., *Ducham* 9850-9857.

Calculation that the loss from foot and mouth disease is about 4 l. per head on the carcass; considerable loss in milk, *Denebfield* 10993-10995. 11056-11072. 11135-11138.—The average loss on cattle from foot and mouth disease is about 2 l. per head, *Goodell* 11643-11653. 11634-11669.

Opinion that the cost of the restrictions as regards foot and mouth disease is greater than the value received from them; insignificant character of the disease, *Smith* 12362-12367. 12414-12445.—Witness considers that the statements with regard to the loss from foot and mouth disease are generally exaggerated, *Lambert* 13496-13499.

Paper submitted by Professor Baldwin relative to the loss from the disease, *App.* 394. 395.

Comparative estimate of loss sustained by the stock owners of the United Kingdom from foot and mouth disease in their herds and flocks during the year 1872; aggregate of 19,510,707 l., *App.* 634.

VI. *Effect of the Act of 1869, and of the Cattle Plague Restrictions, as regards the amount of Disease:*

Slight effect of the Act of 1869 in stopping the disease, *Williams* 410-414. 442.—Improvement as to the disease having increased by extension from the centres which existed after the cessation of the cattle plague regulations, *ib.* 708-713.—Dissent from the view that the disease was extinct in England before the cattle plague regulations were removed, *ib.* 891-894.

Non-interference with the disease previously to 1869; increasing price of meat adverted to hereon, *Williams* 1064-1067.—Opinion that unless much more be done for the prevention of foot and mouth disease, the present regulations may as well be withdrawn altogether, *ib.* 1364-1367.

Stoppage of the disease when the movement of cattle was stopped during the cattle plague, *Brown* 1452. 1453.—Decided risk of the import of the disease from abroad, notwithstanding the present restrictions, *ib.* 2575-2585.

More serious outbreak in 1872 but for the Act of 1869, *Sinonds* 2920. 2921.—Material effect of the cattle plague restrictions in decreasing the amount of foot and mouth disease, *ib.* 2944-2948. 2950-2956. 3377-3379.—Absence of any preventive to foot and mouth disease, or to its spread, *ib.* 3548-3553.

Consultation of witnesses relative to the provisions of the Bill of 1869, on which occasion he expressed but little confidence in any regulations for the suppression of foot and mouth disease, *Sinonds* 3676-3679.

Great fluctuation in the amount of foot and mouth disease, there being climatic and other modifying causes which legislation cannot touch, *Baldwin* 4193-4204.—Freedom from the disease when the cattle plague regulations were in force, *Stratton* 4557-4562; *Fisher* 5149. 5150.

Examination as to the restrictions which have been put in force in England with regard to foot and mouth disease; returns as to this disease not generally furnished by the counties, *Jenkins* 5855-5859. 5895-5896.—Evidence in further support of the statement that the foot and mouth disease died out in England with the termination of the cattle plague, *Clarke* 8276-8279; *Gangey* 9779-9784; *Thomson* 11482-11485.—Statement as to the spread of foot and mouth disease in certain counties in England, *McBride* 9329-9377.—Opinion that the restrictions under the Act have tended to propagate rather than to check the disease, *Lambert* 13414.

VII. *Suggestions on the Score of Isolation, Stoppage of Movement, Compulsory Slaughter, &c.:*

Means of stamping out the foot and mouth disease if, in addition to other precautions, there were compulsory isolation, *Williams* 415-417. 1138. 1146-1151.—Decided objection to the slaughtering of all animals affected with foot and mouth disease, *ib.* 1103. 1104.

Conclusion as regards foot and mouth disease, whether imported from Ireland or not, that any restrictions, to be effectual, should be permanent, and should be similar to those for the eradication of the cattle plague, slaughter being excepted (witness, however, not approving of stringent measures), *Brown* 1438. 1439. 1442-1468.—Question considered whether detention at the port of shipment should not apply to the whole lot amongst which there is any case of foot and mouth disease, *ib.* 2281-2286.

FOOT AND MOUTH DISEASE—continued.

VII. *Suggestions on the Score of Isolation, Stoppage of Movement, &c.—continued.*

Opinion that mere isolation would not suffice to get rid of the disease, and that it would be necessary for the purpose to re-impose the same stringent regulations as to removal, &c., which were in force for the cattle plague, *Simonds* 2850-2955.—Reason for much improvement as regards inspection and movement of cattle, and as regards fairs and markets; check thereby to the disease, *ib.* 3184-3186.

Opinion that the foot and mouth disease may be stamped out, although it has taken deep root in the country, *Baldwin* 3832, 3833.

Advantage of applying to England as well as Ireland witness' scheme of stoppage of fairs and markets and of movement, though he has not considered the circumstances of the former country, *Baldwin* 4408-4410.—Dissent from the views of Professor Brown and other authorities as to the impossibility of stamping out the foot and mouth disease, *ib.* 4410-4413.

Proposition that the disease be treated with the same stringency as the cattle plague, that all movement be prohibited, except under license, in the months of June and July, and that any animals subsequently diseased be slaughtered, *Shattock* 4517-4520, 4532, 4533, 4581-4593, 4622-4629, 4680-4685, 4711-4721.—Explanation relative to the proposed power in the county authorities to slaughter in the case of foot and mouth disease, *ib.* 4632, 4633, 4681-4692, 4693-4646.—Proposal that animals in contact with but not actually suffering from foot and mouth disease, be at once sent to the slaughter house, so that they may be used as food, *Fisher* 5212, 5211.—Suggestions with reference to foot and mouth disease; recommendation that fat cattle infected with this disease should be slaughtered, *Garnett* 6278-6282, 6295-6401, 6429-6436, 6465-6489, 6489-6493.

Dissemination of witness to approve of the removal of foot and mouth disease out of the operation of the Act; opinion, however, that the disease will die out in consequence of the restrictions which have been imposed, *Bolster* 7345-7347, 7477.—Further opinion as to the expediency of stringently carrying out the regulations as regards foot and mouth disease; possibility however of animals getting into a fair, notwithstanding the stringency of the regulations, *ib.* 7620-7629, 7631-7646, 7643-7661.

Examination as to the damage which cattle sustain from the foot and mouth disease; contention that if foreign importation be completely stopped, the disease will of necessity die out, *McBride* 9062-9076, 9102-9104, 9142-9144, 9167, 9215-9218, 9271-9276.

Evidence as to the possibility and means of ridding the country of the foot and mouth disease; belief that the disease died out during the year of the cattle plague, *Ganger* 9427, 9431, 9434-9438, 9460-9462, 9488-9525.—Strong opinion that foot and mouth disease should never be excluded from the Act of 1869, for the reason that it does the most mischief, *ib.* 9442.—Belief that if the importation of foreign cattle is efficiently stopped, the disease will absolutely die out of itself, *ib.* 9519, 9522, 9536-9539.

Further statement as to the means to be adopted for stamping out the foot and mouth disease; expediency of a system of efficient inspection for the purpose, *Ganger* 9586-9614.—Disinfection necessary as regards the animal itself, *ib.* 9598, 9599.—Statement as to the means of stamping out disease upon the arrival of cattle in this country; possibility of getting rid of foot and mouth disease by means of disinfectants, if foreign importation is stopped, *ib.* 9740-9750.

Suggestions as to the best means for preventing the spread of foot and mouth disease; expediency of the Government organising a system by which the privations of cattle when imported should be materially lessened, *Odum* 10076-10080.—Different means suggested with a view to preventing the spread of foot and mouth disease, *Lepper* 10829 *et seq.*—Regulations necessary for preventing the spread of the disease; expediency of isolation as a means to this end, *Denchfield* 10998-11006, 11118-11128.—Suggestions as to the means to be taken to prevent the spread of the disease; necessity for a system of heavy penalties for moving cattle, *Walker* 12207-12209, 12228-12233, 12237-12242.

Statement as to the uselessness of slaughtering animals which have been in the same cargo with animals suffering from foot and mouth disease, *Geishardt* 12995-12997.—Examination as to the restrictions and regulations relating to foot and mouth disease; strong opinion that the only restriction necessary is the total cessation of movement of all live cattle, *Lambert* 13398-13405, 13415-13421, 13501-13507, 13552-13551, 13613-13617, 13675, 13684-13693.

VIII. *Objections to stringent Regulations.*

Belief that such strict regulations as in the time of the cattle plague would never be tolerated in the case of foot and mouth disease, *Brown* 1450, 1451.—Conviction that the disease cannot be permanently stamped out by any regulations, *ib.* 1459-1466.—Expediency of still leaving the foot and mouth in the Act of 1869, although it is better on the whole not to apply stringent regulations on the subject, *ib.* 1664, 1665, 1718-1721, 1743, 1744.

Further

FOOT AND MOUTH DISEASE—continued.

VIII. *Objections to Stringent Regulations*—continued.

Further evidence as to the decrease of foot and mouth disease in consequence of the decreased movement of cattle, whilst its occasional increase arises from natural laws, irrespectively of foreign import, *Brown* 1745-1754.—Conclusion that elaborate restrictions against the spread of the disease are not advisable, and that legislation should only apply to the exposure of diseased animals, *ib.* 1759-1801. 1891-1896.

Further statement to the effect that stringent regulations as to foot and mouth disease would never be observed by farmers, and that legislative interference is not expedient, *Brown* 2089-2100. 2194. 2299.—Conclusion further expressed in disapproval of stringent regulations as to foot and mouth disease; prospect of the disease becoming milder, *ib.* 2257-2263.

Disapproval by farmers of stringent regulations for the foot and mouth disease, *Brown* 2680-2685. 2744-2755; *Morrow* 5634-5635. 5695-5697.—Reluctance expressed by witnesses to approve the compulsory slaughter of animals not actually attacked with the disease, *Ferguson* 5487, 5488. 5534-5537.—Opinion that more noise is made about the disease than is necessary, and that the disease will gradually die out again, *Morrow* 5546, 5547. 5569-5570. 5516, 5517. 5596.—Approval of the present restrictions, though witness is strongly opposed to any increase thereof, *ib.* 5692-5694. 5768-5780. 5800-5805. 5829, 5830.

Examination as to the infectious character of foot and mouth disease; opinion, however, that this disease is not sufficiently important to be included in the Act, *Gaird* 6135-6199. 6253-6255. 6270-6280. 6304-6307. 6324, 6325. 6334-6342.—Decided opinion as to the expediency of removing all restrictions as to foot and mouth disease; mistake of the English graziers in assimilating this disease with rinderpest, *Garnett* 6427, 6527-6593. 6598-6600.—Further statement as to the inexpediency of stringent restrictions as regards foot and mouth disease; contention that the present restrictions have proved of no use, *ib.* 6510-6513. 6587. 6592. 6598-6602. 6632-6635.

Examination upon the question of allowing the exhibition for sale of animals suffering from foot and mouth disease; belief that for their own sakes no farmers or store-feeders would expose such animals, *Vardon* 7715-7736.—Suggestion that there be no legislation for foot and mouth disease, *ib.* 7818, 7819.—Opinion that nothing will prevent attacks of the disease, and that all restrictions are inexpedient, *W. Brown* 13879, 13880.

IX. *Conclusions and Recommendations of the Committee:*

Conflicting character of the evidence before the Committee as to the amount of loss caused by foot and mouth disease, and as to the measures required for its diminution, *Rep. iv*.—Conclusion of the Committee that nothing short of exceedingly stringent measures would extirpate the disease, and that such measures would excite great opposition, and would be an undue interference with the home trade, *ib.*

Recommendation that the sale in a public place, or the carriage of animals affected with the disease be prohibited, *Rep. v*.—Proposal that the Privy Council should cease to issue orders for the check of the disease, *ib.*.—Suggested power in the Privy Council to allow the movement, under proper precautions, of animals affected with the disease, for slaughter, food, or shelter, *ib.*

<i>See also Aberdeenshire.</i>	<i>Abortions.</i>	<i>Aylesbury.</i>	<i>Breeding Stock.</i>	<i>Bristol.</i>
<i>Cattle Ship, 3.</i>	<i>Compensation.</i>	<i>Fairs and Markets.</i>	<i>Farmers.</i>	<i>Foreign</i>
<i>Cattle.</i>	<i>Forfarshire.</i>	<i>Herefordshire.</i>	<i>Inoculation.</i>	<i>Ireland</i>
<i>and Irish Cattle, 1.</i>	<i>Isolation.</i>	<i>Lambay Island.</i>	<i>Legislation.</i>	<i>Limerick</i>
<i>County.</i>	<i>Local Authorities.</i>	<i>Meat (Diseased Animals).</i>		<i>Movement of</i>
<i>Cattle, 1, 2.</i>	<i>Perthshire.</i>	<i>Pigs.</i>	<i>Police.</i>	<i>Quarantine.</i>
<i>Shrop, 1.</i>	<i>Spain and Portugal.</i>	<i>Store Cattle.</i>	<i>Switzerland.</i>	<i>Treatment</i>
<i>of Disease.</i>	<i>Wiltshire.</i>			

FOREIGN CATTLE:

1. *State of the Law as to Foreign Import previously to the Act of 1869.*
2. *Regulations under the Act of 1869 as to import from Scheduled Countries.*
3. *Amount of Import; Prospect of Increase or Decrease.*
4. *Import of Disease with Foreign Cattle.*
5. *Increased Price of Cattle and of Meat on the Continent.*
6. *Expediency of International Regulations for the prompt Suppression of Disease in Foreign Cattle.*
7. *Conflicting Evidence upon the Question of Slaughter at the Port of Arrival in England.*
8. *Suggested Return of Diseased Store Stock to the Exporting Country.*
9. *Other Details and Suggestions on various Points.*
10. *Recommended Maintenance of the Provisions of the Act of 1869.*

1. *State of the Law as to Foreign Import previously to the Act of 1869:*

Information relative to the state of the law as regards foreign import previously to the passing

Report, 1873—continued.

FOREIGN CATTLE—continued.

1. *State of the Law as to Foreign Import previously to the Act, &c.*—continued.

passing of the Act of 1869; numerous acts and orders in Council which the measure of that year had to deal with and to consolidate, *Williams* 90-112.

2. *Regulations under the Act of 1869 as to Import from Scheduled Countries:*

Statement as to the foreign countries placed in 1869 under the regulations in the Schedule of the Act as to slaughter at the landing place, *Williams* 113-116.—Several alterations made in the Schedule in 1870 and 1871; *id.* 117-123.—Several foreign countries now in the schedule with reference to slaughter at the port of landing, *id.* 159.

Statement as to countries not being scheduled for pleuro-pneumonia, or foot and mouth disease; valuable check, however, through the liability of the whole of the cargo to be killed at the port of landing, *Williams* 734-739.—Regulations as to import from scheduled and unscheduled countries, respectively, further adverted to as requiring amendment in several respects; suggestions on the subject, *id.* 765 *et seq.*

Value of the guarantee given by the scheduled countries that they will not allow the import or transit of cattle without certain restrictions, *Brown* 2133-2139.—Expediency of maintaining the system of scheduled countries, *id.* 2207, 2208.

Further provision required as to isolation, disinfection, &c. where animals are landed from scheduled countries, *Simonds* 3076-3078.—Expediency of maintaining the distinction between scheduled and unscheduled countries, *id.* 3094, 3095.

Examination as to the countries which are scheduled under the Act of 1869; expediency of the restrictions being applied to all cattle coming from abroad, *Robinson* 1062a-1063b 10727-10729.

3. *Amount of Import; Prospect of Increase or Decrease:*

Calculation as to the proportion of the supply of live meat which comes from abroad and from Ireland, *Williams* 343-349.—Statement as to the decreased import of foreign cattle into the London market in the last few years having been more than compensated by the increased home supply, *id.* 940-952, 969.—Small per-centage of foreign live meat consumed in England; this proportion is, however, on the increase, and the risk of contagion is not (in witness' opinion) sufficient to call for prohibition of import, *id.* 1219-1227, 1368.

Information as to the extent of the present import of live cattle from different foreign countries, and as to the proportion of stock, *Brown* 2116-2123.—Belief as to the available export supply on the Continent generally having much decreased, with the exception of Russia, *Simonds* 3538-3542, 3590-3597.—Opinion that the foreign cattle trade will not develop itself much more than at present, *Jenkins* 6141, 6142.

Decrease in the amount of meat imported in the year 1872; the probable reason is that the foreigner has been also suffering from foot and mouth disease and has not had the meat to send, *Clarke* 8727-8731.—Statement that except from Russia there will be very little increase of importation from foreign countries; reasons for this conclusion, *Robinson* 10630-10637, 10542-10548, 10573-10580, 10643, 10689, 10690, 10767-10770.—Considerable amount of business done by witness in the cattle carrying trade; countries from which cattle are carried, *id.* 10613-10619, 10675-10680.

Figures showing a continuous increase in the importation of sheep with a diminution in that of cattle for several years, *Gedder* 12749-12751.—Further information with regard to the importation of cattle from the Continent; the number of cattle imported this year from Denmark is double that of last year, *id.* 13101-13109.

4. *Import of Disease with Foreign Cattle:*

Larger proportion of diseased animals sent to England from scheduled countries than from other countries; experience at Deptford adverted to hereon; *Williams* 232-238.—Want of actual proof of any instance of the introduction of foot and mouth disease or pleuro-pneumonia into the country through the medium of foreign cattle, *id.* 870-872, 1005, 1008.

Examination to the effect that cattle plague, pleuro-pneumonia, and foot and mouth disease, have doubtless been imported from abroad, and have caused considerable losses to farmers, *Brown* 2310-2334.—Insufficiency of a mere stoppage of foreign importation as a preventive of the disease, *Fisher* 5230, 5231.

Absolute certainty that foot and mouth disease and all other contagious diseases have been imported from other countries, *McBride* 9076, 9077, 9144, 9166-9191.—Decided opinion that all contagious diseases affecting cattle are of foreign origin, *Ganges* 9454, 9667, 9768.—He is of the opinion that the foot and mouth disease, and also pleuro-pneumonia have been introduced into England from foreign countries, *Lepper* 10784, 10817, 10820-10825, 10841-10845.

5. *Increased*

FOREIGN CATTLE—continued.

3. Increased Price of Cattle and of Meat on the Continent:

Examination as to the prices of cattle on the Continent; considerable increase of late years in the price of meat, especially in Germany, *Gebhardt* 12851-12884.—Information as to the rise in the price of meat on the Continent, *W. Brown* 12832-12904.

6. Expediency of International Regulations for the prompt Suppression of Disease in Foreign Cattle:

Importance of some united action on the part of European countries with a view to the prevention of cattle diseases and their prompt suppression when discovered; difficulties in the matter, *Williams* 180-191.

7. Conflicting Evidence upon the Question of Slaughter at the Port of Arrival in England:

Evidence to the effect that the system of slaughtering all scheduled animals at the port of landing does not give immunity against danger, *Williams* 222-238.—Conviction of witness that wholesale slaughtering of all foreign animals at the ports would not prevent disease in England, *ib.* 338-342.—Belief that there would be more facility than at present to the import and spread of disease if all foreign cattle were slaughtered at the place of landing, *ib.* 1199-1202.

Probable shock to trade by any sudden prohibition of import from any country, except for immediate slaughter, *Brown* 2140-2146.—Approval of general slaughtering at the port if there were good grounds for concluding that the import trade would not suffer in consequence, *ib.* 2147, 2148.

Proposition that all foreign fat stock found to be the subjects of foot and mouth disease should be slaughtered on the spot, *Simonds* 2984, 2995-2998.—Suggestion also that all fat cattle from abroad or from Ireland suffering from pleuro-pneumonia should be slaughtered at the port, *ib.* 3046-3049.—Conclusion as regards the import of pleuro-pneumonia, that slaughter should only apply to those animals which are infected, and that no undue restrictions should be applied to steer cattle, *ib.* 3310-3315.

Further explanations as to the extent to which slaughtering should be resorted to, and as to the point at which isolation should come in, *Simonds* 3427-3436.—Explanation and defence of the practice as to slaughtering the whole cargo of cattle or of sheep from abroad, if only one animal of the same kind has contagious disease, *ib.* 3479-3486, 3532-3535.—Entire inadequacy of a detention of six hours as a check upon pleuro-pneumonia, immediate slaughter being desirable, *ib.* 3605-3609.

Impression that the huge towns in England might be well supplied with meat, even though all foreign cattle were slaughtered at the port of landing, *Baldwin* 4471-4473.—Advocacy of the slaughter or quarantine of all foreign imported animals, *Stratton* 4633-4638, 4699-4704.—Examination as to the expediency of slaughter or quarantine for the prevention of the spread of contagious diseases; necessity for legislative enactment on the subject, *Clarke* 8196-8215, 8238-8267, 8280-8290, 8310-8314, 8378-8398, 8511-8515, 8553-8573, 8582-8585.—Witness's desire for slaughter or quarantine based more upon foot and mouth disease than upon pleuro-pneumonia, *ib.* 8376-8378.—Opinion that the slaughter of fat cattle at the port of debarkation would not be a hindrance to the trade in meat, *ib.* 8410-8415.

Expediency of the system of slaughtering all foreign cattle upon debarkation being made permanent for the purpose of keeping out disease; contention that this regulation would greatly increase the quantity of meat, and so tend to reduce the price, *Clarke* 8532-8535.—Evidence in further support of compulsory slaughter or quarantine, as regards cattle coming into the country from foreign countries; opinion that this course would encourage importers to send more animals than they do at present, *ib.* 8694-8703, 8719, 8726.

Expediency of slaughtering all foreign fat stock immediately upon landing; belief that the consumers would be benefited rather than injured by such means, *McBride* 9078-9089, 9248-9258, 9399-9400.—Evidence in further support of the erection of a permanent barrier to the importation of foreign live cattle into England, with the exception of those from Spain and Portugal, *ib.* 9288-9326.

Necessity of slaughtering all foreign animals at the port of landing; defeat of the object of this course if great care be not taken to disinfect the hides and every thing appertaining to the slaughter-houses, *Gosper* 9466, 9570-9578, 9622-9624, 9723-9733, 9740, 9741.—Approval of slaughtering all foreign cattle immediately upon their landing in this country, *Duckham* 9896-9904, *Lepper* 10824-10826, 10901.

Grounds for the opinion that slaughter at the water-side on arrival would have no effect in deterring foreign stock-keepers from sending over their cattle, *Odgers* 10085, 10086, 10095, 10098-10108, *Robinson* 10539-10541, 10635, 10638, 10642, 10670, 10671, 10681-10685.—Evidence as to the expediency of fixed regulations for the import of foreign cattle; advantage of the certainty of the animals being slaughtered

Report, 1873—continued.

FOREIGN CATTLE—continued.

7. *Conflicting Evidence upon the Question of Slaughter, &c.—continued.*

over the uncertainty of not knowing what to do with them, *Robinson* 10339-10341. 10681-10685. 10718-10723.

Contention that all foreign cattle should be slaughtered at the port of arrival; in the absence of this arrangement, dead meat should be sent from abroad, *Goodlet* 11691, 11692. 11708-11710. 11716-11721.—Decided opinion that all foreign fat cattle should be slaughtered at the port of debarkation or taken by rail to the slaughter-house, *Waller* 12180-12185. 12279-12284.

Examination with regard to the business carried on by witnesses in foreign cattle: unsuccessful attempt made to slaughter at the port of entry, and to transport the meat into the interior of the country, *Hodgetts* 12592-12609. 12638-12657. 12670-12679. 12687-12689. 12694, 12695.—The importation of cattle would be seriously checked by compulsory slaughter, *ib.* 12618-12621. 12626.

Decided opinion that our supplies are considerably lessened by compulsory slaughter at the ports; grounds for this conclusion, *Gebhardt* 12733-12748.—Disapproval of slaughtering the whole cargo if any animals are found to be suffering from foot and mouth disease; advisability of slaughtering animals suffering from other diseases, *ib.* 12735-12757. 12803-12805. 12829-12835.

Decided opinion that if all foreign cattle be slaughtered at the ports it will entirely stop the foreign supply, *Lambert* 13517-13521. 13629-13637.—Grounds for objecting to the slaughtering of cattle at the ports, *Woodcock* 13804-13812. 13829, 13830. 13841-13848.

8. *Suggested Return of Diseased Store Stock to the Exporting Country:*

Proposition that all foreign store stock, if affected with foot and mouth disease, be sent back to the country whence exported, *Simonds* 1984-1991. 2995-2998. 3002.

9. *Other Details and Suggestions on various Points:*

Injustice of the restrictions as regards foreign cattle if there are no restrictions upon Irish cattle, *Williams* 481. 499. 500.—Witness considers that the present regulations are effectual in keeping out disease, and that non-detection is very improbable, *ib.* 1203-1208. 1222, 1223.—Impression as to the foreign fat cattle going chiefly to the wholesale butchers, *ib.* 1209-1212.

Approval of greater stringency in dealing with imported animals than with home animals, *Simonds* 2995-2998. 3471-3473.—Strong objection to foreign fat stock and store stock being imported at the same port, as at Hull, *Fisher* 5100-5111.—Necessity for entirely different measures with regard to the foreign to those adopted for the Irish trade, on account of the evidence of rinderpest in foreign countries, *Gurnett* 6604-6616.—Suggestions as to the course to be pursued with regard to the foreign trade in cattle so as to exclude disease, *Verdon* 7816-7838.

Expediency of a system of isolation of foreign cattle, to be enforced by means of inspectors, *Clarke* 8300-8309. 8324-8327.—Disapproval of the import of foreign live cattle under the existing conditions, *Odams* 10030. 10033, 10034. 10037.—Impossibility of this country enforcing proper conditions as to the import of foreign cattle at the port of embarkation, *ib.* 10035, 10036.—Opinion that the stoppage of the importation of foreign cattle would be a serious impediment to trade, *Switz* 10338-10347. 10362.

Desirability of throwing the foreign cattle trade much more open than it is at present, with a view to extend competition in trade, *Gebhardt* 12808-12809.—Further evidence in support of the abolition of restrictions upon the importation of store cattle; considerable diminution in the importation of fat cattle from abroad under existing restrictions, *ib.* 12837-12850.—Expectation of a considerable increase in the import of foreign cattle in the event of the removal of the existing restrictions; countries whence the cattle would be imported, *ib.* 12900-12907.—Belief that if an Act of Parliament were passed confining foreign cattle to Deptford Market, no cattle would come, *ib.* 12956-12960.

Conclusion that the foreign trade should be unrestricted, except from countries where rinderpest exists, *W. Brown* 13965-13968. 13975-13977.

10. *Recommended Maintenance of the Provisions of the Act of 1869:*

Conclusion that no change should be made in the Act of 1869, so far as it relates to foreign animals, *Rep.* iii.

<i>See also Austria.</i>	<i>Belgium.</i>	<i>Cattle Plague.</i>	<i>Cattle Ships.</i>	<i>Customs'</i>
<i>Officers.</i>	<i>Dead Meat.</i>	<i>Deptford Market.</i>	<i>Foot and Mouth Disease.</i>	
<i>France.</i>	<i>Free Trade.</i>	<i>Germany.</i>	<i>Hanover.</i>	<i>Holland.</i>
<i>Ireland, &c.</i>	<i>Local Authorities.</i>	<i>London, Port of.</i>	<i>Metropolitan Market.</i>	<i>Hull.</i>
<i>Ports.</i>	<i>Privy Council.</i>	<i>Quarantine.</i>	<i>Russia.</i>	<i>Schleswig-Holstein.</i>
<i>Spain and Portugal.</i>	<i>Store Cattle.</i>			

Forfarshire.

Report, 1873—continued.

Forfarshire. Statement that there is a large importation of cattle into Forfarshire from Ireland; decided opinion that these cattle have brought the foot and mouth disease into Scotland, *Goodlet* 11539, 11549, 11559, 11601, 11602, 11648-11665, 11702-11707—Examination as to the prevalence of the disease in the county; belief that the disease is highly contagious, *ib.* 11541-11547, 11635-11645, 11670.

Necessity for more stringently carrying out the regulations for foot and mouth disease; regulations in force in Forfarshire for the prevention of the disease, *Goodlet* 11568, 11569, 11666, 11677—Statement as to the action of the local authorities in Forfarshire; unsatisfactory manner in which the local and the county authorities work, *ib.* 11570-11588, 11626—Character of the inspection as carried out by the local authorities; inadequate nature thereof, *ib.* 11631-11633, 11677, 11678—Considerable risk run by farmers in Forfarshire on account of the large number of cattle which is imported by means of markets, *ib.* 11661-11668, 11687.

Statement that the orders for the purpose of stopping the foot and mouth disease are not carried out in Forfarshire with sufficient stringency; opinion that these orders should be rigidly enforced, *Miles* 11998-12005.

France. French cattle not imported into England at the present time; favourable opinion of witness as to the Normandy cattle, *Geldard* 12791-12800.

Free Trade. Desirability of free trade in cattle, *Woodcock* 13804.

See also *Foreign Cattle.*

G.

Gallies. Doubt as to the cattle plague being indigenous in Gallies, *Williams* 189, 1174-1177.

Ganges, Professor John. (Analysis of his Evidence.)—Great interest taken by witness in the extinction of foreign cattle diseases in Great Britain, notwithstanding that he has retired from the veterinary profession, 9425—Decided opinion that all contagious diseases affecting cattle are of foreign origin, 9426, 9667-9676, 9708.

Examination as to the possibility and means of ridding this country of the foot and mouth disease; belief that the disease died out during the year of the cattle plague, 9427, 9431, 9434-9438, 9450-9452, 9499-9535—Statement that the high price of meat at the present time is due to the persistent introduction into England of foreign cattle and foreign diseases, 9432, 9579-9585.

Witness submits that town dairies are the centres of pleuro-pneumonia; decided opinion that all cattle affected with this disease should be immediately slaughtered, 9439, 9444, 9453-9457, 9476-9484—Calculation that we have lost millions upon millions every year for the last thirty years by foot and mouth disease; grounds upon which this calculation is based, 9441, 9443-9445, 9540-9568.

Strong opinion that foot and mouth disease should never be excluded from the Act of 1869, for the reason that it does the most mischief, 9442—Necessity of inspection of fairs and markets for the purpose of obtaining information, 9446—Inefficiency of a system of license or warranty for the prevention of disease, 9447.

Opinion as to the healthy character of Irish store cattle; necessity of protecting Irish cattle from disease from England, 9448—Impropriety of permitting the sale of diseased cattle at any stage for human food; argument in favour of this opinion strengthened by the precedents of the Jews since the time of Moses, 9454, 9483, 9484, 9651, 9652.

Examination upon the question of adopting inoculation in cases of pleuro-pneumonia; inoculation not necessary for foot and mouth disease, 9455-9461, 9473-9475, 9485, 9486, 9619, 9660, 9666-9671, 9649—Expediency of doing away with private slaughter-houses on account of the facility of spreading disease; instances in which the disease has been transmitted from those places, 9469-9465.

Necessity of slaughtering all foreign animals at the port of landing; defeat of the object of this course if great care be not taken to dissect the hides and everything appertaining to the slaughter-houses, 9466, 9570-9578, 9649-9694, 9723-9723, 9740, 9741—Improper manner in which the regulations as to disinfection are carried out in Deptford, 9465, 9570-9574, 9725.

Admirable manner in which glanders has been stamped out in the Army, 9467, 9468—Means necessary to be taken to prevent the spread of sheep-pox among flocks, 9469, 9470—Value of the thermometer in discovering incipient cases of cattle plague; explanation as to its use, 9471, 9472—Visit of witness to the United States and Canada on an inquiry as to cattle plague; importation of contagious diseases into those countries from Europe, 9472, 9710-9722.

Report, 1873—continued.

Gauger, Professor John. (Analysis of his Evidence).—continued.

Examination as to the period necessary for isolation in cases of pleuro-pneumonia, 9476, 9477.—Inoculation by means of inhaling the spray of pleuro-pneumonia virus, 9486-9489, 9585-9591. 9700, 9701.—Opinion that a system of quarantine would be costly and impracticable, 9487, 9488, 9520, 9521.—Desirability of an uniform and efficient system as regards England and Ireland, 9489, 9490.

Strong expression of opinion against the Veterinary Department being placed under any supervision but that of a veterinary surgeon, 9493.—Endeavours of witnesses for several years past to introduce fresh meat transport with a view of doing away with importation of live animals, 9493-9498.

Belief that if the importation of foreign cattle is efficiently stopped, the foot and mouth disease will absolutely die out of itself, 9519, 9520. 9536-9538.—Further statement as to the means to be adopted for stamping out the foot and mouth disease; expediency of a system of efficient inspection for the purpose of discovering cases of disease, 9586-9594.—Disinfection necessary as regards the animal itself, 9598, 9599.

Expediency of introducing regulations by which people would be bound to proclaim the existence of disease; belief that the existence of foot and mouth disease would not be generally acknowledged, 9605-9607.—Opinion that it would not be necessary to trouble the farmers with regard to foot and mouth disease for the reason that if foreign importation be stopped, the disease will die out, 9607-9612.

Recommendation that store animals should be only imported under special conditions, and then placed in quarantine, 9615-9617.—Quarantine of thirty days would be quite sufficient in cases of pleuro-pneumonia when inoculation has been adopted, 9617, 9618.—Statement as to the opinions of German professors as regards the utility of inoculation, 9626-9631.

Desirability of the Government instituting a series of experiments as to the effects of inoculation, 9636-9641.—Opinion that pleuro-pneumonia can be spread by the breath of the animal; other means of conveying contagion, 9642-9648.—Injury to the human subject arising from the consumption of diseased meat, 9652.

Examination as to the pecuniary danger from importing cattle from the Continent by way of Holland; statement that there are in that country established stations of pleuro-pneumonia, 9653-9660.—Consideration of the opinions held by Professor Simonds as to spontaneous generation of foot and mouth disease, 9667-9676.

Further statement as to the prices of meat from the year 1801 up to the present time; reduction in the price during the last thirty-nine years, notwithstanding the increase of population, 9677-9684. 9734-9739.—Additional evidence as to the expediency or otherwise of instituting a system of inoculation with a view to the prevention of pleuro-pneumonia; instances of experiments to this end carried on by witnesses, 9685-9709.

Statement that the first introduction of the cattle disease into America was by the importation of a cow from Holland, 9713-9717.—Locomotive stage of pleuro-pneumonia averages about six weeks, 9718.—Healthy character of the cattle imported into Canada; statement that the foot and mouth disease, which was recently in that colony, has now totally died out, 9719-9722.

Inutility of slaughtering Spanish and Portuguese cattle upon arrival in this country; opinion that those cattle are as healthy as our own, 9730-9733.—Further statement as to the means of stamping out disease upon the arrival of cattle in this country; possibility of getting rid of foot and mouth disease by means of disinfectants, if foreign importation is stopped, 9740-9750.

Strong opinion that it is the province of the Government to do all that is possible for the discovery of truth in matters relating to cattle diseases, 9751-9757.—Personal inquiries made by witness among the cattle owners in Germany as to the health of their stock, 9758-9767.

Countries from which dead meat would be imported in the event of the live trade being stopped; means by which dead meat would be preserved upon long voyages, 9769-9778.—Evidence in further support of the statement that the foot and mouth disease died out in England with the termination of the cattle plague, 9779-9784.

*Garnett, Samuel. (Analysis of his Evidence).—*Is a magistrate for the counties of Meath and Galway; has been actively engaged in the Irish cattle trade for the last fifty-two years, 6354-6360. 6594-6597.—Opinion that pleuro-pneumonia, though not so infectious as foot and mouth disease, is much more fatal; expediency of all animals infected with this disease being at once slaughtered, 6363-6377. 6487, 6488. 6494, 6496-6552-6580. 6603-6620.

Examination with reference to foot and mouth disease; recommendation that fat cattle infected with this disease should be slaughtered, 6378-6383. 6395-6401. 6499-6436. 6465-6469. 6489-6493.—Impossibility of discovering by what means foot and mouth disease is conveyed; decided opinion that it is not conveyed by running water, 6385-6389.

Inexpediency

Garnett, Samuel. (Analysis of his Evidence)—continued.

Inexpediency of closing fairs and markets and prohibiting the movement of store stock; belief that the adoption of such a regulation would have a most injurious effect upon the cattle trade, 6390-6394—Advantage of having all cattle sales in Ireland held in well-drained fields; desirability of the tolls or customs levied off the animals being paid upon their entry into, and not upon their leaving the fairs, 6402-6405.

Inefficiency of any system of inspection, either at fairs or at ports of shipment; contention that issuing certificates to enable cattle to be moved would altogether prevent diseased cattle being sent from farms, 6405-6407, 6411-6416, 6441-6450, 6516-6530—Strong objection to the method in which cattle are conveyed by the railways in Ireland; cruel manner in which the animals are forced into the trucks, 6405-6418, 6531-6551.

Statement that a system of licensing cattle dealers would be ridiculous; reasons for this opinion, 6419, 6420, 6516-6530—Decided opinion as to the expediency of removing all restrictions as to foot and mouth disease; mistake of the English graziers in assimilating this disease with underpest, 6427, 6587-6593, 6598-6602.

Disagreement with the report of the Council of the Royal Dublin Society as regards the rigid enforcement of regulations for the prevention of disease, 643, 7640—Favourable opinion as to the arrangements made for the transit of cattle by steamers from Ireland to England; belief that the boats employed do not form a nucleus of disease, 6452-6464, 6501-6509, 6514, 6515.

Complaint as to the unnecessary interference of Government with regard to cattle diseases; opinion that this interference is mainly owing to recommendations of possessors and veterinary surgeons and not of owners of stock, 6470-6486, 6496, 6497—Advantage of Government interference for providing for the proper lading of trucks and the cleansing of vessels, 6479-6481.

Approval of a fee compensation being paid for cattle in the case of compulsory slaughter, 6501, 6502—Further statement as to the inexpediency of stringent restrictions as regards foot and mouth disease; contention that the present restrictions have proved useless, 6510-6513, 6587, 6592, 6598-6601, 6602-6655.

Suggestions as to the means to be adopted for preventing the over-crowding of cattle in railway trucks, 6532-6550—Necessity for entirely different measures with regard to the foreign trade as compared with those adopted for the Irish trade, on account of the existence of underpest in foreign countries, 6604-6606.

Expediency of there being facilities given to farmers for the slaughter of diseased animals by the butcher; statement that this power does not exist at the present time, 6650-6650—Considerable loss last year in Ireland from foot and mouth disease; opinion that this loss was caused by the cattle from Ballinacree fair spreading the disease throughout the country, 6634, 6635, 6645-6651.

Gebhardt, Hermann. (Analysis of his Evidence).—Large experience of witness as a cattle salesman in London for twenty-four years; importation of cattle by him chiefly from Germany, 12724-12732—Decided opinion that our supplies are considerably lessened by compulsory slaughter at the ports; grounds for this conclusion, 12733-12748.

Figures showing a continuous increase in the importation of sheep with a diminution in that of cattle, for several years, 12749-12751—Great difficulty in carrying dead meat from the port of entry into the interior, on account of the bad condition of the cattle upon landing; expediency of cattle being fairly rested before being slaughtered, 12752-12754.

Disapproval of slaughtering the whole cargo if any animals were found to be suffering from foot and mouth disease; advisability of slaughtering animals suffering from other diseases, 12755-12757, 12803-12805, 12829-12835—Doubtful propriety of slaughtering animals suffering from pleuro-pneumonia, except under certain circumstances, 12758, 12804, 12805, 12825-12828.

Desirability of sending special steamers for the importation of store cattle and milch cows from Germany; reasons for separating the fat from the store cattle, 12759-12761—Decided opinion that foot and mouth disease is of English as well as of foreign origin; belief that this disease will not be got rid of by shutting out foreign cattle, 12762-12765.

Strong disapproval of compulsory slaughter at the ports of arrival; considerable losses incurred from sending dead meat into the interior after slaughter at the ports, 12766-12780—Statement that the scheduling of Germany is an unnecessary precaution on our part; reasons for this, 12781-12791, 12814-12824.

French cattle not imported into England at the present time; favourable opinion of the Normandy cattle, 12791-12800—Opinion that it is not worth while to import Russian cattle on account of the small numbers that could be brought, 12801, 12802—Desirability of throwing the foreign cattle trade much more open than it is at present, with a view to extend competition for trade, 12806-12809.

Report, 1873—continued.

Gebhardt, Hermann. (Analysis of his Evidence)—continued.

Irregularity of railway trains an additional difficulty in the way of sending dead meat into the interior, 12810-12813.—Evidence in support of the abolition of restrictions upon the importation of store cattle; considerable diminution in the importation of fat cattle from abroad, 12837-12850.

Examination as to the prices of cattle on the Continent; considerable increase, of late years in the price of meat, especially in Germany, 12851-12884.—Extraordinary increase in the price of English stock in the present year; increased importation of foreign cattle from this cause, 12885-12899. 12999-13009.

Expectation of a considerable increase in the import of foreign cattle in the event of the removal of the existing restrictions; countries whence the cattle should be imported, 12900-12907.—Decrease in the numbers of Spanish and Portuguese cattle on account of the war in France, 12908-12914.

Absence of country buyers at Deptford on account of the disadvantages in carrying dead meat, 12915-12919.—Statement that the cattle imported by witness in the year 1868 were not killed at the landing place as a result of the restrictions, but were brought into the market, 12920-12925.

The average price of a foreign bullock at the present time is about 23 £, 12926.—Information as to the average expenses at the Metropolitan Market and at Deptford, 12927-12937.—Examination with regard to the importation of dead meat from abroad; statement that the supply depends a good deal upon the period of the year, 12939-12953.

Belief that if an Act of Parliament were passed confining foreign cattle to Deptford Market no cattle would come, 12956-12960.—Large numbers of cattle which come to England from Schleswig-Holstein; supply of cattle to this country influenced by the demands made by other countries on the Continent, 12961-12977.

Evidence in further support of the objection to making Deptford a dead meat market, 12978-12994.—Further statement as to the usefulness of slaughtering animals which have been in the same cargo with animals suffering from foot and mouth disease, 12995-12997. 13045-13067.—Additional examination with reference to the dead meat trade; statement that the disadvantage at Deptford is the killing of animals in hot weather, whilst they will not keep over Saturday night, 13011-13043.

Channels which would be found for the sale of foreign cattle if they were prevented from coming to England by the restrictions, 13043-13044.—Opinion that the great reduction in the import of Dutch and German cattle is mainly owing to the diminution of price at Deptford, 13068-13074.

Satisfactory consequences of the removal of the restrictions as regards the Schleswig-Holstein cattle; reasons for this, 13075-13085.—Circumstances which govern the prices in the meat market; statement that the live market is invariably guided by the previous week's dead meat market, the supply, and the weather, 13086-13091.

Foot and mouth disease always present in the Deptford Market on account of its being never clean, 13092-13098.—Additional information with regard to the importation of cattle from the Continent; the number of cattle imported this year from Denmark is double that of last year, 13101-13109.

Geestermunde. Large district of country whence cattle come to the port of Geestermunde for export to England, *Williams* 1171-1173.

Germany. Advantage if Germany were as careful about the through transit of cattle as she is on the Russian frontier, *Williams* 191-195.—Doubt as to the supply from Germany being seriously interfered with by that country being scheduled, *ib.* 1072-1080.—Violent effect of the outbreak of foot and mouth disease in Germany in the year 1873; effect of this outbreak upon English cattle, *Denchfield* 11104-11112. 11139-11146. 11150-11159.—Statement that the scheduling of Germany is an unnecessary precaution on our part; reasons for this conclusion, *Gebhardt* 12781-12791. 12814-12824.

GLANDERS:

Serious increase of glanders in horses, improved regulations being required for checking this disease, *Williams* 1276-1285. 1287.—Increased prevalence of glanders; neglect of owners in not giving notice of the disease, *Brown* 2600-2671.—Belief that glandered horses are numerous in London, the law on the subject being entirely neglected, *Simonds* 3224-3226.

Conclusion as to glanders being on the increase in the metropolis, *Hasting* 4755. 4756.—Expediency of horses affected with glanders or fury being at once killed, *ib.* 4764-4770. 4777.—Various forms in which glanders may be communicated; powerful character of the virulent matter, *ib.* 4771-4778.—Probable contagion by means of the public drinking fountains in London, *ib.* 4771.—Strict regulations on the Continent as to glanders, *ib.* 4783.—Prohibitory import of some glandered horses into England, *ib.* 4784. 4785.

GLANDERS—continued.

Large majority of cases of glanders which are not the result of infection or contagion, *Ferguson* 5351—Absence of any reliable cure for glanders, slaughter being desirable, *ib.* 5352, 5354—Admirable manner in which glanders has been stamped out in the army, *Gauger* 9467, 9468.

Recommendation by the Committee that the slaughter of horses affected with glanders should be compulsory, but that payment should be made to the owner for the value of the carcasses, *Reg.* 16.

Glasgow. Higher prices charged for meat in Glasgow than in the metropolitan market; the consumption of meat in Glasgow has trebled since the year 1851, *Smith* 12345-12353—Considerable advantages which would result from the removal of the prohibition to move cattle from Leith to Glasgow to be slaughtered, *ib.* 12355-12361—Suggestions as to the means to be adopted for the improvement of the lairage at Glasgow, *ib.* 12369-12413.

Memorial of master butchers of the city of Glasgow to the Privy Council, praying for a removal of the restrictions upon the import of foreign cattle, *App.* 598.

Glasnevin (Model Farm). Statement as to the foot and mouth disease having been propagated on Glasnevin farm by the drainage water from land on which there were diseased cattle, *Baldwin* 3799, 3796—Introduction of pleuro-pneumonia into Glasnevin by cattle purchased at different fairs throughout Ireland, *ib.* 3938-3941—Estimated loss of 8 l. per cow when there has been a foot and mouth attack at Glasnevin, *ib.* 3950-3956, 3966-3974, 4065-4081.

Map of the Albert model farms at Glasnevin, *App.* 591.

Goslett, William. (Analysis of his Evidence.)—Is a farmer, and is member of the local authority for Forfarshire, 11536-11538—Statement that there is a large importation of cattle into Forfarshire from Ireland; decided opinion that these cattle have brought the foot and mouth disease into Scotland, 11539, 11540, 11557, 11601, 11602, 11640-11665, 11702-11707.

Examination as to the prevalence in Forfarshire of foot and mouth disease; belief that this disease is highly contagious, 11541-11557, 11635-11645, 11670—Method adopted in the treatment of animals affected with foot and mouth disease; good nursing preferable to any system of treatment, 11558-11567—Necessity for more stringently carrying out the regulations for foot and mouth disease; regulations in force in Forfarshire for the prevention of the disease, 11568, 11569, 11620, 11627.

Statement as to the action of the local authorities in Forfarshire; unsatisfactory manner in which the local and the county authorities work, 11570-11588, 11628—Expediency, in cases of pleuro-pneumonia, of slaughtering the animals affected, and isolating the rest of the herd; uselessness of treating cattle for this disease, 11589, 11590, 11597, 11609-11612, 11668, 11671-11673.

Inspection as carried out by the local authorities of Forfarshire; inadequate nature thereof, 11591-11596, 11628, 11631-11633, 11677, 11678—Expediency of liberal compensation in the case of compulsory slaughter; belief that full compensation would not induce the farmers to be reckless of the disease, 11597-11600, 11629, 11675.

Considerable risk run by farmers in Forfarshire on account of the large number of cattle which is imported by means of markets, 11601-11608, 11687—Great carelessness evinced in the transit of cattle by railway; difficulty in keeping the trucks clean, on account of the great traffic in cattle, 11613-11621, 11636-11668.

Strong opinion against permitting the movement of cattle from any farm where disease exists, 11681, 11692, 11686-11688—Calculation that the loss on cattle from foot and mouth disease is about 2 l. per head, 11623-11625, 11634, 11669—Unwillingness of the farmers to report the existence of disease obtained by allowing a liberal compensation, 11629, 11630, 11674-11677, 11680.

Statement that the Aberdeenshire system of regulations would be the most effectual, and the most economical; expediency of this system being adopted throughout the kingdom, 11678-11685—Opinion that cattle diseases come from abroad, 11688, 11689.

Contention that all foreign cattle should be slaughtered at the port of arrival; in the absence of this arrangement dead meat should be sent from abroad, 11691, 11692, 11708-11710, 11716, 11721—Augmentation of price which would follow on a feeling of confidence that Irish cattle were healthy, 11693-11699.

Limited extent to which English calves are purchased by witness at the present time, on account of their unhealthy state, 11699-11701—Decided opinion that whatever restrictions are imposed they should be applied equally to Ireland as to England or Scotland, 11711-11714.

Belief that the slaughter of all fat stock at the port of arrival would have very little effect upon the price of meat; general increase of the dead-meat market adverted to hereon,

Report, 1873—continued.

Goodlet, William. (Analysis of his Evidence)—continued.

hereon, 11717-11730—Question considered as to the expediency of continuing the import of Irish stock cattle, 11723-11727—System of carrying on cattle business in Scotland by means of commission, 11726-11730.

Government Inquiry. Strong opinion that it is the province of the Government to do all that is possible for the discovery of truth in matters relating to cattle diseases, *Gowrie* 9751-9757.

See also *Causes of Disease. Inspection. Privy Council. Veterinary Departments.*

Government Interference. Complaint as to the unnecessary interference of Government with regard to cattle diseases; opinion that this interference is mainly owing to the recommendation of professors and veterinary surgeons, and not owners of stock, *Garnett* 6470-6486, 6496, 6497—Advantage of Government interference for providing for the proper lading of trucks and the cleansing of vessels, *ib.* 6479-6481.

Guiry, Jerome James. (Analysis of his Evidence.)—Is a Magistrate for the county of Tipperary, and a large exporter of cattle; has had large experience in most kinds of cattle diseases, 6189-6193, 6282-6287—Examination as to the infectious character of foot and mouth disease; opinion that this disease is not sufficiently important to be included in the Act, 6195-6199, 6253-6255, 6270-6280, 6304-6307, 6324-6329, 6334-6342.

Decided opinion that the losses from foot and mouth disease have been greatly exaggerated, 6200-6203, 6281-6289—Belief that severe restrictions on the export of Irish cattle would have the effect of raising the price of meat, and also of depreciating the value of land; inexpediency of closing fairs and markets as proposed by Professor Baldwin, 6202-6214, 6256-6263, 6315-6319, 6351-6353.

Frequent fines imposed in Ireland upon persons for permitting cattle to stray upon the highways, 6215-6218—Bad usage of cattle when being shipped; contention that the appointment of inspectors at the port of embarkation, would, in the beginning, have put a stop to foot and mouth disease, 6219-6227, 6290-6294.

Disapproval of the confiscation of any animal which was found diseased at the shipping port, 6228-6230—Advisability of a dead-meat market in consequence of the risk to graziers and breeders of loss by transit, 6231-6234—Contention that pleuro-pneumonia is one of the greatest calamities that can happen to a stock-owner; expediency of slaughtering all diseased animals and all herds which came in contact with them, 6235-6239, 6295-6302, 6330-6333.

Undoubted necessity of giving high compensation for compulsory slaughter; opinion that the full value should not be given as it might lead to jobbery, 6240-6243, 6308-6311—Information as to the reason for shipment of cattle from Ireland to England, 6343-6350.

H.

Hanover. Purchases made by witness of about 2,000 store cattle every year; large number of these cattle obtained from Hanover and from Holland, *Smith* 12306-12309—Healthy character of the Hanoverian cattle; unsatisfactory character of those obtained from Holland, *ib.* 12305-12313—Opinion that the cattle from Hanover could be imported at considerable advantage, *ib.* 12314, 12315.

Hares and Rabbits. See *Foot and Mouth Disease*, II. 3.

Hertfordshire. Returns of the foot and mouth disease in the county during the last year, *Duckham* 9788—Inefficiency of the regulations in Hertfordshire on account of there being no one to see them carried out; inexpediency of a multiplication of local authorities in the same county, *ib.* 9800-9804, 9859-9862, 9877-9881—Willingness of the farmers in the district to submit to more stringent regulations with regard to foot and mouth disease, *ib.* 9805-9808.

Opinion that the county was perfectly free from foot and mouth disease when the cattle plague came to an end; re-introduction of the disease from Bristol, *Duckham* 9809-9819, 9839-9843—Figures showing the numbers of cattle, sheep, and pigs attacked with foot and mouth disease in the year 1873, *ib.* 9843-9849, 9863, 9874, 9908-9912—Larger importation of cattle into Hertfordshire than there used to be; reasons for this, *ib.* 9865-9874.

Paper explanatory of the losses sustained by the stockowners of the county in 1873 from foot and mouth disease; aggregate of 155,126 £, *App.* 634, 635.

Hides. Probable introduction of the foot and mouth disease from abroad by means of hides imported, *Brown* 2530-2534—There is no evidence of the fact, *ib.* 2531, 2532.

Approval of the hides of diseased animals being utilised if they are properly disinfected, *Steads* 3215-3217, 3222, 3223.

High-bred

Report, 1873—continued.

High-bred Stock. Increased susceptibility of the higher bred animals to diseases generally
Brown 1333-1395, 2678-2680.

Highland and Agricultural Society of Scotland. Memorial of the Highland and Agricultural Society of Scotland to the Privy Council, dated 5th March 1873, relative to the want of unanimity of local action in dealing with cattle diseases, *App.* 575.

Hodgetts, Abraham. (Analysis of his Evidence.)—Has been a Butcher and Cattle Dealer at West Bromwich for twenty-five years, 12582-12587, 12667-12669.—Considerable fluctuations in the price of meat for many years past at West Bromwich; opinion that the compulsory slaughter of foreign cattle at the ports is the chief cause of the increase in the price, 12588-12591.

Examination with regard to the business carried on by witnesses in foreign cattle; unsuccessful attempt made to slaughter at the port of entry and to transport the meat into the interior of the country, 12592-12609, 12638-12657, 12670-12679, 12687-12689, 12694, 12695.—Losses incurred in sending dead meat into the interior of the country in summer weather; impossibility of making the best of the offal, 12610-12617, 12622-12625, 12628-12637, 12702, 12703, 12713-12716.

Contention that the importation of cattle would be seriously checked by compulsory slaughter, 12618-12621, 12626.—Statement that a change from the live animal to the dead meat trade would not do for the district at all, 12658-12668, 12690-12694.

Further information as to the causes for the increase in prices of meat; restrictions upon cattle have had a considerable effect upon the prices, 12680-12682, 12693-12693.—Reasons for the prices of meat being lower in London than in Birmingham, 12700-12705.—Grounds of objection to the dead meat trade by the West Bromwich butchers, 12712-12716.—Information as to the retail prices of meat sold by witnesses, 12717-12723.

Holland. Explanation of the grounds upon which Holland was removed from the schedule under the Act of 1869 in April 1871, *Williams* 123-126.—Nature of the evidence upon which it is assumed that foot and mouth disease had been brought from Holland into England and Ireland, *Brown* 1376-1379, 2057-2067, 2106-2111.—Inference as to pleuro-pneumonia having been introduced into Ireland from Holland, *ib.* 2062-2067, 2797, 2798.—Doubt as to Holland continuing to export her cattle to England, *Stewart* 3096, 3097.

Stronger regulations required with regard to animals coming from Holland than coming from Ireland; reasons for this opinion, *Clarke* 8295-8309, 8315, 8316.—Examination as to the peculiar danger in importing cattle from the Continent by way of Holland; statement that there are in that country established stations of pleuro-pneumonia, *Gawjee* 9633-9665.

Opinion that a great deal of pleuro-pneumonia has been introduced into this country by means of Dutch cattle; considerable talking off in the purchase of these, *Odams* 9973-9980, 10039-10041.—Wretched condition in which some Dutch cattle were landed at Harwich; inference therefrom that there was a scarcity of provender in Holland, *ib.* 9995-10000.—Enormous losses sustained in Holland by the prevalence of pleuro-pneumonia, *ib.* 10081.

Prevalence of pleuro-pneumonia in Holland; large sums voted by the Government of that country to compensate for the slaughter of animals suffering from the disease, *Robinson* 10546-10558, 10663-10668, 10668-10679, 10730, 10731.—Relative prices of meat in Holland in the year 1847, and in the present year, *ib.* 10774-10776.

Statement as to the importation of Dutch cattle into Essex in the year 1871 with foot and mouth disease; severe form in which foreign cattle have this disease, *H. Webb* 10912-10918, 10924, 10930-10930.—Less healthy character of the cattle obtained by witnesses from Holland than from Hanover, *Smith* 12995-12913.—Some cattle affected with foot and mouth disease in the Metropolitan market, on 10th June 1872, were chiefly Dutch, *J. Webb* 14071.

Letter from Mr. Cope to the Secretary, Veterinary Department, dated 12th July 1872, with reference to an alleged exposure of diseased Dutch animals in the Metropolitan Market, *App.* 599.

Horses. Belief as to foreign horses not undergoing any inspection on arrival in England, *Hunting* 4779-4782.—Examination as to the course necessary to be followed in the case of importation of horses from districts which are infected with contagious diseases, *Lepper* 10925-10910.—See also *Farcy*. *Glanders*.

HULL:

1. *Representations as to the want of Improved Accommodation and Improved Regulations at the Port of Hull.*
2. *Explanation submitted on the part of the Local Authority.*

1. *Representations as to the want of Improved Accommodation and Improved Regulations at the Port of Hull.*

Inability of the central department to enforce proper regulations at the port of Hull, *Williams* 243-249. 256, 257. 269-271.—Examination as regards the port of Hull to the effect that witness fully believes there are grounds for complaint as to the action of the local authorities, but that Professor Brown is conversant with all the local circumstances and is best able to give evidence as to the shortcomings of the port, *ib.* 1234-1255. 1286.

Great want of improved arrangements at Hull, *Brown* 1577-1582. 1591.—Examination in detail relative to the port of Hull, and to the extent to which any complaint lies against the local authorities or their officers as regards the defined area, *ib.* 1510 *et seq.*—Anxiety invariably evinced by the local authorities of the port to do what was possible for the prevention of disease, *ib.* 2012.—Space of ground at Hull available for the carrying out of improved regulations, *ib.* 2212-2224.

Evidence with further reference to the landing and market accommodation at Hull, and the arrangements for treating diseased foreign cattle, *Brown* 2783-2784.

Improvement required as regards the defined part of the port at Hull, *Simonds* 3072, 3073.—Statement in explanation of witness' suggestions for improving the arrangements and landing accommodation, *ib.* 3547-3551.

Visit of witness to the Hull market, unsatisfactory state of the market on account of its being ill-defined, *Jenkins* 5951-5958. 6058. 6077.—Irregular character of the cattle market, *Woodcock* 13841-13843.

2. *Explanation submitted on the part of the Local Authority.*

Provision for the inspection of foreign cattle imported into Hull, *Roberts* 13118.—Statement as to the provision of lairs for scheduled and unscheduled cattle; special construction of these lairs to meet the requirements of the Privy Council, *ib.* 13119-13126. 13321.—Existing accommodation for the slaughter of cattle; the value of the lairs and slaughterhouses is about 25,000 £, *ib.* 13126-13129. 13213-13228.

Almost total absence of complaints as to the insufficiency of sheds provided by the Dock company; correspondence relating to the only complaints ever made on this subject, *Roberts* 13130-13135. 13262-13265.—Explanation relative to a complaint by Professor Brown as to the presence of German cattle outside the defined area, *ib.* 13139-13141.—Information as to the selection by Professor Brown of the defined area; production of plans showing its precise position, *ib.* 13142-13151. 13170-13175. 13276-13279. 13321-13325.

Statement that during the cattle plague the market was held in Corporation field; description of this market, *Roberts* 13152-13154. 13176-13184.—Memorial presented to the corporation with a view to having the market altered on account of its inconvenient situation; action taken by the Privy Council upon this matter, *ib.* 13155-13169.—Pledges and guarantees entered into by the corporation with a view to properly guarding the defined area, *ib.* 13163-13169.

Decided opinion that it would be unreasonable that Hull should be bound to pay for diseased cattle brought to the port, *Roberts* 13210-13214.—Contention that the local circumstances do not warrant the statement that the cattle plague in the East Riding was first communicated from the Hull market, *ib.* 13215-13221.—Circumstances under which cattle would be slaughtered or placed in quarantine upon arriving in Hull with disease on board, *ib.* 13223-13231.—The slaughterhouses in Hull are the property of private individuals, but they are subject to strict sanitary regulations; favourable opinion of these slaughterhouses, *ib.* 13235-13261.

Statement that the Lincolnshire and foreign cattle are landed at two different piers; description of the position of these piers, *Roberts* 13266-13279.—Proposed bridge over the railway at Hull, to prevent the inconvenience of a level crossing, *ib.* 13278. 13279.—Belief that there is no difference of opinion between the Corporation of Hull and the veterinary department with reference to the duties of the local authorities, *ib.* 13281.—Witness returns that the expenses of compulsory slaughter of animals brought by the steamers to Hull should be borne by the Imperial exchequer, 13283-13287.

Examination relative to complaints from the large towns as to the dead meat which arrived in bad condition; contention that the complaints were chiefly against receiving slaughtered meat instead of live stock, *Roberts* 13308-13350.—Establishment of lairs for foreign cattle in the year 1866, *ib.* 13327.—Absence of any case of pleuro-pneumonia in Hull, *ib.* 13352.—Statement that a case of foot and mouth disease has never been reported to the local authority; character of the reports as usually made with respect to cattle disease, *ib.* 13333-13357.—Changes made by the Corporation for the lairage of cattle, *ib.* 13364-13369.—Opinion that in Hull, as in most of the large towns in England, the old market should be shifted from the centre to the outside of the town, *ib.* 13371-13376.

See also *Cattle Plague*, 3.

Hunting,

Hunting, William. (Analysis of his Evidence.)—Is a veterinary surgeon in London, 4753, 4754—Conclusion as to glanders being on the increase in the metropolis, 4755, 4756—Omission of fury from the Act of 1859, whereas it is a very contagious disease, and produces glanders; it is, in fact, a peculiar form of glanders, and should be subject to the same restrictions, 4757-4766, 4777, 4778, 4856-4859—Expediency of horses affected with glanders or fury, being at once killed, 4764-4770, 4777—Various forms in which glanders may be communicated; powerful character of the virulent matters 4771-4778.

Belief as to foreign horses not undergoing any inspection on arrival in England, 4779-4782—Strict regulations on the continent as to glanders, 4783—Probable import of some glandered horses, 4784, 4785—Particulars relative to the inspection of foreign sheep, as carried out at Brown's Wharf; opinion that the inspection does not guarantee the detection of foot and mouth disease, 4786-4795, 4809-4815.

Advantage of a sufficiently long detention or quarantine in the case of store stock, with reference to foot and mouth disease, cattle plague, and sheep-pox; facility to detection thereby, 4796-4804—Expediency of slaughter in all cases of pleuro-pneumonia, compensation being given, 4800, 4805-4808—Suggestion as regards fury, that compensation might be allowed when horses are slaughtered, as the disease is curable, 4823-4835.

I.

Import of Cattle and Sheep. See *Cattle Plague.* *Foot and Mouth Disease.* *Foreign Cattle.* *Pleuro-pneumonia.* *Sheep.*

Incubation of Disease. Periods of incubation respectively of cattle plague, sheep-pox, pleuro-pneumonia, and foot and mouth disease, *McBride* 9036-9042.

See also *Foot and Mouth Disease*, II. 4. *Pleuro-pneumonia*, 3.

Indigenous Disease. Information as to the several diseases which are indigenous to English cattle, *McBride* 9378-9389—Indigenous character of foot and mouth disease; belief that with the exception of cattle plague, few countries have specific diseases of their own, *Lambert* 13618-13620, 13668-13673, 13679-13683.

Infected Places. Insufficiency of thirty days as the interval or period for which an "infected place" shall continue in that category, *Brown* 1540-1548—Statement as to the want of a power to destroy all cattle within a certain area where there is an outbreak of cattle plague, *ib.* 1545-1552, 1722-1726—Approval of a radius of one mile as the area of an "infected place" where there is an outbreak of cattle plague, *ib.* 2416-2418.

Approval generally of thirty days as the interval before an infected place can be declared to be disinfected, *Simonds* 3045—Insufficiency of the Parliamentary limit of twenty-two days as regards places infected with pleuro-pneumonia, *Baldwin* 4019-4021—The time during which each lair or yard should be liable to be termed an infected place should be decided by the Privy Council, *Clarke* 8357-8367.

Infection or Contagion. See *Cattle Plague*, I. *Foot and Mouth Disease*, II. 1-8. *Pleuro-pneumonia*, 2.

Inoculation. Consideration of the question of inoculation for pleuro-pneumonia; inaccuracy of a statement that a large number of cases has been caused by inoculation, *Brown* 2687-2697—Approval of inoculation for sheep-pox under certain circumstances, *ib.* 2698, 2699.

Belief as to the entire failure of inoculation in reference to pleuro-pneumonia, *Simonds* 3290, 3291, 3293, 3302—Data for the conclusion that inoculation is useless as a means of getting rid of pleuro-pneumonia, *Baldwin* 3868, 3869.

Evidence in favour of inoculation as a preventive of pleuro-pneumonia; description of the method advocated, *Belster* 7371-7377, 7471-7476, 7608-7618—Information as to the probably good effects of inoculation in cases of pleuro-pneumonia; method by which inoculation should be effected, *Clarke* 8435-8490, 8537-8541—Approval of inoculation as a means of preventing the attacks of pleuro-pneumonia; instance in which such treatment has been successful, *Rigby* 8770-8772, 8775, 8873-8879, 8869-8989—Expediency of instituting a system of experiments with regard to inoculation; propriety of the Privy Council conducting these experiments, *McBride* 9050, 9056-9059, 9140, 9239-9241, 9259-9266, 9269, 9270.

Examination upon the question of adopting inoculation in cases of pleuro-pneumonia; inoculation not necessary for foot and mouth disease, *Ganges* 9455-9461, 9473-9475, 9485, 9486, 9619, 9620, 9626-9641, 9649—Statement as to the opinions of German professors as regards the utility of inoculation, *ib.* 9479, 9626-9631—Inoculation of disease by means of inhaling the spray of pleuro-pneumonia virus, *ib.* 9480-9483, 9685-9691.

Inoculation—continued.

9691. 9700. 9701.—Further evidence as the subject of instituting a system of inoculation with a view to the prevention of pleuro-pneumonia; instances of experiments to this end carried on by witness, *Ganges* 9685-9709.

Experiments made by witness upon rabbits with a view to ascertain the effect of inoculation in lung and mouth disease; improbability of the disease having been spread by means of hares, *Thomas* 11235-11245.

INSPECTION:

1. *Functions and Remuneration of the two Chief Inspectors attached to the Central Department.*
2. *Functions and Mode of Payment of the Veterinary Inspectors at the Ports; increased Staff required.*
3. *Large Number of Local Inspectors; Mode of Payment of these.*
4. *Proposals for a large Extension of the System of Central Government Inspection, aided by a County or Local Inspection.*
5. *Suggested Inspection of Premises in the Neighbourhood of Disease.*
6. *Character of the Inspection in Ireland; Amendment required.*
7. *Question of Inspection at the Port of Shipment in Ireland, or at the Port of Arrival in England.*
8. *Exceptions taken to any System of Inspection.*
9. *Recommendations by the Committee.*

1. *Functions and Remuneration of the two Chief Inspectors attached to the Central Department:*

Several functions of the two inspectors attached to the central office, *Williams* 37-41.—Explanatory statement relative to the salary of witness when an officer of the veterinary department, with considerations as to the remuneration generally of the office of inspector in reference to the responsible duties to be performed, *Sims* 3164-3174.

2. *Functions and Mode of Payment of the Veterinary Inspectors at the Ports; increased Staff required:*

Particulars relative to the mode of appointment and payment, and the duties, of the inspectors of foreign animals at the ports, the greater number being now paid by salary instead of by fees; necessity of an increase of staff in order that these duties may be properly discharged, *Williams* 42-77.—Transfer of the appointment and payment from the Customs to the Veterinary Department; inconvenience when the inspectors were under the former department, *ib.* 43-55.—Advantage of payment by salary instead of by fees, *ib.* 50, 51, 56, 57.

Business of the inspector to deal with the animals after they are landed, the landing being in the hands of the Customs, *Williams* 58-62.—Difficulties owing to the want of staff for carrying out the regulations as to transit by vessel or by railway, *ib.* 510, 511, 518, 598, 599.—Diminution of the Government inspecting staff by diminishing the number of ports, *ib.* 1007-1009.

Instructions from the Privy Council Office to the veterinary inspectors at the ports, dated December 1871, *App.* 583, 584.

3. *Large Number of Local Inspectors; Mode of Payment of these:*

Difficulty in supplying a complete return of the expenses of the local authorities as well as of the Central Department on the score of inspection, &c., *Williams* 78-84.—Total of between 1,500 and 2,000 inspectors in 1872, including police officers who acted in that capacity; practice as to these sending weekly returns to the Privy Council, *ib.* 853-863.—Advantage if the local or county inspectors were required to devote their whole time to the duties of their office, *ib.* 926-930.—Payment of the numerous local inspectors in England out of local rates, *ib.* 1109-1111.

4. *Proposals for a large Extension of the System of Central Government Inspection, aided by a County or Local Inspection:*

Contemplated appointment of a large body of Government inspectors who should report any case of disease on farms, *Williams* 444-454.—Enormous expense in carrying out the scheme for the appointment of a large number of veterinary inspectors; witness submitting however that this is the most effectual mode of preventing the spread of disease, *ib.* 816-826.—Contemplated central control of the inspectors if these be appointed by the local authorities, *ib.* 830-842.

Scheme propounded whereby pleuro-pneumonia may be kept under by a wholesale system of inspection on the farmers' premises throughout the country under central supervision; large staff required, *Brown* 1505-1527.—Advantage of one chief inspector for each county; facility thereby for obtaining reliable statistics, *ib.* 2447-2455.

Proposition

*INSPECTION—continued.**a. Proposal for a large Extension, &c.—continued.*

Proposal that each county be divided into sections, and that a professional inspector be appointed for each section, to whom the local veterinary surgeons should report the occurrence of any outbreak of contagious disease, *Simonds* 3025-3041.—The inspectors should be under the immediate direction of the central department, *ib.* 3033.

Further suggestions as to the appointment of district inspectors by Government and as to their remuneration, *Simonds* 3199-3208.—Incorporate reports from the present local inspectors on the subject of cattle plague, *ib.* 3323, 3326.—Requirement of a staff of inspectors throughout the country if the new transit orders are to be enforced, and if the railway arrangements are to be properly supervised, *ib.* 3334-3339.

Further explanations in connection with the proposed appointment and functions of the county inspectors under the central department; reliance to be placed upon the veterinary surgeons throughout the country for giving information to the inspectors, *Simonds* 3401-3406.—Contemplated report by the inspectors to the local authority, though they should be amenable only to the central department, *ib.* 3402-3406.—Professional inspection necessary for the prompt detection of pleuro-pneumonia, *ib.* 3417, 3418.

Examination as to the means to be employed for giving effect to the regulations with regard to the stamping out of the disease; expediency of the appointment of qualified inspectors throughout the country by the Privy Council, *Clarke* 8338-8347, 8459-8470, 8491-8510.—Means by which local inspectors would discover the existence of foot and mouth disease; belief in the willingness of the farmers to submit to these regulations for the prevention of the spread of the disease, *ib.* 8347-8355.—Further examination as to carrying out the regulations with respect to foot and mouth disease; necessary that the inspector to be appointed by the Privy Council should be totally independent of the local authorities, *ib.* 8458-8472.

Desirability of appointing inspectors at the cost of the county to see that the provisions of the Act are carried out with uniformity and efficiency, *Waller* 12167-12170.

b. Suggested Inspection of Premises in the Neighbourhood of Disease:

Necessity for a constant inspection by qualified officers of all premises in the neighbourhood of disease; expediency of employing the police upon this duty, *Jenkins* 3867-3870.

c. Character of the Inspection in Ireland; Amendment required:

Opinion that there is no real inspection in Ireland; estimate of from ten to twenty per cent. of the cases as not reported, *Baldwin* 3876-3882, 4489-4470.

Way in which disease in Ireland would be checked, and outbreaks more readily reported, if there were authority at once to send professional inspectors to the locality, *Ferguson* 4884-4899.—Comparatively few cases in which veterinary inspectors were sent from the Central Department in 1872 to inspect cases of foot and mouth disease, *ib.* 4919.—Advantage of a staff of veterinary inspectors, with power to seize diseased animals, and to act with the police, *ib.* 4929.—Decided objection to the abolition of all inspection, *ib.*—Illustrations of the want of professional inspectors, in lieu of the necessity of sending them to the localities from Dublin, *ib.* 4932-4934.

7. Question of Inspection at the Port of Shipment in Ireland, or at the Port of Arrival in England:

Entire inadequacy of the Government inspector at Bristol and at Liverpool to properly inspect the large imports from Ireland, *Williams* 470-478.—Absence of central inspection or control over Irish cattle until they are landed in England, *ib.* 865-867.—Expediency of an efficient inspection at the port of embarkation in Ireland, rather than at the port of embarkation in England, *ib.* 1098, 1099, 1112-1116, 1122-1125, 1131-1135.—Explanation that the Privy Council inspectors do not examine Irish cattle; duty and action of the local authorities on the subject, *ib.* 1159, 1322-1335.—Excuse taken to the view that there is any direct neglect of duty on the part of the local authorities at Bristol or Liverpool in regard to the inspection of Irish cattle, *ib.* 1345-1349, 1352, 1355.

Value of an efficient inspection at the port of departure in Ireland; that is, if there were a power of detention, *Brown* 1431, 1432.—Difficulties as regards inspection at the Irish ports with a view to the detention of all animals likely to spread disease, *ib.* 1710-1717, 1783-1785, 2226-2228.—Inadequacy of the present inspection at Waterford and Cork, *ib.* 1715, 1716, 1783-1785.—Check to some extent upon the export of cases of disease from Ireland, if there were inspection at the port of shipment; probable effect upon the prices in Ireland, *ib.* 2367-2369.

Slight extent to which inspection at the port of shipment in Ireland would have a deterrent effect, *Simonds* 3394-3395.—Conclusion as to the inadequacy of inspection at the port of embarkation in Ireland, or the port of arrival in England, as a means of preventing

INSPECTION—continued.

7. *Question of Inspection, &c.—continued.*

venting the spread of disease, *Baldwin* 3835. 3876-3882, 4054-4056. 4142. 4152-4157 —Belief that few of the inspectors themselves place much faith in inspection, *ib.* 4157.

Grounds for the conclusion that a system of inspection at the port of embarkation would not be any adequate check to the export of animals under the influence of foot and mouth disease, *Ferguson* 4914-4921 —Steps taken by witness in consequence of representations from England, for the inspection of cattle at certain ports, with a view to the detention and condemnation of diseased animals; disease hitherto of the powers of confiscation, *ib.* 5038-5054.

Further explanation of witness' reasons for concluding that any inspection of Irish cattle should be at the port of landing in England, and not at the port of shipment in Ireland, *Ferguson* 5393-5403.

Suggestion that there be a proper inspection of Irish cattle at the port of shipment, and that any having disease be sent back to their owners, or to the farms whence they came, *Morrow* 5596, 5597. 5633-5646. 5732-5735. 5774. 5809-5811 —Contention that an efficient system of inspection, both at the shipping and landing ports, would greatly tend to diminish the spread of infection, *Jenkins* 6130-6139 —Bad usage of Irish cattle when being shipped; opinion that the appointment of inspectors at the port of embarkation would, in the beginning, have put a stop to foot and mouth disease, *Quiry* 6219-6227. 6290-6294.

Opinion that a qualified person should be placed at the port of shipment to examine animals; careful attention paid by cattle dealers to the state of other cattle shipped with their own, *O'Neill* 6714-6717. 6882-6882 —Possible use of inspection at the port of embarkation in order to prevent the shipment of diseased animals, *McBride* 9242-9247 —Examination with regard to the transit of cattle from Ireland; decided opinion in favour of inspection at the port of shipment, *Stewart* 11754-11831. 11836-11840. 11873-11881.

8. *Eruptions taken to any System of Inspection :*

Conclusions as to the inadequacy of the Irish Veterinary Department, or any system of inspection, as a means of keeping down cattle diseases, *Baldwin* 3835. 3876-3882. 4054-4056. 4142-4152. 4157. 4401. 4465 —It is impossible for inspectors to ascertain the existence of foot and mouth disease in a latent state, *ib.* 3835. 3878.

Grounds for the conclusion that inspection is of very little use as a check upon foot and mouth disease, *Stratton* 4538-4540. 4607-4610 —Method adopted in the Liverpool Market as regards inspection of animals by the police; contention that this inspection tends more to propagate than to prevent diseases, *Verdon* 7897-7903. 8031-8036.

Inutility of inspection as a preventive measure, *Wells* 8113. 8160-8164 —Inefficacy of inspection in preventing the introduction of contagious and infectious diseases into the country, *McBride* 9232-9233. 9242. 9245-9162. 9253-9258 —Conclusion that inspection would be powerless to detect pleuro-pneumonia, *Thomson* 11499-11507.

9. *Recommendations by the Committee :*

Opinion of the Committee that there should be an inspection from time to time by the officers of the central authority of the vessels engaged in the Irish and coasting, as well as in the foreign trades, and also of railways, fairs, markets, and fairs, *Rep. vi.* —A sufficient number of travelling inspectors should be appointed and employed by the central authority to give effect to the Orders of Council on the foregoing points, *ib.*

See also *Cattle Ships*, 6. *Entry to Premiums*, *Fairs and Markets*, 4. *Foreign Cattle*, *Foot and Mouth Disease*, *Ireland, &c.* *Liverpool*, *Local Authorities*, *Movement of Cattle*, *Police*, *Railways*, *Veterinary Departments*, *Veterinary Surgeons*.

IRELAND, AND IRISH CATTLE :

I. *Foot and Mouth Disease :*

1. Amount of Disease in the Country at different Periods.
2. Conveyance of the Disease between Ireland and Great Britain.
3. Estimated Loss from the Disease in 1872.
4. Regulations and Restrictions in Operation.
5. Scheme of Professor Baldwin for stamping out the Disease, by stopping Fairs and Markets, and by preventing Movement of Cattle, for Two Months in the Year.
6. Sanitary Objections to the foregoing Restrictions.
7. Suggested Removal of all Restrictions.

II. *Pleuro-pneumonia.*

IRELAND, AND IRISH CATTLE—continued.

- I). *Pleuro-pneumonia.*
- III. *Large Annual Loss from Preventible Diseases.*
- IV. *Source of Payment of Inspection, Compensation, &c.*
- V. *Duty of the Constabulary in reference to Cattle Diseases.*
- VI. *Amount of Export from Ireland to Great Britain; Statistics on the Subject.*
- VII. *General Condition of Irish Cattle sent to England.*
- VIII. *Question of imposing Restrictions in the shape of Slaughtering, Detention, &c., at the Port of Arrival in England.*
- IX. *Expediency of similar Restrictions generally in Ireland as in England.*
- X. *Import of Foreign Cattle to Ireland.*
- XI. *Model Agricultural Schools.*
- XII. *Sundry Details and Suggestions on various Points.*
- XIII. *Returns and Statistics of Diseases.*
- XIV. *Conclusions and Recommendations of the Committee.*

I. *Foot and Mouth Disease :*1. *Amount of Disease in the Country at different Periods :*

Less prevalence of foot and mouth diseases in Ireland than in England, *Brown* 1074-1078—Appearance of the disease in Ireland in 1830, since which year there have been several outbreaks, *Simonds* 1082-1084.

Statement as to there having been from 15,000 to 20,000 centres of foot and mouth disease in Ireland in 1872, *Baldwin* 3880. 4016. 4184—Existence of the foot and mouth disease in Ireland for the last thirty years; it was worse in 1872 than in any previous year, *ib.* 3917, 3918. 4005. 4271-4285—Great decrease of the disease some few years ago, until it was re-imported, *ib.* 3919.

Dissent from the view of the Veterinary Department, that in May and June 1871 there was no foot and mouth disease in Ireland, *Baldwin* 3959, 4000—Severe foot and mouth disease last year in the case of sheep, *ib.* 4067-4070.

Statistics relative to the amount of foot and mouth disease in Ireland in 1872, and the mortality therefrom, in the case, respectively, of cattle, sheep, and swine, *Ferguson* 4900-4909—Four hundred and sixty-eight outbreaks of the disease were reported in 1872, *ib.* 4902, 4903—Great decline in the number of cases, *ib.* 4958, 4959—Number of cases of the disease in Donegal and in Kerry in 1872; no county was exempt, *ib.* 4982-4984—Incomplete character of the returns as to the amount of the disease, *ib.* 4985-4988.

Data further submitted for the conclusion that irrespective of further restrictions foot and mouth disease has rapidly diminished, and will probably die out altogether, *Ferguson* 5479-5488. 7528—Statement on the subject of the peculiar prevalence of foot and mouth disease among sheep, in 1870, *ib.* 5510-5512.

Discovery by witness of an outbreak of foot and mouth disease in 1843; doubt as to its origin, *Morrow* 5803, 5804. 5848-5850—Belief that there was less disease in 1872 than in 1871; exemption of witness' cattle from the disease in 1872 and down to the present time, *ib.* 5828, 5829. 5831-5834—Personal experience of witness as to foot and mouth disease since 1843; care taken by him in his purchases, so that he has been fortunate, *ib.* 5880-5887.

2. *Conveyance of the Disease between Ireland and Great Britain :*

Large import of foot and mouth disease from Ireland at the ports of Bristol and Liverpool, though the disease is said to have been first introduced into Ireland from England, *Williams* 450-459—Absence of any check to the movement of Irish cattle from the ports into the interior, so that foot and mouth disease is easily spread in England; obstacles to the diseased animals being detained and isolated at the place of landing, *ib.* 479-499—Grounds for the conclusion that there is a larger proportion of disease imported from Ireland than from foreign countries, *ib.* 1095-1109. 1153-1161.

Statement as to foot and mouth disease not having been in Ireland when the cattle plague was there, and as to its having been twice introduced into Ireland by cattle or calves from Bristol, *Brown* 1780-1781—Appearance of the disease in England long before it was known in Ireland, *ib.* 1822-1826—Large import of Irish foot and mouth disease at Liverpool as well as at Bristol, *ib.* 2031-2033.

Probability of a great number of diseased animals having been sent to England in 1872, though many were not sent spontaneously, *Ferguson* 4913—Opinion that the number of diseased cattle sent from Ireland to England is very much exaggerated, *ib.* 4943—With regard to the frequent practice formerly of sending diseased cattle to England this system no longer exists, and the movement of diseased cattle in Ireland is now prohibited, *ib.* 5397. 5400-5407.

Export by witness of about 2,200 cattle to Glasgow and other places in the last six years; in only one lot of this large supply was there foot and mouth disease, *Morrow*

IRELAND, AND IRISH CATTLE—continued.

I. Foot and Mouth Disease—continued.

2. Conveyance of the Disease between Ireland and Great Britain—continued.

5574-5578—Particulars as to an outbreak of the disease among some cattle sent by witness to Falkirk; this was on the fourth day after their departure from Ireland, and there was then no disease among them, *Morris* 5581-5592. 5593-5598—Instances of disease having broken out among Irish cattle in Scotland, through infection in the railway trucks or in the markets, *ib.* 5599-5605—Means by which foot and mouth disease is transmitted from Ireland to England, *Jenkins* 6031, 6052.

Decided opinion that the statement that Irish cattle have brought disease into England is very much exaggerated; absence of any complaints as to disease in animals when landed from the steamer- or witness' company, *O'Neill* 6482-6867. 6901—Examination as to the prevalence of foot and mouth disease in Ireland; decided opinion that the disease has been brought from England, *Fergus* 7026. 7033-7040. 7081. 7083. 7095. 7098-7114. 7094. 7095. 8037-8040—Evidence in support of the theory that foot and mouth disease originates in the east, and travels westward in Ireland, *ib.* 7801-7813.

Statement that Irish cattle are the healthiest that are brought to England, *McBride* 9304-9396—Opinion as to the healthy character of Irish store cattle; necessity of protecting them from disease from England, *Gauger* 9448.

Examination as to the introduction of diseased animals from Ireland; opinion that though the stoppage of cattle from Ireland would not give immunity from disease, it would have the effect of cutting off a main source, *Smith* 10253-10263. 10330-11357. 10366-10381. 10383-10395. 10379-10383—Prevalence of foot and mouth disease in the Irish cattle which come to Perthshire, *Stewart* 11841.

Inaccuracy of statements that Ireland is the source of supply of foot and mouth disease to England, *Lansford* 10520-10538.

3. Estimated Loss from the Disease in 1872:

Examination as to the data upon which witness estimates a loss of 1,500,000 £ in 1872 on account of the foot and mouth disease, though as a rule the disease does not kill; serious loss on the score of milk, the condition of the animals, &c., *Baldwin* 3947-3974. 4065-4080.

4. Regulations and Restrictions in Operation:

Duty of owners to report to the police any outbreak of the disease, and to restrain any movement of cattle from the land; liability to fines for breach of these regulations, *Baldwin* 3920-3926—Examination as to the effect that notwithstanding legislative restrictions in Ireland the foot and mouth disease was probably worse in 1872 than when there was no legislation on the subject, *ib.* 4271-4285.

Failure of the steps taken in Ireland as well as in England for checking the spread of foot and mouth disease, *Fergus* 4969-4977—Very serious effect of a withdrawal of the present regulations, *ib.* 5025-5028—Argument that much has been done under witness' department to arrest the movement of animals with foot and mouth disease, and to check the spread of the disease, though as regards fairs but little has been accomplished, *ib.* 5512. 5546-5554.

Witness would maintain the present restrictions generally in Ireland, but would not increase them, *Morris* 5820-5830.

Visits made by witness to Irish fairs with a view to inquiry into the foot and mouth disease; indifferent character of the isolation carried out at these fairs as to diseased animals, *Jenkins* 5843-5847—Statement that the restrictions on paper were stringent as regards foot and mouth disease, but that in practice they were neglected, *ib.* 5848-5850.

Necessity for stringently carrying out the law as regards restrictions for preventing the spread of foot and mouth disease; expediency of close vigilance on the part of the police, *Bolton* 7300-7320. 7330. 7331. 7396. 7397. 7416-7421. 7478-7490. 7586-7600.

5. Scheme of Professor Baldwin for stamping out the Disease, by stopping Fairs and Markets, and by preventing Movement of Cattle for Two Months in the Year:

Proposition that all fairs and markets in Ireland for the sale of store stock be closed for six weeks or two months, after the May fair, as a means of destroying the foot and mouth disease, *Baldwin* 3801-3811—Expected co-operation on the part of stock owners as regards the closing of all fairs for a time, *ib.* 3811. 3833—Suggestion that all animals subsequently showing the disease should be killed, the owners being compensated, *ib.* 3812-3816.

Further statement as regards foot and mouth disease, that the movement of store cattle, as well as the holding of fairs, should be prevented for six weeks or two months, *Baldwin* 3900-3916—Conclusion that under witness' scheme there would be no failure or difficulty as to the farmer reporting to the police, *ib.* 3907-3932.

Explanation

IRELAND, AND IRISH CATTLE—continued.

1. Foot and Mouth Disease—continued.

a. Scheme of Professor Baldwin for stamping out the Disease, &c.—continued.

Explanation that witness would prohibit absolutely the movement of store cattle in Ireland during the period proposed for closing fairs, in order to extirpate the foot and mouth disease; fat cattle might be moved, but not without a license now without being branded, *Baldwin* 4102-4105.—Witness reports that the most effectual plan is to stamp out the disease in Ireland, and that the farmers generally would approve of the means proposed by witness for the purpose, *ib.* 4153-4157.

Witness further advocates the closing of all fairs and markets in Ireland, and all transit of store stock, for six weeks, as a means of stamping out the foot and mouth disease; slaughter should be applied to any cases that arise in spite of these restrictions, *Baldwin* 4225-4241. 4293-4298.—Belief that the farmers would approve of the proposed remedies; that is, if adequate compensation be awarded, *ib.* 4233-4235. 4239. 4240. 4298.—The months of prohibition on removal should be June and July, *ib.* 4294-4296.

Grounds for the opinion that the farmers of Ireland would support the measures proposed by witness, though they disapprove of existing restrictions, *Baldwin* 4361-4368. 4419-4422. 4492-4494.—Repetition of arguments in favour of stopping all movement of store cattle and closing all fairs for six weeks or two months; this would be necessary only once, and not yearly, *ib.* 4369-4378. 4401 et seq.—Explanation that slaughtering should not be applied till after the disease had been stamped out; it should then be put upon the same basis as the cattle plague, *ib.* 4411. 4416-4418. 4423-4438. 4447.

Suggestions for the employment of the constabulary as an effectual machinery for dealing with any outbreak of foot and mouth disease after all movement has been stopped for a certain period, *Baldwin* 4423-4431.—Belief that no serious difficulty would be experienced in stopping, through the constabulary, all private sales and all movement during the months of June and July, *ib.* 4433-4442.—Approval of June and July as the months in which to stop all movement, although in England the disease has been most prevalent in the autumn months, *ib.* 4448-4450.

Suggestions for an alternative scheme to that given in the previous evidence of witness; expediency of dividing the county into police districts and of carrying out the scheme of closing fairs and markets in the infected districts only, *Baldwin* 5556-5568.

Suggestions in detail by Professor Baldwin for an enactment to relieve Ireland of the loss now entailed on her by pleuro-pneumonia and foot and mouth diseases, and to protect Great Britain from the exportation from Ireland of animals affected with these diseases, *App.* 591-595.

b. Sundry Objections to the foregoing Restrictions:

Conclusion as regards Ireland that the stringent regulations necessary for stamping out the foot and mouth disease would be most prejudicial to the grazing interests of the country, *Brown* 2038-2047. 2187-2192. 2194.

Efficiency of Mr. Baldwin's plan for the extirpation of disease, if the obstacles from the stoppage of movement, and from slaughter and compensation, are not found to be insurmountable; witness would be sorry to propose such stringent measures, *Ferguson* 4928-4934. 4942-4950. 4980-4984. 4997-5020.—Excessive inconvenience by stopping all movement of cattle to fairs in Ireland in May and June, or in June or July, *ib.* 4950-4954. 5003-5020. 5027.—Obstacle to the enforcement of a general prohibition upon movement for a given time, the magistrates objecting to impose penalties, *ib.* 5469-5475.

Belief as to the insufficiency of a period of two months during which to stop all movements in reference to foot and mouth disease; doubt as to the time required, *Ferguson* 5476. 5518-5527.—Conclusion, moreover, as to the inexpediency of the proposed restriction on account of its great interference with the farming and grazing interests of the country, *ib.* 5477. 5478. 5481. 5518-5528.—Decided objection to Professor Baldwin's proposal for stopping all movement of cattle, and all fairs and markets in June and July, as a means of getting rid of foot and mouth disease; wide-spread opposition expressed, *Morrow* 5553-5563. 5586-5577. 5595-5701.—Graziers and farmers would strongly oppose the restrictions in question, *ib.* 5554-5555. 5595-5597.—Difficulty in detecting all fresh cases through the police, *ib.* 5577-5583.

Inexpediency of adopting restrictions in Ireland, with regard to the suppression of foot and mouth disease, which would not be tolerated in England; opinion that the present rules of the Irish Department are sufficiently stringent provided they are carried out, *Jenkins* 6057. 6078-6080.—Belief that severe restrictions on the export of Irish cattle would have the effect of raising the price of meat, and also depreciating the value of land; inexpediency of closing fairs and markets as proposed by Professor Baldwin, *Gair* 6004-6214. 6255-6263. 6315-6319. 6331-6333.

IRELAND, AND IRISH CATTLE—continued.

I. Foot and Mouth Disease—continued.

6. Sundry Objections to the foregoing Restrictions—continued.

Inexpediency of closing fairs and markets and prohibiting the movement of store stock; belief that the adoption of such regulations would have a most injurious effect upon the cattle trade, *Garratt* 6390-6394—Disapproval of Professor Baldwin's suggestion for shutting up fairs and markets during the months of June and July; opinion that such a course would be ruinous to the Irish cattle trade, *Balster* 7297-7299, 7330-7332, 7639.

Statement that stopping all the fairs and markets for six weeks, as proposed, would have the effect of ruining the greater number of the small farmers in Ireland, *Ferdon* 7024—Entire disagreement of witness with the majority of Professor Baldwin's recommendations, *ib.* 7981, 7982.

Strong disapproval by the Royal Dublin Society of the proposal for stopping all fairs and markets, and all movements of cattle and sheep, during two at least of the summer months, *App.* 589.

7. Suggested Removal of all Restrictions:

Expediency of removing the restrictions as regards foot and mouth disease on account of the injury to trade; opinion that the restrictions have never been of any use, *Ferdon* 7013-7023, 7027, 7076-7081, 7114, 7116, 7122, 7123—Statement as to the class of persons who have signed the memorial which has been handed in by witness, paying for the removal of restrictions; nearly all the growers who have signed are Irish, and all the cattle dealers are English, *ib.* 7070-7074.

Expediency of non-restriction as regards foot and mouth disease in Ireland; approval of the agriculturist being left entirely to himself, to do as he thinks proper as regards the disease, *Wolfe* 8067-8071, 8082, 8132, 8133, 8158, 8159, 8171—Argument that if the disease is eradicated from England it will die out in Ireland, which is a naturally healthy country, *Mc Bride* 9196-9203, 9211-9214.

Memorial of landowners, cattle breeders, graziers, farmers, cattle salesmen, and butchers, to the Privy Council, objecting more especially to the restrictions as regards foot and mouth disease and sheep scab, *App.* 603.

II. Pleuro-pneumonia:

Belief that pleuro-pneumonia is frequently introduced into England from Ireland, though there are no statistics on the subject, *Williams* 481, 1153-1155, 1158-1161, 1167, 1168—Fewer diseased animals imported from Ireland than are moved from one part of England to another, *Brown* 1495-1498—Conclusion that pleuro-pneumonia is imported to England from Ireland, *ib.* 2030—Data for inferring that pleuro-pneumonia was introduced into Ireland from Holland, *ib.* 2062-2067, 2797, 2798—Alleged import of the disease from Ireland into the London dairies in 1841, *ib.* 2208-2273.

Less serious loss in Ireland from pleuro-pneumonia than from foot and mouth disease, *Baldwin* 3852—Absence of the disease in the breeding districts, *ib.* 3855—Exemption of the public model farms from pleuro-pneumonia, except Glasnevin, *ib.* 3865-3867—Very small staff required in connection with cases of pleuro-pneumonia, *ib.* 3933-3936.

Statement as to home-bred stock not being so liable as purchased stock to pleuro-pneumonia, though they are equally liable to foot and mouth disease, *Baldwin* 4007-4013—Result of the investigations of witness that pleuro-pneumonia and foot and mouth disease are of foreign origin, and are not generated in Ireland, *ib.* 4171-4191—Advocacy of a system of slaughter of cattle affected with pleuro-pneumonia, as well as of these animals in contact with diseased ones, *ib.* 4193-4197.

Satisfactory regulations now in force in Ireland relative to this disease; relaxation of the imperative restrictions in force in 1871, *Ferguson* 4955-4957—Very little pleuro-pneumonia now in Ireland, *ib.* 4958, 4959, 5498-5430, 5555, 5556—Opinion that whatever the origin of the introduction of pleuro-pneumonia into Ireland, it should be dealt with as entirely contagious or infectious, *ib.* 5387-5392.

Occurrence of three cases of pleuro-pneumonia among witness' stock in 1845; steps taken for preventing the spread of the outbreak, *Morrow* 5611-5613, 5651, 5652—Less pleuro-pneumonia in the rural districts than in the town dairies, *ib.* 5791, 5792.

Opinion that Ireland is singularly free from pleuro-pneumonia; evidence in support of the opinion that the disease comes principally into Liverpool from Cheshire, *Ferdon* 7031, 7032, 7096, 7097, 7118-7124, 7191-7197—Statement as to pleuro-pneumonia having been imported into Scotland from Ireland; desirability of the restrictions being stringently carried out in Ireland, *Stewart* 11954-11961, 11987-11982.

III. Large Annual Loss from Preventable Diseases:

Estimated loss of from 2,000,000 £. to 3,000,000 £. annually, from preventable diseases in Ireland; data for this calculation, *Baldwin* 3817-3826, 3881, 3948-3974, 4050-4086.

IV. Sources

IRELAND, AND IRISH CATTLE—continued.

IV. *Source of Payment of Inspection, Compensation, &c.*

Payment of compensation in Ireland out of a public rate levied on the union, *Baldwin* 4999.—Explanations in connection with the general rate to be levied throughout Ireland for working the Cattle Diseases Acts; expediency of a general rate rather than of local rates, *Ferguson* 5055-5066.—Considerable dissatisfaction if the expenses of a proper administration of the Act of 1869 in Ireland were to fall upon the ratepayer, *ib.* 5318-5320.—Exceedingly economical working of the Act in Ireland as compared with the expense in England, *ib.* 5321-5323.

Inspection of animals embarking for England is paid for from the Irish local rate; statement that the charge is unjust, *Murray* 12494-12497.—Contention that the expenses of this inspection should be paid from public moneys for the reason that the inspection is in the English interest, *ib.* 12498, 12499.—Explanation with regard to the Irish local rate; considerable amount of money repaid to the counties upon the breaking up of the Veterinary Department, *ib.* 12500-12503, 12559.—Further examination as to the propriety of the payment for inspection at the Irish ports being made out of Imperial funds, *ib.* 12504-12510.—Statement that in respect to the cattle trade England may be considered the buyer and Ireland the seller, *ib.* 12550-12555, 12576-12580.

V. *Duty of the Constabulary in reference to Cattle Diseases.*

Information relative to the duty of the constabulary throughout Ireland as to detecting cases of contagious disease and reporting them to the veterinary department; efficient discharge of these duties, on the whole, though many cases escape detection, *Ferguson* 4863-4866, 4885-4889.—Great facility with which simultaneous action may be taken throughout Ireland by means of the constabulary, *ib.* 4968.

Additional pay not received by the constabulary for the duties performed by them under the Veterinary Department, *Murray* 12556-12558.

VI. *Amount of Export from Ireland to Great Britain; Statistics on the subject.*

The Irish import of live cattle into England is 274 per cent. of the whole, and is more than twice the foreign supply, *Williams* 317, 420.—Explanation of the data upon which witness has estimated the relative per-centage of Irish and foreign cattle imported into England, *ib.* 501-508.—Respects in which the estimate of 274 per cent. as the English import from Ireland is probably excessive, *ib.* 1086-1088.—Reliance to be placed upon Ireland for English import of cattle, *Simonds* 3595, 3598.

Statistics as to the large export of cattle, &c. from Belfast to England and Scotland; the large majority are store stock, *Murray* 5528-5531.—Increasing character of the Irish cattle trade; large quantities of store cattle sent to the English market, *Belcher* 7333-7338, 7349-7354.

Large numbers of cattle exported into Liverpool from Ireland; excellent condition in which these cattle arrive, *Verdon* 7038-7039.—Increasing exportation of fat cattle from Ireland into Liverpool; purchases made in Dublin directly by Manchester dealers without the intervention of Liverpool salesmen, *ib.* 7030-7038, 7763-7769.

Monthly return of all animals imported from Great Britain in the years 1871 and 1872, *App.* 579.—Return showing the number and description of animals imported to and exported from Ireland in the month of May 1873, and the respective ports, *ib.* 590.

Summary of tabulated returns showing, according to the daily returns furnished to the Irish Veterinary Department by the Royal Irish Constabulary and Dublin Metropolitan Police, the number and description of animals imported into and exported from Ireland, during the month of June 1873, setting forth the Irish ports of disembarkation and embarkation, *App.* 590.

Number of cattle, sheep, and swine, exported from Ireland to Great Britain for the years 1869, 1870, 1871 and 1872, *App.* 618.

VII. *General Condition of Irish Cattle sent to England.*

Bad condition in which cattle arrive from Ireland, owing to insufficient food before starting, *Brown* 1423-1426.—Causes of the impoverished condition of some of the Irish store cattle which go to England, *Ferguson* 5342.—Large export trade in cattle from Ireland to England; moderate price and inferior quality of some of the supplies, *Murray* 5738-5746, 5807, 5808.—Belief that the poor cattle exhibited in the Yorkshire market come from Tyrone and Donegal, *Verdon* 7814-7817.

VIII. *Question of imposing Restrictions in the shape of Slaughtering, Detention, &c. at the Port of Arrival in England.*

Check to the import of disease from Ireland by strict regulations as to slaughtering; opinion that this would, however, practically stop the export of store animals to England, *Brown* 1422, 1423, 1428-1437.—Conclusion that nothing short of extreme restrictions

Report, 1873—continued.

IRELAND, AND IRISH CATTLE—continued.

VIII. *Question of imposing Restrictions, &c.—continued.*

in England would effectually prevent the import of disease from Ireland, *Brown* 2785-2790.

Proposition that Irish fat cattle, if diseased, should be slaughtered at the port of landing, and that Irish store cattle, when diseased, should be sent back to Ireland, *Simonds* 2985, 2990-2992, 3003, 3202-3214.—Proposed detention for six hours in the case of Irish cattle, *ib.* 2992, 2993.—Explanation that the proposed detention of Irish cattle for six hours is very different from quarantine, *ib.* 3455-3459.

Further statement in favour of sending back to Ireland any store stock found to be diseased or in contact with diseased animals, whilst diseased fat stock should be slaughtered at the port, *Simonds* 3474-3478, 3501-3518, 3530, 3531, 3583-3591.—Proposed detention of Irish cattle for six hours for the purpose of feeding and watering them as well as for inspecting, *ib.* 3503, 3504.

Strong objection to a proposal that Irish cattle discovered with disease in England should be sent back to Ireland, *Baldwin* 3834-3837.—Absence of check to foot and mouth disease by detaining for six hours the animals from Ireland, *Fisher* 5182, 5183.—Disposal of Irish cattle being quarantined, or of their export to England being otherwise unduly checked, the Irish supply being of great value to this country, *ib.* 5259-5264.

Suggestion for preventing the wilful export of diseased animals from Ireland to England, *Ferguson* 4943-4945.—Exceptions taken to the proposed detention of Irish cattle for six hours at the port of debarkation, *ib.* 5362, 5363, 5504.—Explanation that witness would not stop the export of a cargo of animals, one of which had been discovered to be diseased; undue interference with trade thereby, *ib.* 5403-5408.

Belief that any interference with the Irish cattle trade would directly affect the supply of meat to the large towns which are served by Liverpool; strong prejudice against Irish cattle entertained by some of the landowners, *Verdax* 7145-7153.—Contention that there should be no more restriction upon the importation of Irish cattle into England than detention for six hours and certificates of health from the port of embarkation, *Clarke* 8291-8294.

IX. *Expediency of similar Restrictions generally in Ireland as in England:*

Advocacy of similar legislation and similar restrictions, as far as possible, for Ireland and for England, *Withens* 1105, 1126-1137; *Simonds* 3208-3214.—Approval of Irish cattle being dealt with in the same way as English cattle if the restrictions in Ireland were the same as in England, *Simonds* 3508-3501, 3615-3626.—Contemplated adoption of the same stringent measures in Ireland as in England with regard to foot and mouth disease; otherwise Irish cattle should be treated in the same way as foreign cattle, *Stratton* 4564, 4565, 4633-4638, 4699-4710.

Similar restrictions desirable as regards both Irish and English cattle, on the score of transit, &c., *Fisher* 5259, 5260-5264.—Importance of uniformity in the regulations with regard to England and Ireland, *Jenkins* 6082-6087; *Wade* 8085, 8165, 8171; *Clarke* 8211, 8292; *Gowrie* 9489, 9490; *Milne* 12115, 12116.—Decided opinion that whatever restrictions are imposed, they should be applied equally to Ireland, as to England or Scotland, *Goodell* 12711-12714; *Walker* 12253-12258.

X. *Import of Foreign Cattle to Ireland:*

Suggestion that the import of foreign cattle into Ireland might be stopped altogether, the amount being trifling, *Ferguson* 5024.—Expediency of the same check in Ireland as in England upon the import of diseased foreign cattle; very small foreign import to Ireland, so that it might be prohibited altogether, *ib.* 5455-5460.—Absence of foreign importation into Ireland with the single exception of fat Spanish cattle, *Wade* 8085-8090.

Return of the number and description of foreign animals imported into Ireland during the years ended 31st December 1871 and 1872, specifying the ports from which imported, the names of the importing vessels, the number of animals which died on each voyage, the number certified by the Government inspector as being diseased, and the number to be slaughtered in the Custom House Docks previous to their delivery, *App.* 694.

XI. *Model Agricultural Schools:*

There are about 200 model schools throughout the country, *Baldwin* 3757, 3768.—Statement that there is an agricultural school under witness in every county in Ireland except Wexford, there being about 200 schools altogether, *ib.* 4342-4346.—Practice of witness as to visiting the schools, and as to attending fairs and markets, so that he is brought much in contact with the farming class, *ib.* 4347-4352.

XII. *Summary*

IRELAND, AND IRISH CATTLE—continued.

XII. *Sundry Details and Suggestions on various Points:*

More effective machinery in Ireland than in England for applying the regulations of the Central Department, *Williams* 1330, 1351—*Advantage* of cases of concealment of disease went before paid magistrates, *Baldwin* 3956, 3999—Very small movement of cattle in Ireland save in connection with fairs and markets, *ib.* 4353-4357—Necessity of the administration of the law being in the hands of experts rather than of magistrates, *ib.* 4481.

Opinion that Irish cattle are singularly healthy at the present time, *Verdon* 7094-7097—General incorrectness of certain statements made by Mr. Jenkins about Liverpool and the Irish cattle trade in his book, *ib.* 7171, 7172.

Statement that the crossing of Irish cattle with higher breeds has had the effect of weakening their constitutions, *Bolton* 7328, 7329, 7605, 7607—Inexpediency of leaving the repression of cattle diseases in the hands of the cattle dealers and the proprietors in Ireland, *ib.* 7569-7571.

Desirability of English graziers coming over to Ireland to make their own purchases instead of employing middlemen; opinion that such a course would prevent the importation of wretched cattle as at present, *Walsh* 8097-8101—Examination as to the present state of the cattle trade between England and Ireland, *ib.* 8172-8185.

Information as to the health of Irish cattle brought over to England; suggestions as to the means which should be adopted to insure their coming in a healthy state, *Rigby* 8797-8809, 8819-8825, 8910-8914—Irish cattle would increase in value if they could be brought into the country in as healthy a state as Welsh cattle, *ib.* 9027.

Augmentation of price which would follow on a feeling of confidence that Irish cattle were healthy, *Gardner* 11693-11699—Question considered as to the expediency of considering the import of Irish stock cattle into England, *ib.* 11723-11727.

Table showing the number of cattle, sheep, and swine in Ireland, in the years 1869, 1870, 1871, and 1872, *App.* 618.

XIII. *Returns and Statistics of Diseases:*

Return of all cases of pleuro-pneumonia, foot and mouth disease, sheep pox, and sheep scab, which were officially reported in the years 1871 and 1872 respectively, and showing the amount of fines levied in each year, *App.* 571.

Tabulated return containing sundry particulars relative to foot and mouth distemper, pleuro-pneumonia, and sheep scab, for each week from 16th November 1872 to 31st May 1873, *App.* 573.

General abstract showing the extent to which the foot and mouth distemper prevailed in each county in Ireland, together with other particulars during the year ended 31st December 1872, *App.* 610, 611.

Abstract showing the number of outbreaks of contagious or infectious diseases reported from each county in Ireland, in each month during the four years ended the 31st December 1872, *App.* 612-615.

Table showing the sanitary state of the cattle, sheep, and swine in each county in Ireland, in the years 1861, 1870, 1871, and 1872, *App.* 616, 617—Table showing the number of deaths from the foot and mouth disease, pleuro-pneumonia, and scab diseases in 1869-72, *ib.* 618—Per-centage of deaths as compared with the number of animals affected with foot and mouth, pleuro-pneumonia, and scab diseases, *ib.*

General abstract showing the extent to which pleuro-pneumonia prevailed in each county in Ireland, together with other particulars, during the year ended 31st December 1872, *App.* 619—Similar return as regards sheep scab, *ib.*

Table showing the number of farms, lands, premises, or places in each province in Ireland under restrictions at certain dates, on account of being infected with foot and mouth disease, pleuro-pneumonia, and sheep scab, during the year 1872, *App.* 621.

Table showing the number of outbreaks of foot and mouth distemper, pleuro-pneumonia, sheep scab and sheep pox, which occurred in Ireland in the years 1871 and 1872; distinguishing those cases which were reported by the owners of the infected place from those which were discovered by other means, *App.* 622, 623.

XIV. *Conclusions and Recommendations of the Committee:*

Considerable complaint made to the Committee as to the import of disease into England from Ireland, *Rep.* v.—Recommendation that the regulations in Great Britain and Ireland with regard to contagious diseases should be similar, *ib.*—Also that such regulations should be carefully enforced at the landing places both in England and Ireland, *ib.*—Also that the Irish Government should take steps, by inspection at Irish ports, to prevent the shipment to Great Britain of any diseased or infected animals, *ib.*

IRELAND, AND IRISH CATTLE—continued.

XIV. *Conclusions and Recommendations of the Committee*—continued.

Conclusion that the precautionary measures suggested would be of advantage not only to the English cattle buyers but also to the Irish cattle breeders. *Rep. vi.*

See also *Ballinasloe Fair. Bristol. Calves. Cattle Plague, 4. Cattle Ships, 2-4. Centralisation. Cheshire. Cruelty. Dead Meat. Dealers and Jobbers. Drogheda. Dublin. Fines and Penalties. Glasgow. Inspectors, 6, 7. Limerick. Liverpool. Longford. Railways. Royal Dublin Society. Sheep. Veterinary Departments, 2.*

Isolation (Diseased Animals). Importance of local arrangements for a real isolation; *Williams 950. 976*—Efficiency of isolation both for pleuro-pneumonia and foot and mouth disease, *ib. 415-417. 1138. 1146-1151*—Power of the local authority as to buying land for the isolation of cattle from the markets, *ib. 868. 869.*

Suggestions for amending the existing orders; expediency of an isolation of fourteen days in the case of all newly purchased stock, *Smith 10178-10184. 10298-10309.*

See also *Foot and Mouth Disease, VII. Movement of Cattle. Pleuro-pneumonia, 7.*

J.

Jenkins, Henry Michael. (Analysis of his Evidence.)—Has been Secretary for some years to the Royal Agricultural Society, *5835. 5836. 5914. 5919*—Instructions given by the society to witnesses with regard to inquiries as to foot and mouth disease; report on the subject sent in by witness, *5837-5842*—Views made to Irish fairs with a view to the inquiry; indifferent character of the isolation carried out at these fairs as to diseased animals, *5843-5847*—Statement that in Ireland the restrictions on paper were stringent as regards foot and mouth disease, but that in practice they were neglected, *5848-5859.*

Examination as to the restrictions which have been put into force in England with regard to foot and mouth disease; returns as to this disease not generally furnished by the counties, *5855-5859. 5895-5910*—Regulations necessary to be observed to prevent the spread of infectious diseases; great importance of a system of licensing and registration of cattle dealers and salesmen, *5861-5866. 5946-5951. 5980-5981. 6091-6094. 6097-6102. 6155-6157*—Necessity for a constant inspection by qualified officers of all premises in the neighbourhood of disease; expediency of employing the police upon this duty, *5867-5870.*

Doubtful propriety of giving the local authorities full power to carry out the regulations, *5871*—Opinion that the restrictions as regards movements which were adopted during the time of the cattle plague are too oppressive for the foot and mouth disease; reasons for this conclusion, *5873-5889*—Contention that the punishment for infringing the Order in Council as to moving cattle that are diseased should be made real instead of being nominal as it is now, *5890-5894. 6005.*

Information with regard to the progress of foot and mouth disease; considerable amount of this disease in Dutch cattle, *5899-5904. 5920-5923. 6008-6009. 6041. 6042. 6107. 6108. 6163-6173*—Impossibility of obtaining evidence of a trustworthy character with regard to pleuro-pneumonia from any person who is not a veterinary surgeon, *5913-5919.*

Unsatisfactory nature of the arrangements made for the cattle traffic between England and Ireland; likelihood in many cases of the animals taking the disease in the steamer, *5930-5943*—Information as to the state of the cattle vessels between England and the Continent; decided opinion that the cattle plague was imported into England by the cargo of the "Joseph Soames," *5949-5959. 6064-6069.*

Visit of witness to the Hull market; unsatisfactory state of the market on account of its area being ill-defined, *5958-5959. 6058. 6077*—Expediency of sub-division of lairs; belief that lairs are a fruitful source of disease, *5982-6004. 6103-6106*—Advisability of all diseased animals discovered at fairs being slaughtered, and the owners punished for sending them, *6003. 6004. 6083-6090. 6133-6135.*

Examination with regard to some alleged deaths from foot and mouth disease in Longford, as reported in the "Irish Farmers' Gazette"; comments upon the denial given to this report, *6008-6009*—Frequent instances of dealers purchasing diseased animals for the purpose of exporting them to England, *6007-6033*—Favourable opinion as to the management of the farms in Cheshire, *6034-6040.*

Frequent neglect upon the part of graziers in Ireland to report the existence of foot and mouth disease upon their farms; desirability of inflicting substantial fines for breaches of this regulation, *6043-6050*—Means by which foot and mouth disease is transmitted from Ireland to England, *6051-6058.*

Inexpediency of adopting restrictions in Ireland with regard to the suppression of foot and mouth disease, which would not be tolerated in England; opinion that the present rules

Report, 1873—continued.

Jenkins, Henry Michael. (Analysis of his Evidence)—continued.

rules of the Irish Department are sufficiently stringent, provided they are carried out 6057. 6078-6080—More harm than good resulting from the multiplicity of small fairs in the country, 6081-6083—Importance of uniformity in the regulations with regard to England and Ireland, 6084-6087.

Belief that respectable cattle dealers would not look upon the system of licensing as a stigma; opinion that the cost of a license should be about 1*l.*, 6091-6094—Statement that the order as to the disinfection of railway trucks is carried out by the largest companies in the most satisfactory manner, 6095, 6096.

Advisability of licenses being granted by the magistrate of the district in which the applicant resides; expediency of the drovers being also licensed, 6100-6102—Greater danger in the importation of store cattle into England from Ireland, than the sending of fat cattle into the Metropolitan Market, 6110-6114.

Differences in ventilation in the holds of vessels when at sea, and when coming up the Avon into Bristol; reasons for this, 6115-6122—Opinion that there is not the same danger of infection when the cattle are carried on deck as when they are placed in the ship's hold, 6123.

Filthy state of the cattle trucks upon the Irish railways; absence of any attempt to cleanse or disinfect them, 6124-6126—Satisfactory character of the lair in Dublin belonging to the London and North Western Railway Company, 6127, 6128—Opinion that the hosts are not so thoroughly disinfected as they ought to be, 6129.

Contention that an efficient system of inspection both at the shipping and landing ports would greatly tend to diminish the spread of infection, 6130-6132—Expediency of giving larger compensation in the case of compulsory slaughter, 6136-6140—Opinion that the foreign cattle trade will not develop itself much more than at present, 6141, 6142.

Information as to the average consumption of meat in England, 6143-6146—Desirability of the Veterinary Department undertaking experiments with regard to foot and mouth disease, 6147, 6148—Examination as to the estimated loss from the disease, 6149-6154—Decided opinion as to the necessity for uniform action on the part of the local authorities in England, 6181-6186.

Jenkins, Mr. Concurrence in the statements generally in the report of Mr. Jenkins, *Ferguson* 5543.

Exceptions taken to certain passages in report by Mr. Jenkins; inaccurate statements in the report, *Ferden* 7888 *et seq.*

Jobbers. See *Dealers and Jobbers.*

"*Joseph Seamer,*" *The.* See *Cattle Plague*, 2.

K.

Kinross-shire. Recommendation by the local authority for Kinross-shire, dated 5th May 1873, for the immediate slaughter of all animals affected with pleuro-pneumonia, *App.* 578.

L.

Lairs. Importance of sufficient lairage accommodation at the port of landing, and of facilities for slaughter and for burial of the carcasses; explanation as to existing regulations on these points, *Williams* 796-812—Statement that witness has not now any power to inspect private lairs, *Brown* 1873-1878—Advantage of a proper system of inspection at the private lairs or places where cattle are kept, *Id.* 2195-2201.

Objection to private lairs at the ports, it being expedient that proper lairs should be provided by the local authority, *Simonds* 3460-3462—The lairs should be approved by the central authority, *Id.* 3461, 3462—Expediency of sub-division of lairs; belief that lairs are a fruitful source of disease, *Jenkins* 5982-6004. 6103-6106.

Suggestions by the Committee for an extended inspection of lairs, *Rep.* vi.

See also *Dublin.* *Liverpool.*

Lambay Island. Indirect manner in which foot and mouth disease must have been conveyed into Lambay Island, *Green* 2799-2802—Information relative to the origin of an attack of foot and mouth disease in Lambay Island; also on some enclosed land to which outside cattle had no access, *Baldwin* 4497, 4498.

Lambert, Septimus, Jun. (Analysis of Evidence.)—Is a member of the firm of Septimus Lambert & Son, cattle salesmen of Manchester; is also a member of the Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons, both at London and Edinburgh, 13378-13387. 13615, 13616—Large experience of witness respecting Irish cattle, 13388, 13389—Farming operations extensively carried on by witness in the neighbourhood of Manchester; indubious cows and feeding stock kept by him, 13391-13394.

Opinion that the most stringent measures should be taken under the Act with reference to rinderpest, 13395-13397—Examination as to restrictions and regulations relating to foot and mouth disease; strong opinion that the only restriction necessary is the total cessation of movement of all live cattle, 13398-13405. 13415-13421. 13501-13507. 13559-13561. 13613-13617. 13675. 13684-13693.

Rapid recovery of milch cows from foot and mouth disease if left undisturbed and at rest, 13406-13410—Strong disapproval of the appointment of county police as inspectors; belief that the police act as central centres of infection, moving from one place to another, 13411-13413. 13698-13713.

Opinion that the restrictions under the Act have tended to propagate foot and mouth disease throughout the country, 13414—Inexpediency of permitting men or dogs to pass from field to field where there are diseased animals; infection undoubtedly conveyed by birds, hares, and other living animals, 13421-13424. 13621-13625. 13770-13772.

Existence of foot and mouth disease in the Liverpool Market, 13427-13438—Foreign cattle received in Salford Market from London; statement that the principal foreign import into Liverpool and Salford is sheep, entirely from the German ports, 13439-13449. 13475-13482. 13559-13567—Small quantity of dead meat sent from the ports to Manchester and Salford, 13450.

Decided opinion that the regulations regarding pleuro-pneumonia cannot be too stringent; necessity of slaughtering cattle immediately upon their showing the slightest signs of the disease, 13451, 13452. 13576-13583. 13729-13739. 13764-13769.

Expediency of giving compensation to the extent of two-thirds of the value in the case of compulsory slaughter; belief that without such compensation farmers will not report the existence of disease, 13453-13454—Use of the fumes of gas tar as a remedial measure in the case of pleuro-pneumonia; strong opinion as to the efficacy of this remedy, 13455-13463. 13569-13612. 13633-13655. 13787-13789.

Statement that the cattle supplied to the Salford Market about five-sixths are from Ireland in summer, and in winter about one-half, 13464, 13465—Regulations as to foot and mouth disease in cattle apply equally to sheep in the Salford Market, 13469, 13470—Inexpediency of including sheep scab in the Act, 13471-13474. 13495-13738-13740—Further information as to the supply of German sheep in Salford, 13482-13494.

Average numbers of cattle shown in the Salford Cattle Market, 13495-13499—Opinion that the statements with regard to the loss from foot and mouth disease are generally exaggerated, 13508-13512—Favourable opinion as to the management of the fairs in Ireland, 13513-13519—Incorrectness of statements that Ireland is the source of supply of foot and mouth disease to England, 13520-13523.

Capital accommodation for cattle on board the Irish steamers, 13524-13526—Decided opinion that if all foreign cattle be slaughtered at the ports it will entirely stop the foreign supply, 13527-13532. 13619-13637—Examination with regard to the enhanced price of meat of late years, and the probability of its further increasing, 13533-13539. 13544-13551. 13594-13603. 13638-13652. 13657-13667. 13749-13755. 13779-13795.

Injurious effect of the restrictions under the Act upon Liverpool, 13646-13648—Unsatisfactory nature of the proceedings taken by the local authority in Liverpool, 13652-13654. 13694-13697—Belief that no prejudice exists against Irish cattle on the part of the local authorities, 13664-13666—Unsatisfactory character of the Cheshire cattle fairs, 13667-13675. 13645-13647.

Indigenous character of foot and mouth disease; belief that, with the exception of cattle plague, few countries have specific diseases of their own, 13618-13620. 13668-13673. 13679-13683—Opinion that we shall never be rid of pleuro-pneumonia in this country, 13683—Expediency of foreign cattle being quarantined for twenty-four hours, and subjected to an examination by a veterinary inspector; necessity of slaughtering all cattle which come from countries where rinderpest is known to exist, 13722-13728.

Inexpediency of stopping the supply of calves to Ireland from England; reasons for this opinion, 13741-13744—Statement that the small cattle tradesmen in Liverpool have been exterminated by reason of the restrictions as regards foot and mouth disease, 13747, 13748—Purchases of cattle in London which are brought to the Salford Market, 13796-13799.

Lancashire. Information relative to the sources of supply of the Liverpool and Salford Markets; large supply of cattle from Ireland, and, in the Salford Market, of sheep from Germany, *Lambert* 13438-13449, 13475-13482, 13584-13597.—Small quantity of dead meat sent from the ports to Manchester and Salford, *ib.* 13459.—See also *Salford*.

Law Expenses (Veterinary Department). Information to be obtained from the Treasury as to the law expenses of witnesses' department; he cannot supply any particulars whatever, *Williams* 637-640.

Legal Proceedings. The tribunals before whom cases are brought are generally the magistrates in the towns and the justices of the peace in the country, *Walter* 12172-12175.

Legislation. Entire failure of legislation as regards the foot and mouth disease, *Simonds* 3183.—See also *Foot and Mouth Disease*. *Government Interference*.

Leinster. The fattening of Irish cattle is principally carried on in the province of Leinster, *Wolke* 8154-8157.

Lepper, George Andrew. (Analysis of his Evidence.)—Is a veterinary surgeon at Aylesbury, and has had considerable experience in cattle diseases, 10779, 10780, 10837-10839.—Information respecting an outbreak of foot and mouth disease in the district of Aylesbury in the year 1869; 10781-10789, 10849-10850.—Belief that the foot and mouth disease, and also pleuro-pneumonia, have been introduced into England from foreign countries, 10784, 10807, 10820-10825, 10841-10848.

Expediency of destroying all animals affected with pleuro-pneumonia, and in isolating the rest of the herd, 10792-10795, 10819.—Opinion that the employment of police as inspectors is an expense which leads to nothing, 10810-10814.—Contention that compensation to the full value of the animal slaughtered should be made to insure discovery of cases of disease, 10815-10818.

Desirability of slaughtering all foreign cattle at the port of landing, 10824, 10826, 10901.—Suggestions with a view to preventing the spread of foot and mouth disease, 10829 *et seq.*—Propriety of licensing cattle dealers after the same manner as horse dealers, 10831, 10863-10876, 10887.

Necessity of prohibiting the movement of store-cattle suffering from foot and mouth disease; expediency of slaughtering fat cattle without moving them, and sending the meat to London, 10835-10835, 10888-10900.—Suggestion that farmers be obliged to report every case of disease, and that in the absence of such report they should be fined heavily, 10835, 10877-10886.

Advisability of uniformity of action in imposing fines for violating the Act in driving animals suffering from disease over a highway, 10880, 10886.—Examination as to the course necessary to be followed in the case of importation of horses from districts which are infected with contagious diseases, 10905-10910.

Licenses (Cattle Dealers, &c.). Great difficulty in levying a license upon middlemen who trade in cattle for profit, *Williams* 573-576.—Great importance of a system of licensing and registration of cattle diseases and salesmen, in addition to other regulations, *Jenkins* 5861-5861, 5945-5951, 5950-5981, 6091-6094, 6097-6102, 6155-6157.—Belief that respectable cattle dealers would not look upon the system of licensing as a stigma; the cost of a license should be about 1*l.*, *ib.* 6091-6094.—Advisability of licenses being granted by the magistrates of the district in which the applicant resides; expediency of the drovers being also licensed, *ib.* 6100-6103.

Statement that a system of licensing cattle dealers would be ridiculous; reasons for this opinion, *Garnett* 6419, 6420, 6516-6530.—Inefficiency of a system of licensing or warranty for the prevention of disease, *Ganger* 9447.

See also *Dealers and Jobbers*.

Limerick. Instances of want of vigilance on the part of the police in permitting the removal of cattle affected with foot and mouth disease to the Limerick Market, *Bolster* 7305-7308, 7601-7604.—Mode of treatment of pleuro-pneumonia by the farmers in witness' district; sale of diseased animals to inferior butchers, *ib.* 7491-7505, 7579-7574.—Instance of an animal which would have died of pleuro-pneumonia being exhibited in a butcher's shop in Limerick, and marked "First Prize," *ib.* 7509, 7601-7603.

Resolution of the grand jury of the county of Limerick, condemning the present restrictions and Orders in Council relating to the foot and mouth disease; disengagement of witness with this resolution, *Bolster* 7556-7564, 7619.

Lincolnshire. Inconsiderable traffic in cattle between Lincolnshire and Yorkshire via Hull, *Roberts* 13304-13307.

Report, 1873—continued.

LIVERPOOL:

Absence of lairs at the landing place in Liverpool, there being, however, very good lairs at the railway station, *Brown* 1862-1872.—Practical obstacles at Liverpool to the provision of a suitable defined area, *ib.* 2213-2218.—Very good lairs of the London and North Western Railway Company at Liverpool, *ib.* 2840, 2850.

Satisfactory manner in which the cattle going from Drogheda to Liverpool are treated by the men in charge of them; rest of nine hours given to the cattle before being sent on by rail from Liverpool, *O'Neill* 6701-6707.—Approval of the manner in which store cattle are fed and watered before being put on the railway at Liverpool, *ib.* 6888, 6889, 6929-6943, 6987-6994.

Examination relative to the cattle trade of Liverpool; the estimated value of cattle imported into Liverpool in the year 1872 was over five millions sterling, *Verdon* 7187-7193, 7182-7190.—Public meetings held in Liverpool to protest against the Act of 1869, *ib.* 7188-7191.—Large amount of traffic diverted from Liverpool on account of the restrictions; statement hereon as to the difference between the regulations of the Liverpool Market and those of the Metropolitan Market, *ib.* 7689, 7753-7762, 8006-8014.—Bye-law of the Liverpool Market, which prohibits the exhibition for sale of any animal for state purposes, *ib.* 7706-7714, 8024-8028.

In frequent instances of foot and mouth disease in the parks at Liverpool, *Verdon* 7777-7782.—The cost of transit between Liverpool and London is 11s. per head, *ib.* 7850-7852.—Statement that all the trade at the present time is from London to the north; men-of-war in and about Liverpool are supplied with meat by London contractors, *ib.* 7855-7868.—Information as to the meat contractors for Government supplies at Liverpool, and the terms upon which they do business, *ib.* 7857-7863.

Statistics with reference to the increase of the Liverpool Market since the year 1831; returns of the number of animals slaughtered and consumed within nine miles of Liverpool in the year 1872, *Verdon* 7869-7877, 8005, 8006.—Further evidence in favour of the removal of the restrictions in Liverpool; large increase, however, in the business of witness and other salesmen since the restrictions were put in force, *ib.* 7878-7887, 7993-7996.—The importation of dead meat into Liverpool at the present time has almost ceased, *ib.* 8015, 8016.

Existence of foot and mouth disease in the Liverpool Market, *Lambert* 13427-13438.—Injurious effect of the restrictions under the Act of 1869 upon Liverpool, *ib.* 13540-13543.—Unsatisfactory nature of the proceedings taken by the local authority, *ib.* 13553-13564, 13694-13697.—Belief that no prejudice exists against Irish cattle on the part of the local authority, *ib.* 13564-13566.—The small cattle tradesmen in Liverpool have been exterminated by reason of the restrictions as regards foot and mouth disease, 13747, 13748.

Disapproval of the system of inspection at the Liverpool Market; conclusion that disease is largely spread thereby, *W. Brown* 13863-13876.—Opinion that the inspection at the Stanley Market has brought down the supply to nearly one-half what it was, *ib.* 13879-13876.

Return illustrative of the growth of the Liverpool cattle trade since 1831, *App.* 604.—Actual numbers of sea-borne cattle and sheep landed at Liverpool, and estimated number by railway, in each of the years 1869-72, *ib.*—Number of cattle, sheep, and hams slaughtered and consumed within nine miles of Liverpool Exchange in the year 1872, *ib.*—Number of cattle and sheep exhibited for sale at Stanley Market in each week during the years 1869, 1870, 1871, 1872, 1873, *ib.* 605.

Statement of amounts paid for construction of sheds, &c., and for rents in connection with the "Cattle Diseases (Animals) Act," *App.* 607.

Tabular return, containing particulars of the imports of cattle, sheep, and hams, for the year 1872, *App.* 608.

See also *Cattle Ships*, 2-4. *Foot and Mouth Disease*, III. *Inspection*, 9. *Prices*.

LOCAL AUTHORITIES:

1. *Action of the Local Authorities under the Act of 1869.*
2. *Expediency of a Reduction in the Number of Local Authorities, and of Uniformity of Action on their Part.*

1. *Action of the Local Authorities under the Act of 1869:*

Limited numbers of counties and boroughs which have applied the orders of the central department as to the slaughter of animals having pleuro-pneumonia, *Williams* 374-380, 389.—Statement as to the local demands on the department for the issue of stringent orders relative to the foot and mouth disease, and as to the action of the department, and of the local authorities in the matter, *ib.* 381-414.—Conclusion as to the necessity of the proposed restrictions being carried out and enforced by the central department, instead of being left to local authorities with different jurisdictions, *ib.* 420-456—

Report, 1873—continued.

LOCAL AUTHORITIES—continued.

1. *Action of the Local Authorities under the Act of 1869*—continued.

436.—Insufficient interest of the local authority in ports for the prevention of contagion, *Williams* 1228-1230.

Grounds for the conclusion that the local authorities have not used due diligence in the administration of the Act, *Brown* 2607-2651.—Comment upon the want of uniformity in the treatment of foot and mouth disease by the county and other local authorities, *Simonds* 935-936.—Drawback in England through the local authorities not acting in unison, *Ferguson* 468, 532, 535.—Illustrations of absence of uniformity between counties and boroughs, *Clarke* 8503-8506.

Names of the local authorities, who, in September 1869, applied for stringent regulations for foot and mouth disease, *App.* 580.—Names of the local authorities who in October, November, and December asked for modification or revocation of Order of 28th September 1869, *ib.*—Names of counties who applied the provisions of the Order in Council of 16th December 1869, *ib.*

Memoandum showing how many local authorities object to further restrictions in respect of foot and mouth disease, and how many asked for further restrictions, and also how many local authorities have made regulations under the Act and Orders, and how many, as far as is known, have made no regulations since 1st January 1872 to 1st August 1873, *inclusive*, *App.* 581.

Communications dated since 1st January 1872, objecting to present or further restrictions in respect to foot and mouth disease, received from local authorities and others, *App.* 581.—Memorandum of applications for more stringent regulations in respect of foot and mouth disease, received from local authorities since 1st January 1872, *ib.* 582.

2. *Expediency of a Reduction in the Number of Local Authorities, and of Uniformity of Action on their Part :*

Facility to the central department if there were only one local authority for each county, *Williams* 457-459, 924, 925.—There are 404 local authorities, *ib.* 553.—Increased benefit of the regulations of witness' department if they were properly carried out by the local authorities, *ib.* 985-992.

Improvement in several respects by reducing the number of local authorities in each county, *Brown* 2438-2441.—Expediency of efficient supervision of the local authorities by the Privy Council and the officers of the department, *ib.* 2457-2464.—Considerable advantage likely to arise from reducing the local authorities, and from preventing the present conflict of interest between the county and borough authorities, *Simonds* 3446-3454.

Expediency of uniform action in counties and boroughs; grounds for the conclusion that the latter should be under the control of the former, *Stratton* 4511-4523, 4531, 4532, 4730-4750.—Importance of compulsory action on the part of the local authorities, *Pieper* 5176, 5177.—Doubtful propriety of giving the local authorities full power to carry out the regulations, *Jenkins* 5871.—Decided opinion as to the necessity for uniform action on the part of the local authorities, *ib.* 6181-6183.

Necessity of uniformity in carrying out the Orders in Council, or the Act of 1869, with the view of stopping the spread of disease, *Clarke* 8341, 8342; *Highy* 8810-8818; *Walker* 12167-12169.—Expediency of the county board being constituted partly of justices of the peace, and partly of tenant farmers; opinion that this arrangement would give more confidence to the farmers, *Highy* 8934-8938, 8950-8954.—Desirability of there being but one county board for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the Cattle Diseases Act, *Duckham* 9521-9530, 9534.

Strong opinion in favour of uniformity of action in the different counties; desirability of an amalgamation of the local authorities of counties and towns, *Walker* 12153-12156, 12164-12167, 12263-12278.—Inexpediency of leaving much discretionary power with the local authority as to issuing regulations; opinion that the rules and regulations should be imperative throughout under Act of Parliament, *ib.* 12161-12163.

Conclusion of the Committee that the regulations with regard to the stoppage of disease should cease to be varying or permissive, and should be uniform throughout Great Britain, as they are in Ireland, *Rep.* v.

Instances of satisfactory amalgamation of the county and borough authorities in Scotland, *Rep.* v.—Conclusion that an amalgamation of local authorities, both in England and Scotland, is desirable, suggestion as to the mode of levying the expenses in such case, *ib.*

See also *Aberdeenshire*, *Cattle Plague*, 3, *Clarke*, *Forfarshire*, *Herefordshire*, *Highland, &c. Society*, *Hull*, *Inspection*, *Isolation*, *Movement of Cattle*, *Police*, *Slaughter (Diseased Animals)*, *Wiltshire*, *Yorkshire*.

Report, 1873—continued.

London, Port of. Satisfactory practice in landing cattle and pigs in the Port of London; *Brown* 1626.—Very large per-centage of the foreign cattle which come to the Port of London, &c. 2174-2176.

Communications of witness with the Government respecting the offer of a wharf for a market, and for the slaughter of foreign cattle upon their debarkation in the Port of London, *Odums* 9935-9942.—Complaints as to the treatment which witness has received at the hands of Government; large sum of money expended when the market was abandoned, &c. 9943-9947.—Excellent working and condition of this market up to the time of its abandonment, &c. 9948-9953.—Information as to the manner in which the dead meat was transported inland from the market; the cost of the carriage of dead meat would be less than the carriage of the live animal, &c. 9954-9973-9998-9994. 10042-10046. 10134-10140. 10144-10149.

See also Deptford Market.

Longford. Examination with regard to some deaths from foot and mouth disease in Longford as reported in the "Irish Farmers' Gazette"; exceptions taken to the denial given to this report, *Jeakins* 6008-6036.

Inaccuracy of the statements in Mr. Jeakins' report as to Mr. Russell's cattle; letter from Mr. Russell on this subject, *Verdon* 7954-7958.

Loss from Disease. Reference to certain statistics as to the immense losses from contagious diseases from 1842 to 1847, *Willmer* 2114-2118.—Reference to an Official Paper as showing that from 1842 to 1867, the losses from imported disease were about three-fifths of the cattle imported; the losses, except from cattle plague, were about one per cent. of the whole stock in the country, *Brown* 2177-2181. 2185, 2186.—Exceptions taken to certain calculations by Professor Gamgee, as to the loss from disease in different years in proportion to the import, &c. 2182-2184.

Conclusion that the agriculturists have not recouped themselves in the increased price of milk and meat for the loss sustained by cattle disease; loss also to the public in being supplied with bad milk and bad meat, *Baldwin* 4138-4140.—Serious after loss in the shape of grass, &c., after an attack of cattle plague, or of foot and mouth disease, *Fisher* 5097-5099. 5256-5258.

See also Cattle Insurance Company. Cheshire. Foot and Mouth Disease. Ireland, &c. I. B. II. III. Mortality from Disease.

M.

McBride, John Adam. (Analysis of his Evidence.)—Is Professor of Veterinary Medicine at the Royal Agricultural College at Cirencester; has also been an inspector at Glasgow, 9028-9036.—Inefficiency of inspection in preventing the introduction of contagious and infectious diseases into the country, 9033-9035-9048. 9145-9162. 9253-9258.—Periods of incubation of cattle plague, sheep-pox, pleuro-pneumonia, and foot and mouth disease, 9036-9042.

Decided opinion that all cattle which are herded with diseased cattle should be slaughtered; expediency of giving the power of slaughtering to the Privy Council, 9043-9047.—Advisability of slaughtering flocks that are infected with sheep-pox; inefficiency of inoculation as a preventive of sheep-pox, 9048, 9049. 9163-9165. 9204-9210.

Statement that in country districts animals attacked with pleuro-pneumonia, and those in contact with them, should be at once slaughtered; difficulties as to the course to be taken with regard to animals in town dairies, 9050-9055. 9060. 9111-9113. 9141.—Expediency of instituting a system of experiments with regard to inoculation; propriety of the Privy Council conducting those experiments, 9050. 9055-9059. 9140. 9230-9241. 9259-9266. 9269. 9270.

Examination as to the damage which cattle sustain from the foot and mouth disease; contention that if foreign importation be completely stopped this disease will of necessity die out, 9060-9075. 9102-9104. 9142-9144. 9167. 9215-9218. 9271-9276.—Absolute certainty that foot and mouth and all other contagious diseases have been imported from foreign countries, 9076, 9077. 9144. 9165-9191.

Expediency of slaughtering all foreign fat stock immediately upon landing; belief that the consumers would be benefited rather than injured by such means, 9078-9089.—Material effect upon the price of meat occasioned by the prevalence of disease, 9091, 9092.—Opinion that a satisfactory system of quarantine is altogether impracticable, 9093-9101. 9192-9195.

Unsatisfactory state of markets and railway trucks as regards the means taken for disinfection; expediency of appointing a Government inspector to see to this matter, 9105-9110.—Desirability, in the case of slaughter, of giving full compensation for healthy

Report, 1873—continued.

McBride, John Adam. (Analysis of his Evidence)—continued.

healthy and half compensation for diseased animals; contention that an arrangement of this character would induce farmers to report all cases of disease, 9114, 9115, 9228-9238.

Evils of town dairies as centres for the propagation of pleuro-pneumonia, 9216-9219—Great sufferings of cattle from want of ventilation in coming from Ireland, 9120-9128—Opinion that pleuro-pneumonia can only be conveyed by the breath of an animal; impossibility of the spontaneous generation of the disease, 9129-9132, 9288-9290—Absence of fresh information as regards cattle diseases during the last ten years, 9133-9135.

Belief that animals which have recovered from the foot and mouth disease will carry the contagion with them for a considerable time, 9137-9139—Argument that if the disease is eradicated from England it will die out in Ireland, which is a naturally healthy country, 9198-9203, 9211-9214.

Decided approval of making it penal to expose, or move an animal that is affected with foot and mouth disease; expediency of the local authorities continuing to have the power to seize and kill such cattle, 9219-9227—Possible use of inspection at the port of embarkation in order to prevent the shipment of diseased animals, 9242-9247.

Further statement that slaughtering foreign cattle at the port of landing would be beneficial to the public, 9248-9253, 9390-9393—Opinion that veterinary surgeons are decidedly useful in preventing loss to stock owners, 9277-9287—Evidence in further support of the erection of a permanent barrier to the importation of foreign cattle into England, with the exception of those from Spain and Portugal, 9288-9295.

Information as to the opportunities which witness has possessed of acquiring practical knowledge as regards the diseases of animals, 9317-9347—Further statements as to the small progress made in the last ten years as regards the knowledge of contagious diseases of cattle; this state of things is mainly owing to the absence of Government assistance, 9343-9354.

Additional examination as to the spread of foot and mouth disease in certain counties in England, 9350-9377—Information as to diseases which are indigenous to English cattle, 9378-9389—Evidence in further support of the statement that Irish cattle are the healthiest that are brought to England, 9374-9395.

Magistrates. See *Fines and Penalties.*

Markets. See *Fairs and Markets.*

Meat (Diseased Animals). Impression that the foot and mouth disease does not render the meat unfit for food, *Williams* 1159—Immense quantity of cattle consumed who have had foot and mouth disease, there being no reason to believe that the meat is unfit for food, *Brown*, 1814—Absence in witnesses' experience, of any case of human disease from eating diseased meat, *ib.* 2255, 2256.

Belief that the flesh of animals affected with pleuro-pneumonia is not unwholesome; many thousands have been eaten, *Sinclair* 3024—Expediency of prohibiting the sale for food of any animal which has had the cattle plague, *ib.* 3071—Approval of the meat being used of animals slaughtered as being headed with others which have cattle plague; necessity, however, of careful precautions, *ib.* 3222, 3223.

Increased facilities desirable as regards the slaughter and sale for food of animals in the earlier stages of pleuro-pneumonia; undue restrictions at present under the Sanitary Act, *Ferguson* 5434-5442—Opinion that foot and mouth disease has no effect upon the quality of the animal when slaughtered, *Bolster* 7327.

Impropriety of permitting the sale of diseased cattle at any stage for human food; argument in favour of this opinion strengthened by the practices of the Jews since the time of Moses, *Gosger* 9434, 9483, 9484, 9651, 9652—Injury to the human subject arising from the consumption of diseased meat, *ib.* 9681.

Considerable amount of diseased meat prepared for sale by slunk butchers; punishment of these persons when detected, *Smith* 10228, 10298, 10309, 10365-10370.

Meat Supply. Excellent quality of the meat of foreign fat stock; belief that foreign cattle are bought by all the butchers in London, with a few exceptions, *Brown* 2165-2173—Information as to the average consumption of meat in England, *Jenkins* 6143-6146—Examination as to the meat supply of the country; contention that the repression of contagious diseases among home stock is the easiest way to add to that supply, *Clarke* 8574-8581, 8592-8647, 8702-8718, 8734-8743—The amount of animal food consumed in England per year is about six-and-a-half stone weight per head, *ib.* 8657.

Estimates of the annual home production of meat, *App.* 629-632—Table showing the number of cows and heifers and the number annually drafted for meat, *ib.* 629—Table showing the number of calves dropped per year and the number probably killed for veal, *ib.* 630—Table showing the number of cattle at different ages probably

Report, 1873—continued.

Meat Supply—continued.

killed for beef, *App.* 631.—Table showing the number and dead weight of cattle, calves, sheep, lambs, and pigs probably killed for meat, *ib.* 631.

Total estimated meat supply, and relative proportion furnished by home and by foreign animals, *App.* 633.

See also *Dead Meat. Foreign Cattle. Prices.*

Meath County. Merely nominal fines imposed by the magistrates in Meath for the concealment of disease, *Ferguson* 4896-4899.

Metropolis. Advantage of a cordon round the metropolis as a means towards subduing pleuro-pneumonia in the country; great opposition apprehended, *Brown* 1480-1485.—Very indifferent condition of the lanes and landing places round London, *Baldwin* 4097-4103.—Statement that the Metropolitan Market has been of late comparatively free from foot and mouth disease; opinion that where the disease has appeared in the market it has developed itself after the animals left the *waterside*, *Devonfield* 11081-11096.

See also *Dairies. Deptford Market.*

Metropolitan Cattle Market. Way in which disease is spread from the Metropolitan Market, *Brown* 2830, 2831.

Discovery by witness upon the 10th June 1872, of upwards of thirty animals in the market suffering from foot and mouth disease; all those cattle were newly imported, *Webb* 14008-14033, 14065-14070.—Unsatisfactory result of examination by Mr. Rayment, the inspector, into these cases, *ib.* 14022-14027, 14048-14064, 14078-14085.—Discovery also by witness of foreign sheep affected with scab, *ib.* 14034-14042.

Examination with reference to the visits paid to the market by Mr. Webb in June 1872; statement that witness failed to detect foot and mouth disease in the animals pointed out by Mr. Webb, *Rayment* 14164 14183, 14192-14198.—Detection of foot and mouth disease in the market in the autumn of 1871, *ib.* 14184-14191.

Statement of the amount of tolls, dues, and payments, received at the Metropolitan Cattle Market during the years 1871 and 1872, *App.* 579.

Mid-Lothian. Explanation of the views of the local authorities on the subject of dealing with cattle diseases, *Walker* 12152 *et seq.*

Milk and Milk Cows (Foot and Mouth Disease). Inquiry made into the question of children catching the foot and mouth disease from drinking the milk of diseased cows; this has not been proved, *Brown* 1815, 1821.—Instances of the disease having affected cows' udders, *ib.* 1904-1907.

See also *Dairies. Foot and Mouth Disease.*

Milne, Andrew. (Analysis of his Evidence.)—Is a farmer in Forfarshire, 11983, 12065, 12096.—Expediency of uniformity of action throughout the whole country in carrying out the provisions of the Contagious Diseases Act; power should be given to the Privy Council to enforce obedience to the orders, 11984-11992, 12109.—Considerable attention paid by witness to the question of transit of cattle by rail; conclusion as to the great hardships suffered by cattle when travelling by railway, 11984, 11985, 12006-12028, 12081, 12086, 12119, 12120, 12137-12145.

Decided opinion that the cheapest and most efficient system of getting rid of pleuro-pneumonia is to slaughter all animals infected, and also those that had been in contact with them, 11993-11995, 12097-12118.—Approval of an isolation for three months of herds where pleuro-pneumonia had existed, 11996, 11997.—Statement that the orders for the purpose of stopping the foot and mouth disease are not carried out in Forfarshire with sufficient stringency; opinion that these orders should be rigidly enforced, 11998-12005.

Preparation by witness of two models of improved railway trucks; explanation of their construction, 12049, 12058, 12080, 12092-12094, 12131-12136.—Calculation as to the cost of converting the existing trucks as proposed by witness; willingness to pay an increased rate to the railway companies for the use of improved trucks, 12055, 12069-12079, 12121-12124, 12130, 12136.

Paramount objection in the present trucks is that there is no provision for feeding and watering upon the journey; great privations suffered by cattle upon long journeys for the want of water, 12080, 12081.—Obviation of all the hardships suffered by cattle in the existing trucks by the adoption of the trucks submitted by witness, 12087-12090.

Opinion that it would not be difficult to draw up regulations with regard to the slaughter of animals that have been in contact with others suffering from pleuro-pneumonia; belief that we shall never get rid of the disease by the machinery at present in operation, 12108-12110.—Necessity of enforcing in Ireland the same regulations as in Great Britain with regard to cattle disease, 12115, 12116.

Opinion that the farmers in Scotland would willingly submit to any regulations that

were

Miles, Andrew. (Analysis of his Evidence)—continued.

were made for the stamping out of pleuro-pneumonia and foot and mouth disease, 12118. 12125, 12129.—Expediency of giving compensation to the extent of three-fourths of the value for compulsory slaughter, 12126-12128.

Monmouthshire. Recommendations and suggestions agreed to at a meeting of the local authority for the county of Monmouth, held on the 9th May 1873, App. 578, 579.

Morres, Robert. (Analysis of his Evidence).—Long and extensive experience of witness, as a farmer and grazier, and as a cattle exporter, in the County Down; he has been selected to represent the interests of the north of Ireland before the Committee, 5578-5579, 5665-5668.—Export by witness of about 2,000 cattle to Glasgow and other places in the last six years; in only one lot of this large supply was there foot and mouth disease, 5574-5578.—Conveyance of witness' cattle from Belfast to Glasgow chiefly on deck; arrangement of this arrangement, 5579-5580.

Particulars as to an outbreak of foot and mouth disease among some cattle sent by witness to Falkirk; this was on the fourth day after their departure from Ireland, and there was then no disease among them, 5581, 5592. 5630-5632.—Instances of disease having broken out among Irish cattle in Scotland, through infection in the railway trucks or in the markets, 5593-5595.—Suggestion that there be a proper inspection of Irish cattle at the port of shipment, and that any having disease be sent back to their owners or to the farms whence they came, 5595, 5597. 5632-5646. 5733-5735. 5774-5809-5811.

Statistics as to the large export of cattle, &c., from Belfast to England and Scotland; the large majority are store stock, 5598-5602.—Discovery by witness of an outbreak of foot and mouth disease in his stock in 1843; doubt as to its origin, 5603, 5604. 5648-5650.—Very small mortality from the disease, 5605.—Calculations as to the deterioration in value through the disease, 5606-5609.—Instances of cows aborting as an effect of the disease, 5610.—Occurrence of three cases of pleuro-pneumonia among witness' stock in 1845; steps taken for preventing the spread of the outbreak, 5611-5613. 5651, 5652.

Instances of cattle plague in 1665 among some stock of witness' which he had sent to Scotland, 5615-5621.—Outbreak of foot and mouth disease among some sheep purchased by witness at Falkirk in October 1872; 5622-5624.—Doubt as to horses and rabbits propagating this disease, 5625-5627.—Belief that there was less disease in 1872 than in 1871; exemption of witness' cattle from the disease in 1872, and down to the present time, 5628, 5629. 5631-5634.—Opinion that more noise is made about the disease than is necessary, and that the disease will gradually die out again, 5646, 5647. 5768-5770. 5816, 5817. 5826.

Decided objection to Professor Balgair's proposal for stopping all movement of cattle, and all fairs and markets, in June and July, as a means of getting rid of foot and mouth disease; widespread opposition expected, 5653-5663. 5665-5677. 5695-5701.—Personal experience of witness as to foot and mouth disease since 1843; care taken by him in his purchases so that he has been fortunate, 5680-5687.—Reduction of price to be required by witness if he were to buy animals with the disease, 5688-5691.—Approval of the present restrictions, though witness is strongly opposed to any increase thereof, 5692-5694. 5768-5780. 5820-5828. 5829, 5830.—Way in which witness would deal with cases of pleuro-pneumonia in fat stock and store stock respectively, 5702-5707.

Statement of the arrangements for the conveyance of witness' cattle from Ireland to Scotland; they are fed and watered before they leave, 5708-5714. 5812-5815.—Belief that disease is not caught on board the boats from Belfast; excellence of the arrangements in these vessels, 5717. 5758-5767.—Opinion as to witness' sheep having suffered from an attack of foot and mouth disease, 5725-5729. 5798-5803.—Information relative to the parks or pasture fields near Falkirk, and other farms or markets to which cattle are sent, before going into the markets; liability to the spread of disease in these places, 5737. 5747-5754.

Large export trade in cattle from Ireland to England; moderate price and inferior quality of some of the supplies, 5738-5745. 5827, 5828.—Convenience to farmers in Ireland in having fairs near their farms, 5755.—Expediency of the railway trucks being as well cleaned in Ireland as they are in Scotland, 5756, 5757. 5771, 5772. 5804, 5805, 5822, 5823.—Opinion that half value or compensation should be given when an animal suffering from pleuro-pneumonia is slaughtered, and that full value should be given for any animals slaughtered which have only been in contact with the disease, 5781-5790.

Less pleuro-pneumonia in the rural districts than in the town dairies, 5791, 5792.—Relative effect of sheep rot and of foot and mouth disease in the case of witness' sheep, 5798-5803. 5827, 5828.—Statement as to witness having kept fewer cattle of late years and more sheep, the latter paying pretty well, 5793-5797.—Very good cattle sent from

Morrow, Robert. (Analysis of his Evidence)—continued.

the County Down to Carlisle, 5818, 5819.—Witness repeats that he would maintain the present restrictions generally in Ireland, but would not increase them, 5820-5830.

Mortality from Disease. Absence of any statistics at the command of Professor Brown and witness in estimating at about one per cent. the losses from imported disease between July 1841 and December 1867, *Simonds* 3175-3177.

See also *Cattle Plague.* *Foot and Mouth Disease, IV.* *Pigs.* *Pleuro-pneumonia, 5.*

MOVEMENT OF CATTLE:

1. *Generally as to the Restrictions to be applied to Movement when Disease breaks out.*
2. *Foot and Mouth Disease.*
3. *Pleuro-pneumonia.*

1. *Generally as to the Restrictions to be applied to Movement when Disease breaks out:*

Importance of the movement of cattle being at once stopped in any district or infected place, where an infectious or contagious disease is discovered, *Williams* 370. 418, 419.—Evidence in support of the proposal for preventing transit in places declared to be infected, and for applying a system of licenses, through Government inspectors, before movement is allowed, *ib.* 418-436.

Further suggestions relative to the issue of licenses by the inspectors before removal from districts declared to be infected, *Williams* 835-838. 977-984.—Less strict regulations proposed as to licenses than when the cattle plague was in the country, *ib.* 835-838.—Importance further attached to the non-removal from "infected places," without a license; this should apply to Ireland as well as to England, *ib.* 1129-1137.

Proposition that no person should move cattle from any farm without signing a declaration that they had not been in contact with disease; expected willingness of farmers to comply with this regulation, *Fisher* 5156-5166. 5181. 5231-5242. 5250-5255.—Inefficiency of any system of inspection either at fairs or at ports of shipment; contention that issuing certificates to enable cattle to be moved, would altogether prevent diseased cattle being sent from farms, *Garnett* 6405-6407. 6421-6426. 6441-6450. 6516-6530.

Satisfactory manner in which the movement of cattle by certificate was carried out in Cheshire; circumstances in which the certificate might be made use of generally in the future, *Bigby* 8946-8959.—Strong opinion against permitting the movement of cattle from any farm where disease exists, *Goodlet* 11621, 11622. 11680-11688.—Means to be adopted for the prevention of movement of diseased animals upon public roads, *Stewart* 11878-11881.

2. *Foot and Mouth Disease:*

Opinion that it would be useless to stop movement merely for six weeks, in the case of foot and mouth disease, *Brown* 1456, 1457.—Approval of continued prohibition upon the movement of animals actually infected with the disease, check being still applied also as regards foreign supply, *ib.* 2261. 2264-2266.—Expediency of preventing the movement from one part of a farm to another across a road, of an animal under an attack of foot and mouth disease, *ib.* 2886-2888.

Evidence to the effect that witness disapproves of the prohibition of removal, and that even with extreme and stringent regulations, foot and mouth disease would not be exterminated, and would again break out; nor would the farmers tolerate extreme measures on the subject, *Simonds* 2955-2977.—Opinion that animals under the disease should be removable from one farm to the slaughterhouse, or from one part of a farm to another part; slight risk run, *ib.* 2979-2983. 3001. 3140. 3529. 3582.

Examination, in dissent from the view that much danger would arise from the movement of cattle affected with foot and mouth disease along a public highway to a slaughterhouse, *Simonds* 3383-3389.—Reasons for the removal of existing restrictions, notwithstanding the infectious nature of the disease, *ib.* 3576-3581.

Evidence, in detail, in favour of stopping all movement of cattle, and all fairs and markets in Ireland, for a period of two months, as a means of stamping out foot and mouth disease, *Baldwin* 3801 *et seq.*—Very limited extent to which infection might still be conveyed by running water, all movement of cattle being prohibited, *ib.* 4443-4446.—Evidence in favour of the stoppage for a time of all movement of cattle as a means of suppressing the foot and mouth disease; witness would prefer that this prohibition lasted for a whole summer, but the agricultural community generally would probably not concur therein, *Stratton* 4517-4520. 4581-4593. 4622-4629. 4680-4685. 4711-4721.

Difficulty in fixing a time which would suffice, by stopping all movement of cattle, for stamping out the foot and mouth disease, *Ferguson* 4931-4934. 4997-5002.—Prohibition

MOVEMENT OF CATTLE—continued.

2. Foot and Mouth Disease—continued.

tion at the present time in Ireland upon the movement of any animal affected with foot and mouth disease, *Ferguson* 4935.

Opinion that the restrictions as regards movement which were adopted during the time of the cattle plague are too oppressive for the foot and mouth disease; reasons for this conclusion, *Jenkins* 5872-5889—Injurious effect of movement upon cattle when suffering from foot and mouth disease; inference: therefore that no rational man would expose an animal so affected in a store market, *Fordos* 7081, 7117, 7118.

Inappropriety of moving cattle that are suffering from foot and mouth disease any considerable distance, *Wells* 8071, 8073, 8091-8098, 8103-8109, 8127-8131, 8139-8151—Opinion that the stoppage of the movement of cattle for two months, in June and July, would produce a marked recession of the foot and mouth disease, *Clarke* 8222-8224, 8317-8323—Additional explanation as to the selection of the months of June and July for prohibiting of movements of cattle, *ib.* 8473-8476.

Decided approval of making it penal to expose, or move an animal that is affected with foot and mouth disease; expediency moreover of the local authorities continuing to have the power to seize and kill such animals, *McBride* 9219-9227—Necessity of prohibiting the movement of store cattle suffering from foot and mouth disease; expediency of slaughtering fat cattle without moving them, and sending the meat to London, *Lepper* 10833-10835, 10888-10900.

Decided opinion that foot and mouth disease can be exterminated in this country by the adoption of stringent regulations for stopping the movement of diseased animals, *Dewchfield* 10988, 10989—Concurrence in the view as to the efficiency of a stoppage of movement, *Wulfer* 12207-12209, 12218-12231; *Lambert* 13398-13405, 13415-13421, 13501-13507, 13604-13609.

3. Pleuro-pneumonia.

Explanation in connection with the proposal for stopping all movement out of an infected place for thirty days after the last case of outbreak of pleuro-pneumonia; careful supervision required, *Brown* 2411-2424—Suggested requirement of a certificate in the event of movement within two months after the prohibited interval of thirty days in the case of pleuro-pneumonia, *ib.* 2412-2415.

Approval of the removal for a distance of animals which have been exposed to pleuro-pneumonia; that in, under careful restrictions, *Stewart* 3341-3346—Means of stopping the spread of pleuro-pneumonia by complete isolation and by the prevention of movement, *Ferguson* 4953, 4954.

Expediency of giving the farmers more liberty to remove their cattle, when afflicted with pleuro-pneumonia, to fat markets for the purposes of sale and slaughter, *Stewart* 11779-11793.

See also *Fairs and Markets*. *Fines and Penalties*. *Foot and Mouth Disease*, VII., IX. *Ireland*, &c., I., 5, 6.

Murray, Herbert. (Analysis of his Evidence.)—Holds the office of Treasury Remembrancer in Ireland, 12451-12455—Examination with reference to the position held, and the pay received, by Professor Ferguson; staff of clerks assisting this officer, 12456-12485, 12511-12531, 12545-12549, 12560-12575.

Comparison between the cost of the Veterinary Departments in Ireland and in England; large amount of the work of the department transacted by the Irish constabulary, 12486-12491, 12532-12539—Economy resulting from the employment of police clerks; opinion that the present staff of clerks is sufficient to carry on the duties of the department, 12490, 12491.

The only alteration necessary in the Irish Veterinary Department is the addition of one clerk, and one or two more holidays, 12492, 12493—Inspection of animals embarking for England is paid for from the Irish local rate; statement that this charge is unjust, 12494-12497—Contention that the expenses of this inspection should be paid from public money, as the inspection is in the English interest, 12498, 12499.

Explanation with regard to the Irish local rate; considerable amount of money repaid to the counties upon the breaking up of the Veterinary Department, 12500-12503, 12559—Further examination as to the propriety of the payment for inspection at the Irish ports being made out of Imperial funds, 12504-12510.

Possibility of the difference between the amount expended on the English and on the Irish Veterinary Departments being considered as an Irish grievance, 12540-12545—Statement that in respect to the cattle trade England may be considered the buyer and Ireland the seller, 12550-12555, 12576-12580—Additional pay not received by the constabulary for the duties performed by them under the Veterinary Department, 12556-12558.

Report, 1873—continued.

N.

New South Wales. Peculiar circumstances under which the foot and mouth disease was conveyed to New South Wales by some cattle from England, *Resolves* 3929-3933, 3497, 3498.

Norfolk. Liability to a large proportion of diseases in Norfolk, the stock being chiefly purchased and not bred at home, *Baldwin* 4060, 4061.

Information relative to the working of the Contagious Diseases Act in Norfolk; when the Act was passed in 1869 there was no local authority in the county, *Read* 14088-14096—Memorial sent by the County to the Privy Council with regard to the orders relative to foot and mouth disease; powers given to the local authorities to issue orders for their district, *ib.* 14097-14105—Order issued by the local authority with reference to pleuro-pneumonia, by which a license was required for the removal of animals, *ib.* 14106, 14107—Examination as to the detail of regulations and restrictions with regard to pleuro-pneumonia; statistics of this disease in Norfolk, *ib.* 14108-14110, 14181-14135, 14141-14148.

Statement as to the number of prosecutions in the county since the passing of the Act; expediency of power being given to imprison in default of payment of penalties, *Read* 14111, 14112, 14149, 14150—The inspectors for the county are all veterinary surgeons; assistance afforded to the inspectors by the police, *ib.* 14113-14117—Increase of foot and mouth disease during last year, *ib.* 14119, 14120—Statistics of the Norfolk Farmers Live Stock Insurance Company, *ib.* 14136-14141—Statement as to the means of giving compensation in the county for compulsory slaughter, *ib.* 14157-14160.

Northumberland. Report of the Cattle Diseases Committee of the Northumberland adjourned sessions, dated 31st May 1873; recommendations therein with reference to foot and mouth disease, *App.* 596, 597.

O.

Odams, James. (Analysis of his Evidence.)—Considerable experience of witness in the landing of foreign cattle, 9935—Communications of witness with Government respecting the offer of a wharf for a market and for the slaughter of foreign cattle upon their debarkation in the port of London, 9935-9949—Complaints as to the treatment which witness has received at the hands of the Government; large sums of money expended when the market was abandoned, 9943-9947.

Excellent working condition of the market up to the time of its abandonment, 9948-9953—Information as to the manner in which the dead meat was transported inland from the market; cost of the carriage of dead meat would be less than the carriage of the live animal, 9954-9973, 9992-9994, 10042-10046, 10134-10140, 10144-10149.

Opinion that a great deal of pleuro-pneumonia has been introduced into this country by means of Dutch cattle; considerable falling off in the purchase of these cattle for that reason, 9973-9980, 10033-10041—Explanation that foot and mouth disease is nothing more than fever brought on by privation, 9981.

Contradiction of the statement that foot and mouth disease does not exist in Spain and Portugal; instance of the importation of 100 Spanish cattle, some of which were suffering with that disease, 9982-9991—Wretched condition in which some Dutch cattle were landed at Harwich; inference therefrom, that there was a scarcity of provender in Holland, 9995-10000.

Expediency of abolishing private slaughter-houses in London, 10001—Desirability of turning the whole of the foreign trade into a dead meat trade; great loss resulting from the transit of live cattle from the ports of landing to their destination, 10002, 10083.

Examination as to the evils attendant on transit of cattle by sea; prevention of foot and mouth disease to a great extent by proper treatment on board vessels and when being conveyed by railway, 10003-10023, 10031-10036, 10047-10049, 10080-10086, 10141-10143.

Statement that fat cattle coming from Aberdeen lose in weight one stone per day by railway transit, 10018—Disapproval of the import of foreign live cattle under the existing conditions, 10030, 10033, 10034-10037—Impossibility of this country enforcing proper conditions as to the import of foreign cattle at the port of embarkation, 10035, 10036.

Decided opinion that cattle which are imported should be conveyed on the decks of vessels, and not in the holds, 10047-10049—Cleanliness of the cattle ships between Waterford and Bristol, 10049—Personal experience of witness as regards the disease incident

Report, 1873—continued.

Odawa, James. (Analysis of his Evidence)—continued.

incident to Irish cattle; probability of their being free from disease when shipped, but inflammation follows from their being jammed together in transit, 10050-10059.

Suggestions as to the best means for preventing the spread of foot and mouth disease; expediency of the Government organising a system by which the privations of cattle when imported should be materially lessened, 10066-10080.—Enormous losses sustained in Holland by the prevalence of pleuro-pneumonia, 10081.

Contention that the slaughter of foreign cattle at the port of debarkation would have no effect in raising the price of meat; belief that we never should have had the present enormous price if we had adopted that system years ago, 10083-10094. 10096, 10097.—Grounds for the opinion that slaughter at the waterside on arrival, would have no effect in deterring foreign stock-keepers from sending over their cattle, 10085, 10086, 10095, 10098-10108.

Conclusion that compulsory slaughter of foreign cattle prevents the dissemination of disease; argument therefrom that prices are greatly enhanced by sending live animals through the country, 10100-10108.—Generally healthy character of the cattle of Spain and Portugal; belief that this is chiefly attributable to the favourable climate, 10109, 10110.—Stringent regulations as to the slaughter of Spanish and Portuguese cattle adopted in Liverpool in the year 1869; 10110-10117.

Opinion that shutting out foreign cattle will diminish, but will not exterminate pleuro-pneumonia, 10118-10133.—Instances in which an animal died from pleuro-pneumonia, which had not been communicated by contagion, 10137.

Offal. Statement showing that there is no practical difficulty in the transit of offal when cattle are killed at a considerable distance from towns, *Stratton* 4563-4573.

O'Neill, Peter. (Analysis of his Evidence).—Is secretary to the Drogheda Steam Packet Company; has had large experience in the conduct of the cattle export trade, 6661-6683.—Description of the ships employed by the Drogheda Company for cattle transit; servants of the company sent with each ship to look after the cattle shipped, 6684-6699, 6735-6758, 6944-6952.

Examination as to the method adopted in stowing cattle in the holds of the vessels; statement that the hold is preferable to the deck for the conveyance of cattle, 6670-6679, 6708, 6746-6754, 6806-6811, 6829-6838, 6893-6900.—Average number of sailings per week of the vessels; general character of the passage between Ireland and England, 6680-6683, 6823-6828, 6953.

Information with regard to the disinfection and whitewashing of the vessels as laid down by the Order in Council; strong objection to the whitewashing on account of the injury occasioned to the ironwork, 6684-6698, 6735-6745, 6795-6805, 6813-6822, 6830-6861.—Deputation to the Chief Secretary, with a view to the abolition of the whitewashing; high commercial standing of the gentlemen forming this deputation, 6692, 6693.

Statement as to the English markets to which the cattle conveyed from Drogheda are exported, 6699, 6700.—Satisfactory manner in which the cattle going to Liverpool are treated by the men in charge of them; rest of nine hours given to the cattle before being sent on by rail, 6701-6707.—Excellent accommodation at Dundalk for the reception of cattle before shipment, 6709, 6710.

Statement that no animals suffering from pleuro-pneumonia have been shipped from Drogheda within the last five years; possibility of cases in an incipient stage of disease escaping notice, 6711, 6712, 6770-6777.—Animals affected with foot and mouth disease are never permitted to approach the premises of the company; belief that no grazier having a regard for his own interest, would send an animal so affected, for shipment, 6713, 6722, 6723.

Opinion that a qualified person should be placed at the port of shipment to examine animals; careful attention paid by cattle dealers to the state of other cattle shipped with their own, 6714-6717, 6882-6884.—Decided opinion that all cattle affected with pleuro-pneumonia should be slaughtered, 6719.

Expediency of giving compensation to owners who should report as to disease, 6720, 6721.—General inaccuracy of Mr. Jenkins' report as regards the Drogheda Steam Packet Company, 6724-6734, 6812-6814.—Description of the cattle exported in the steamers of the company; different rates charged for store and fat cattle, 6756-6758, 6778-6794, 6995-6996.

Disapproval of the regulation by which an animal found to be diseased on landing is declared contraband and seized by the Customs, 6759-6769, 6885-6887, 6981-6986.—Absence of convictions of persons for contravening the Orders in Council as regards contagious diseases in Ireland; instance in which the Drogheda Company was summoned for not whitewashing, 6839-6849.

O'Neill, Peter. (Analysis of his Evidence.)—continued.

Statement that the Order as to whitewashing applies to railway companies as well as to steam companies; this regulation not so rigidly enforced in the case of railway companies, 6852, 6853.—Decided opinion that the statement that Irish cattle have brought disease into England is very much exaggerated; absence of complaints as to disease in animals when landed from the company's steamer, 6862-6867, 6901.

Examination as to the mode of shipping cattle on board the steamers; unfounded statements as to ill-treatment when getting the cattle on board, 6868-6876, 6927, 6928.—Evidence in further support of the deleterious effect of whitewash upon iron; efficacy of carbolic acid and water as a disinfectant, 6877-6881, 6902-6922, 6954-6980, 6982-6985.

Satisfactory manner in which store cattle are fed and watered before being put on the railway at Liverpool, 6888, 6889, 6929-6943, 6987-6994.—Statement that the Belfast steamers are more suitable for the conveyance of cattle upon deck than those belonging to the Drogheda Company, 6890-6899.

Further statement that there is no export of store cattle from Drogheda to Liverpool as a destination, but that they go on from there, 6903-6926.—Impossibility of using a hose for the purpose of whitewashing the vessels, for the reason that it must be of a certain thickness to stick on the sides, 6972-6978.

Orders in Council. See *Prize Council*.

P.

Penalties. See *Fines and Penalties*.

Perthshire. Examination as to the state of foot and mouth disease in the county; gradual extension of the disease throughout Scotland, *Stewart* 11736-11746, 11841-11845.—Amount of loss in the year 1872 from foot and mouth disease estimated at 10 per cent., *ib.* 11751-11758.—The estimated loss from pleuro-pneumonia last year in Perthshire was about 4,000 *l.*, *ib.* 11760, 11770.—Absence of conflicting interests in Perthshire between the county and borough as regards the suppression of disease, *ib.* 11838-11837.

Philcox, George. (Analysis of his Evidence.)—As clerk to the Deptford market, explains the capacity of the market as regards oxen and sheep respectively, 4303-4310.—Is not aware that exporters are dissatisfied with the market, 4311, 4312.—Considers that increased railway communication with the markets is desirable; particulars hereon, 4313-4341.—No inconvenience arises as regards the carting away of the offal, 4334-4336.

Pigs. In 1866 pigs suffered greatly from foot and mouth disease, *Brown* 1384.—Proof by experiment that the foot and mouth disease may be conveyed by pigs, *Stewart* 2906.—Very much larger mortality of swine from foot and mouth disease than of sheep or cattle, *Ferguson* 4989-4991.

PLEURO-PNEUMONIA:

1. *Source of Introduction of Pleuro-pneumonia.*
2. *Infectious or Contagious Nature of the Disease.*
3. *Period of Incubation.*
4. *Treatment.*
5. *Mortality from the Disease.*
6. *Suggestions on the Score of Compulsory Slaughter.*
7. *Suggestions on the Score of Isolation.*
8. *Other Details and Suggestions generally.*
9. *Conclusions of the Committee.*

1. *Source of Introduction of Pleuro-pneumonia:*

Belief that pleuro-pneumonia has not been largely introduced from abroad during the last few years, *Williams* 318-323.—Doubt as to pleuro-pneumonia having increased in the country, though more cases are brought to light, *ib.* 362-369.—Conclusion that pleuro-pneumonia is frequently introduced from Ireland, though there are no statistics on the subject, *ib.* 461, 1153-1155, 1158-1161, 1167, 1168.

Existence of pleuro-pneumonia in England since 1841, when it is supposed to have come from Ireland and from Holland to Ireland in the previous year, *Brown* 1467-1472.—Existence of pleuro-pneumonia both in England and Ireland as early as 1841, there being no proof that it came direct from abroad, *Stewart* 3004-3007.—Opinion that Ireland is singularly free from pleuro-pneumonia; evidence in support of the opinion that the disease comes principally into Liverpool from Cheshire, *Ferdon* 7031, 7032, 7096, 7097, 7178-7184, 7191-7197.

Conclusion

*PLEURO-PNEUMONIA—continued.*1. *Source of Introduction of Pleuro-pneumonia—continued.*

Conclusion that pleuro-pneumonia comes from abroad, *Drenchfield* 11001-11005.—Contention that pleuro-pneumonia is a disease of foreign origin; introduction of the disease into Aberdeenshire attributable to Irish cattle, *Thomson* 11310-11327, 11417-11425.—Evidence in support of the statement that pleuro-pneumonia was imported into Scotland from Ireland; desirability of the restrictions being stringently carried out in Ireland, *Stewart* 11954-11961, 11967-11980.

2. *Infectious or Contagious Nature of the Disease.*

Conclusion that the disease can only be communicated by association with a diseased animal, *Brown* 1475-1477, 1483-1487.—Doubt as to the disease being communicable save by direct contact, *ib.* 2521-2523.—Contagious character of pleuro-pneumonia further adverted to in connection with a certain experiment by witnesses on the subject, *ib.* 2813-2821.

Conclusion that pleuro-pneumonia is not spontaneous, *Simonds* 3011.—Less infectious character of pleuro-pneumonia than of foot and mouth disease, the former being more easy to stamp out, *ib.* 3013-3016.—Failure of attempts to produce pleuro-pneumonia save by contagion; inference that the disease might be stamped out, *ib.* 3215, 3216, 3301-3306.

Grounds for the conclusion that the prison of the disease is propagated by the breath, and not in any other way; experiments herein adverted to, *Baldwin* 3839-3848, 3865-3867, 3879-3885.—Belief that both pleuro-pneumonia and foot and mouth disease are infectious, *ib.* 3778, 3779.

Grounds for the conclusion that pleuro-pneumonia sometimes occurs in Ireland otherwise than by infection or contagion, *Ferguson* 4951, 4952.—Average of about sixteen per cent. of the cattle attacked with the disease when it appears on a farm in Ireland, *ib.* 5375-5377.—Circumstances of this disease never being very prevalent when foot and mouth disease is rife; probable increase of the former as a result of decrease of the latter, *ib.* 5430-5557, 5560.

Impossibility of obtaining evidence of a trustworthy character with regard to pleuro-pneumonia from any person who is not a veterinary surgeon, *Jenkins* 5913-5919.—Contention that bad treatment of cattle as regards food and cleanliness will lead to attacks of pleuro-pneumonia, *Bolster* 7292, 7380-7389.—Description of the symptoms of pleuro-pneumonia when it first attacks cattle, *ib.* 7450, 7474, 7475.—Opinion that pleuro-pneumonia can only be conveyed by the breath of an animal; impossibility of the spontaneous generation of the disease, *McBride* 9129-9132, 9208-9279.

Conclusion that pleuro-pneumonia can be spread by the breath of the animal; other means of conveying contagion, *Ganger* 9642-9648.—Instances in which an animal died from pleuro-pneumonia which had not been communicated from contagion, *Odessa* 10127.—Opinion that pleuro-pneumonia infection is only conveyed by the breath, *Thomson* 11418.

3. *Period of Incubation.*

Very long period of the disease in incubation, so that it is peculiarly difficult to deal with, *Brown* 1479-1481.—Concurrence in the view as to the long period of incubation in the case of pleuro-pneumonia, *Simonds* 3011, 3012; *Thomson* 11413-11415.—Cases have occurred from ten to twelve weeks after exposure to infection, *Simonds* 3012.—Varying period from seventeen to forty-four days for the incubation of pleuro-pneumonia, *Baldwin* 3842-3848.—The incubative stage of pleuro-pneumonia averages about six weeks, *Ganger* 9718.

4. *Treatment.*

Great difficulty of any treatment of pleuro-pneumonia, *Brown* 1570.—Opinion that the best treatment for pleuro-pneumonia is to give the animals plenty of water and to leave them alone, *Baldwin* 4451-4453.—Doubt as to any real cure of the disease, there being moreover a great deterioration of the animals apparently recovered, *Ferguson* 5375-5381, 5384-5386.—Use of gas tar by some farmers as a remedial measure in the case of pleuro-pneumonia; strong opinion as to the efficacy of this remedy, *Lambert* 13455-13463, 13609-13612, 13653-13655, 13767-13769.

5. *Mortality from the Disease.*

Average mortality of about eighty per cent. of the animals attacked, *Brown* 1478, 1488.—Great fatality in cases of pleuro-pneumonia, *Simonds* 3020.—Death of fully sixty per cent. of the animals attacked with pleuro-pneumonia in Ireland, *Baldwin* 3856-3859.—Probable accuracy of an estimated mortality of eighty per cent. of the attacks of pleuro-pneumonia, though the returns in Ireland show a mortality of only sixty per cent., *Ferguson* 5382, 5383.

PLEURO-PNEUMONIA—continued.**5. Mortality from the Disease—continued.**

Statement that pleuro-pneumonia has not done one-fourth of the mischief that has resulted from foot and mouth disease; examination as to the losses of witnesses from attacks of pleuro-pneumonia and foot and mouth disease respectively, *Clarke* 8376, 8439-8453, 8479-8484, 8608-8635.

6. Suggestions on the score of Compulsory Slaughter :

Legislative interference is required in the case of pleuro-pneumonia; system of slaughtering contemplated, *Brown* 2101, 2102, 2230-2233.—Expediency, in connection with inspection at the ports, of arrangements for slaughtering all animals affected with pleuro-pneumonia, *ib.* 2278-2280.—Opinion that it should be imperative at once to slaughter animals affected with pleuro-pneumonia, *Simonds* 3042-3044.—Expected willingness of owners to approve the slaughter of animals attacked with pleuro-pneumonia, *ib.* 3307.

Proposition that every animal under the influence of pleuro-pneumonia be killed, and that adequate compensation be given to the owner, *Baldwin* 3855-3864, 3870-3875, 3880, 4024-4028; *Huxing* 4800, 4805-4808; *Waleh* 8081-8083, 8089, 8110-8113.

Decided opinion in favour of slaughtering all animals actually infected with pleuro-pneumonia, *Fisher* 5200-5203; *Duckham* 9832-9834, 9905; *Lepper* 10792-10796, 11819; *Wade* 10925-10928, 10963-10967.

Contention that pleuro-pneumonia is one of the greatest calamities that can happen to a stock-owner; expediency of slaughtering all diseased animals, and all heads which come in contact with them, *Gatry* 6235-6239, 6295-6302, 6330-6333.—Opinion that pleuro-pneumonia though not so infectious as foot and mouth disease, is much more fatal; expediency of all animals infected with this disease being at once slaughtered, *Garnett* 6363-6377, 6487, 6488, 6494, 6495, 6552-6586, 6603-6630.—Approval of compulsory slaughter in the case of animals suffering from pleuro-pneumonia, *O'Neill* 6719; *Verdon* 7030.

Circumstances under which pleuro-pneumonia has broken out in dairy stock owned by witnesses; opinion that the only treatment for the disease should be slaughter of the infected animals and isolation of the rest, *Belater* 7293-7296, 7341, 7343, 7360-7364.—Contention that a herd affected with pleuro-pneumonia should be slaughtered, *Verdon* 7821-7823.—Approval of slaughtering all animals that are affected with pleuro-pneumonia in England, and allowing full compensation; expediency of isolating those adjacent and inoculating them, *Clarke* 8451-8458.

Decided opinion that every animal when attacked with pleuro-pneumonia should be at once slaughtered; contention that the slaughter of infected animals would in the end be the most inexpensive method of treating the disease, *Rigby* 8766-8769, 8773, 8782-8788.—Statement that in country districts animals attacked with pleuro-pneumonia and those in contact with them should be at once slaughtered; difficulty as to the course to be taken with regard to animals in town dairies, *McBride* 9050-9055, 9060, 9111-9113, 9114.—Grounds for the opinion that all cattle affected with this disease should be immediately slaughtered, *Gawye* 9439, 9440, 9459-9467, 9476-9484.

Conclusion that all animals affected with pleuro-pneumonia should be immediately slaughtered; compulsory slaughter not resorted to in Cheshire at the present time, *Suzle* 10183-10196, 10245-10251, 10274-10277, 10302-10304.—Opinion that pleuro-pneumonia is on the decrease; expediency of slaughtering the animals affected with this disease, *Denchfield* 11007-11009, 11035-11043.—Expediency in cases of pleuro-pneumonia of slaughtering the animals affected, and isolating the rest of the herd; uselessness of treating cattle for this disease, *Goodlet* 11529, 11590, 11597, 11609-11612, 11668, 11671-11673.

Decided opinion in favour of slaughtering animals affected with pleuro-pneumonia; movement of animals suffering from the disease should be restricted to three months at the least, *Stewart* 11759-11772, 11890-11896.—Conclusion that the cheapest and most efficient system for getting rid of pleuro-pneumonia is to slaughter all animals infected, and also those that had been in contact with them, *Milne* 11953-11965, 12007-12112.—Opinion that it would not be difficult to draw up regulations with regard to the slaughter of animals that have been in contact with others suffering from pleuro-pneumonia; belief that we shall never get rid of the disease by the machinery at present in operation, *ib.* 12108-12110.

Doubtful expediency in slaughtering the cattle which are affected with pleuro-pneumonia, unless it be extended to all the animals on the same farm, *Walker* 12211-12226.—Desirability of slaughtering animals that are severely affected with pleuro-pneumonia; opinion that store animals should not be removed from an infected place, *Scott* 12368-12382.—Doubtful propriety of slaughtering animals suffering from pleuro-pneumonia, except under certain circumstances, *Gebhardt* 12758, 12804, 12805, 12825-12828.

Decided

PLEURO-PNEUMONIA—continued.**6. Suggestions on the score of Compulsory Slaughter—continued.**

Decided opinion that the regulations regarding pleuro-pneumonia cannot be too stringent; necessity of slaughtering cattle immediately upon their showing the slightest signs of the disease, *Lambert* 13451, 13458, 13576-13583, 13749-13756, 13764-13769.

7. Suggestions on the score of Isolation:

Expediency of an interval of at least two months before an animal, after recovery from pleuro-pneumonia, is allowed to go upon a farm, *Brown* 1491, 1493.—Advantage of testing suspected pleuro-pneumonia by means of the thermometer and of at once isolating all animals which show a slight rise in temperature, *ib.* 2371-2378.

Opinion that animals herded with those which have been attacked should not be slaughtered, but should be isolated and carefully watched, *Stewart* 3308, 3309.—Explanation that witness disapproves of the immediate slaughter of animals in contact with those suffering from pleuro-pneumonia; comment based upon the apparently beneficial results of this system in Holland, *ib.* 3529-3539.—Concurrence in the view that animals in contact with the disease be isolated, whilst those diseased should be slaughtered, *Fisher* 5206-5209; *Clarke* 8451-8456; *Duckham* 9832-9838, 9905; *Lepper* 10798-10799, 10819; *Webb* 10925-10928, 10953-10957.

Cattle which have been herded with diseased animals should be isolated for at least two months, *Ridgely* 8776-8781.—Examination as to the period necessary for isolation in cases of pleuro-pneumonia, *Gargrey* 9476, 9477.—Approval of an isolation of three months of herds where pleuro-pneumonia had existed, *Miles* 11995, 11997.

8. Other Details and Suggestions generally:

Inadequacy of the present home regulations for extinguishing pleuro-pneumonia, though they prevent its further increase, *Williams* 750-754, 869.—Explanation that in the case of pleuro-pneumonia slaughter is not compulsory, *ib.* 1295, 1296.

Belief that the total stoppage of the import of foreign cattle would not now get rid of pleuro-pneumonia, *Brown* 1473, 1474.—Doubt as to the expediency of any more stringent regulations than at present as regards the import of pleuro-pneumonia, *ib.* 1501-1504.—Opinion that in about two years, with active measures and strict supervision, the disease might be almost exterminated, *ib.* 2435, 2436.

Examination in denial that the Act of 1868 has been a failure as regards pleuro-pneumonia, the failure arising rather from the provisions of the Act not having been carried out, and from the movement of diseased animals to fairs and markets not having been stopped by the local authorities, *Brown* 2607-2651.

Slight value of animals attacked with this disease unless they be at once sold for dead meat, *Simonds* 3081-3093.—Conclusion that whatever the origin of the introduction of pleuro-pneumonia into Ireland, it should be dealt with as entirely contagious or infectious, *Ferguson* 5387-5398.—Way in which witnesses would deal with cases of pleuro-pneumonia in fat stock and store stock respectively, *Marrow* 5702-5707.

Expediency of stringent regulations for the prevention of the spread of pleuro-pneumonia; necessity for severe penalties to prevent the exposure of animals affected with the disease at fairs or markets, *Ferdon* 7028, 7029.—Strong objection to a fat animal being exposed in a market while suffering from the disease, *ib.* 7669-7705, 7737-7739.—Opinion that shutting out foreign cattle will diminish but will not exterminate pleuro-pneumonia, *Odams* 10118-10133.

Decided opinion that the same stringency should be observed with pleuro-pneumonia as with foot and mouth disease, *Stewart* 1577.—Opinion that we shall never be rid of pleuro-pneumonia in this country, *Lambert* 13683.—Less necessity for restrictions than in the case of rinderpest, *Woodcock* 13848, 13849.—Expediency of severe restrictions, *W. Brown* 13959-13974.

9. Conclusions of the Committee:

Recommendation that the slaughter of all cattle affected with pleuro-pneumonia should be compulsory, *Rep.* iv.—Suggestion in regard to the removal and isolation of cattle which have been in the same shed, or have been herded with diseased animals, *ib.*

Recommendation that the time for which the pleuro-pneumonia rules should be applied to any premises in which the disease has been discovered should be extended from thirty days to two months, *Rep.* iv.

<i>See also</i>	<i>Aberdeenshire.</i>	<i>Cheshire.</i>	<i>Compensation.</i>	<i>Dairies.</i>	<i>Fairs and</i>
	<i>Markets.</i>	<i>Foreign Cattle.</i>	<i>Holland.</i>	<i>Infected Places.</i>	<i>Isolation.</i>
	<i>Ireland, and Irish Cattle, &c.</i>	<i>Isolation.</i>	<i>Local Authorities.</i>	<i>Meat (Diseased Animals).</i>	<i>Movement of Cattle, 1, 2.</i>
			<i>Quarantine.</i>		

Police. Slight use in the police reporting cases of foot and mouth disease to the local authority, the latter not exercising their power of stopping the movement of cattle from markets, &c., *Williams* 740-749.—Usefulness to some extent if notice were given to the police relative to foot and mouth disease, *Brown* 1678, 1673.

Police—continued.

Duty of the police (under witness' scheme) to make reports to the local authority, and to guard against the removal of animals without license, *Simonds* 3407-3413.—Proposed action of the local police, with a view to discovering and reporting cases of foot and mouth disease; neighbouring farmers would readily aid in such report, *Stratton* 4583-4589. 4653-4666. 4690. 4697. 4722. 4723.

Additional labour put upon the police in carrying out the inspection under the Act, *Smith* 10155. 10160-10171.—Opinion that the employment of police as inspectors is an expense which leads to nothing, *Lepper* 10810-10814.

Notice given in witness' county to the police to stop the movement of infected cattle; opinion that there is not much concealment of disease, *Druckfield* 11109-11134.—Satisfactory manner in which police inspection has worked in Scotland; all the cattle are held in check by the police until examined by the inspector, *Stewart* 11962-11966.

Strong disapproval of the appointment of county police as inspectors; belief that the police act as central centres of inspection, moving from one place to another, *Lambert* 13411-13413. 13698-13713.

See also Entry to Premises. Fines and Penalties. Ireland, &c., v.

Pork. Reduced price of pork owing to the large increase of import, *Williams* 1084. 1085.

Ports (Foreign Cattle). Expediency of all the ports being required to make as good provision for landing, slaughtering, isolation, &c., as is made at Deptford; difficulties experienced on this subject by the central department, *Williams* 230-277.—Importance of the number of cattle ports being reduced as much as possible; large diminution already, *ib.* 257-266.

Recommendations relative to the actual limitation to be applied to the number of importing ports, *Williams* 773. 790-785.—Increased protection if the regulations as at Deptford were applied to Hull and other ports; obstacles on the score of expense, *ib.* 953-968.—Little, if any, interference with the freedom of trade by the proposed diminution in the number of ports, *ib.* 1081-1089.—Explanation that in advocating the Deptford system at other ports, witness has in view the cattle only from scheduled countries, *ib.* 1231-1233.

There are eighteen English and three Scotch ports at which scheduled animals are allowed to arrive, *Brown* 1595.—Very incomplete arrangements and accommodation at the outports generally, on the score of isolation and slaughtering, *ib.* 1574-1594.—Question whether it is necessary to incur great expense at the several outports in order to avoid the risk of cattle plague, there being power to prohibit import from any country where it exists, *ib.* 1595-1599.—Total of thirty-two ports in Great Britain where cattle may be landed, there being twenty-one of such ports with defined ports, *ib.* 2112-2115.—Importance of limiting the number of ports for cattle from scheduled countries, and of improving the accommodation and arrangements, by providing at each port a proper defined area, &c., *ib.* 2209-2225.

Approval of limiting the number of ports for cattle from scheduled countries, and of requiring the provision of proper slaughter-houses and means of disinfection, *Simonds* 3236-3238.—Desirability of there being two places of landing at ports, in case one should be infected, *Clarke* 8226-8229.—Doubtful propriety of permitting fat and store cattle to be imported at the same ports, *ib.* 8402, 8403.

Recommendation by the Committee that the Privy Council should limit the ports at which foreign cattle are allowed to be landed, *Rep. ii.*—The ports should be limited to those at which satisfactory provisions have been made for lirage, isolation, and slaughter, and for the disposal of carcases, *ib.*

See also Bristol. Customs Officers. Dead Meat. Foreign Cattle. Hull. Lairs.

Portugal. *See Spain and Portugal.*

Poultry. Belief that at one period poultry were attacked with foot and mouth disease, *Brown* 1382.—*See also Foot and Mouth Disease, H., &c.*

Preserved Meat. Obstacles hitherto to the successful import of American or other beef in a preserved state, *Williams* 1340-1344.—*See Australian Meat.*

PRICES:

Statement of the advance within the last three years in the price of beef, mutton, &c., in the metropolitan market, *Williams* 909-914.—Tendency to an increase of prices if all imported cattle were slaughtered at the ports, *ib.* 931.—Injurious effect upon imports from abroad and from Ireland, if the regulations imposed an additional charge of from 5 s. to 10 s. a head, *ib.* 1117-1125.

Statement to the effect that the price of meat fell rather than rose after the slaughtering orders

PRICES—continued.

orders of the Privy Council were put in force, *Brown* 2146-2164.—Difference of a penny per lb. between the price of foreign beef and of English beef in the Metropolitan market, *ib.* 2516-2518.—Public prejudice, owing to which foreign fat cattle fetch a lower price than English cattle, *ib.* 2851-2853.—Disputed question whether slaughtering at the port tends to raise the price of meat, *ib.* 2854-2857.

Effect of the great loss of animals from disease in enhancing the price of meat; this loss, in fact, is far greater than is generally supposed, *Fisher* 5184-5195.—Fluctuations in the price of meat at Liverpool, &c., caused by the working of the Act of 1869; reasons for this, *Verdon* 7041-7057.—Evidence relative to the prices of meat in Liverpool as compared with London; enhanced price in the former city, *ib.* 7670-7683. 7689-7699.—Statement that the tendency of the Liverpool high sellers has been to cause more or less of a monopoly among the large salesmen; belief that the restrictions have been the chief cause of the high prices, *ib.* 7884-7887.—Material effect upon the price of meat occasioned by the prevalence of disease, *McBride* 9091, 9092.

Statement that the high price of meat at the present time is due to the persistent introduction into England of foreign cattle and foreign diseases, *Grosvor* 9432. 9579-9585.—Statement as to the prices of meat from the year 1801 up to the present time; reduction in the price during the last thirty-nine years, notwithstanding the increase of population, *ib.* 9577-9584. 9734-9739.

Contention that the slaughter of foreign cattle at the port of debarkation would have no effect in raising the price of meat; belief that we should never have had the present enormous prices if we had adopted this system years ago, *Odams* 10083-10094. 10098, 10097.—Conclusion that slaughter of foreign cattle prevents the dissemination of disease; argument therefrom that prices are greatly enhanced by sending live animals through the country, *ib.* 10102-10108.

Statement showing the prices of meat in the London market, per hundredweight, during the past few years, *Robinson* 10771-10773.—Belief that the slaughter of all fat stock at the port of arrival would have very little effect upon the price of meat; general increase of the dead meat market adverted to hereon, *Goodlet* 11717-11720.—Information as to the causes for the increase in prices of meat; restrictions upon cattle have had a considerable effect upon the prices, *Hodgetts* 12588-12591. 12680-12686. 12690-12693.—Reasons for the prices of meat being lower in London than in Birmingham, *ib.* 12700-12705.

Extraordinary increase in the price of English stock in the present year; increased importation of foreign cattle from this cause, *Gökard* 12845-12859. 12999-13009.—The average price of a foreign bullock at the present time is about 23 £, *ib.* 13006.—Opinion that the great reduction in the import of Dutch and German cattle is mainly owing to the diminution of prices at Deptford, *ib.* 13068-13074.—Circumstances which govern the prices in the meat market; statement that the live market is invariably guided by the previous week's dead meat market, the supply, and the weather, *ib.* 13080-13091.

Examination with regard to the enhanced price of meat of late years, and the probability of its further increasing, *Lambert* 13533-13539. 13544-13551. 13594-13603. 13638-13652. 13657-13667. 13749-13755. 13779-13795.—Evidence as to the difference in the price of meat between London and Lancashire; considerable increase of price in York-shire and Lancashire, *W. Brown* 13877, 13878. 13881-13885. 13944-13953. 13978-13981. 13985-13991.—Reasons for the high price of meat at the present time, *ib.* 13954-13962. 13985-13991.

Statement, in memorial from Glasgow butchers, as to the enhanced price of meat, owing to the restrictions upon the importation of foreign cattle, *App.* 538.

See also *Foreign Cattle*, s. *West Bromwich*.

Privy Council. Objection to any restrictions by Orders in Council beyond those in the Act, in the case more especially of foot and mouth disease, *Simonds* 9567. 9577. 3000.—Opinion that a non-fatal contagious disease, such as foot and mouth disease, should remain in the Act, but should not be subject to Orders in Council, *ib.* 3350-3353. 3537-3539.

Statement as to some of the original orders for dealing with outbreaks of foot and mouth disease having been in advance of the time, *Baldwin* 4160-4168.—Entire inadequacy of the present orders of the Privy Council relative to the foot and mouth disease, *Stratton* 4517.—Advantage of the discontinuance of the former vexatious restrictions imposed by the Privy Council as regards the disease, *Ferguson* 4911.

Decided inexpediency of the discretion to slaughter foreign animals, on their arrival into the country, being left to the Privy Council; grounds for this opinion, *Clarke* 8199-8201. 8204. 8248-8252. 8258. 8379-8388.—Expediency of making the Privy Council Orders compulsory and not permissive, *ib.* 8506-8509.—Want of uniformity of action throughout the whole country as regards carrying out the provision

Privy Council—continued.

of the Contagious Disease Act; powers should be given to the Privy Council to enforce obedience to the Orders, *Miles* 11984-11993, 12109.

Recommendation by the Committee that the Privy Council should cease to issue orders for the check of the foot and mouth disease, *Rep.* v.—Proposed power in the Privy Council to allow the movement, under proper precautions, of animals affected with the disease, for slaughter, food, or shelter, *ib.*

Reference by the Committee to the Orders of Council relating to the transit of animals as being well adapted for their purpose, *Rep.* vi.—Improved system of inspection required in order to give effect to such orders, *ib.*

See also *Animal Reports. Centralisation. Disinfection. Foot and Mouth Disease. Foreign Cattle. Inspection. Ireland, &c., IX., XIV. Local Authorities. Reports and Statistics (Cattle Plague). Statistics. Treatment of Diseases. Veterinary Departments.*

Public Health. Conclusion as to human beings not being liable to the foot and mouth disease, *Simonds* 2942, 2943.—See also *Dairies. Meat (Diseased Animals). Milk, &c.*

Publicity. Great importance attached to the prompt report of all cases of disease by the farmers or by local inspectors, it being expedient for this purpose to make it to the interest of the farmer not to make any concealment of disease, *Brown* 2345 *et seq.*—Approval of a requirement that the occupant of a farm where any horned animal dies or is slaughtered should report the same within three days, *ib.* 2494-2499.—Difficulty in compelling notice by the owner to his immediate neighbours, *ib.* 2674, 2675.—Unwillingness of stock-owners to publish the existence of foot and mouth disease among their cattle, *ib.* 2834, 2835.

Facility desirable as regards publicity of disease in the locality, *Fisher* 5209, 5210.—Grounds for objecting to the existence of disease on any farm being advertised, though on its becoming known to the police, publicity would soon result as among the neighbours, *Ferguson* 5417-5427.—Expediency of introducing regulations by which people would be bound to proclaim the existence of disease; belief that the existence of foot and mouth disease would not be generally acknowledged, *Gangee* 9602-9607.

See also *Compensation. Fines and Penalties.*

Q.

QUARANTINE:

Immense expense involved in applying quarantine regulations to foreign store cattle, *Williams* 873-876.—Obstacles to a distinction between fat cattle and store cattle from abroad, with a view to the latter being quarantined, *ib.* 919-922.—Prohibitory effect of quarantine if applied to store animals from Ireland, *Brown* 1424, 1425.—Opinion that quarantine stations would become immense pethouses, *Simonds* 3458, 3661.—Strong disapproval of a place of quarantine at Thames Haven, or elsewhere, *ib.* 3861.

Belief that the importation of disease cannot be excluded by quarantine and inspection, *Baldwin* 4029, 4030.—Witness is, in fact, entirely opposed to quarantine, *ib.* 4402.—Impracticability of a system of quarantine at the port of embarkation in Ireland, *Ferguson* 4922, 4923.

Advantage of a sufficiently long detention or quarantine in the case of store stock, with reference to foot and mouth disease, cattle plague, and sheep pox; facility to detection thereby, *Hunting* 4795-4804.—Suggestions for the quarantine of all foreign store stock at one place if possible, *Fisher* 5111-5113, 5119-5127.—Disinfection necessary in the case of foreign sheep after quarantine; conveyance of foot and mouth disease in the wool, *ib.* 5114-5118.—Increased value of foreign dairy cows if subjected to quarantine, *ib.* 5124-5127.

Efficacy of a week's quarantine in arresting many of the acute cases of pleuro-pneumonia, *ib.* 5418 it would not intercept the disease from entrance into the kingdom, *Clarke* 8374-8377.—Practicability of providing sufficient lairage at the ports to quarantine a considerable number of animals, *ib.* 8399-8402.—Opinion that in the event of disease breaking out in a quarantine establishment, the whole of the animals should be slaughtered immediately, *ib.* 8511-8515, 8688.

Opinion that a satisfactory system of quarantine is altogether impracticable, *McBride* 9093-9101, 9192-9195.—Conclusion that a system of quarantine would be costly and impracticable, *Gangee* 9447, 9488, 9620, 9621.—Quarantine of thirty days would be quite sufficient in cases of pleuro-pneumonia when inoculation has been adopted, *ib.* 9617, 9618.

Expediency of a period of ten days' quarantine at the port of debarkation for the discovery

Report, 1873—continued.

QUARANTINE—continued.

discovery of rinderpest and foot and mouth disease; opinion that for pleuro-pneumonia no time would be long enough, *Smith* 10264, 10265—Quarantine for seven or ten days necessary in the case of store cattle brought from abroad, *Waller* 12170-12179—Expediency of foreign cattle being quarantined for twenty-four hours, and subjected to an examination by a veterinary inspector; necessity also of slaughtering all cattle which come from countries where rinderpest is known to exist, *Lambert* 13722-13728.

See also Foreign Cattle, 7. Ireland, &c., VIII.

R.

RAILWAYS (CATTLE TRUCKS):

1. Existing Accommodation and Arrangements as to Transit by Railway.
2. Suggestions for the Adoption of an Improved System.

1. Existing Accommodation and Arrangements as to Transit by Railway:

Statement of the arrangements for conveyance by railways, more especially as regards water supply; on a journey of twelve hours or so food and water are not needed, *Brown* 1639-1656. 1679-1697. 1727-1737—Very imperfect arrangements for the cleansing of railway trucks; entire insufficiency of the staff of inspectors for enforcing this duty, *ib.* 1657-1663—Abuse at times through cattle being delayed at railway sidings, *ib.* 1698, 1699—Doubt as to cattle and sheep being ever put in the same truck, *ib.* 2202, 2203—Approval of tolerably close packing in trucks and on steamers, *ib.* 2847, 2848.

Considerable overcrowding of cattle on railways; reference especially to Irish store-cattle, *Stewart* 3127-3139—Extensive correspondence of witness with railway companies; willingness evinced by them to meet the wishes of the department, *Lordly* 3718, 3719—Serious spread of disease in Ireland through the railway trucks not being disinfected; denial that such rests with witness' department in this matter, *Ferguson* 4378-4381. 4388—Information as to the orders in force in Ireland at different times for the disinfection of railway trucks, *ib.* 5030-5037.

Statement that the order as to the disinfection of railway trucks is carried out by the largest companies in the most satisfactory manner, *Jenkins* 6095, 6096—Filthy state of the cattle trucks upon the Irish railways; absence of any attempt to cleanse or disinfect them, *ib.* 6124-6126.

Further explanations as to the course pursued by the Irish Government in dealing with the railway companies; searching official inquiry instituted as to the validity of the objections urged against the Order in Council by the companies, *Ferguson* 6187, 6188—Strong objection to the method in which cattle are conveyed by the railways in Ireland; cruel manner in which the animals are forced into the trucks, *Garnier* 6408-6418, 6531-6551—Agreement with Mr. Jenkins in his statement that the railway companies in Ireland do not properly disinfect their trucks; superiority of water and carbolic acid over whitewash for this object, *Verdon* 7908-7910. 8048.

Statement that for cattle coming from Aberdeen to London loss in weight one stone per day by railway transit, *Adams* 10018—Inspection of railway trucks in Cheshire, &c., left altogether to the railway authorities; unsatisfactory state of those trucks as regards their cleanliness, *Smith* 10160-10165. 10324-10329—Considerable depreciation in the value of cattle by reason of the privations during transit by rail, *Thomas* 11401-11405—Great carelessness evinced in the transit of cattle by railway in Scotland; difficulty in keeping the trucks clean on account of the great traffic in cattle, *Goodie* 11612-11621, 11666-11668.

Considerable attention paid by witness to the question of transit of cattle by rail; conclusion as to the great hardships suffered by cattle when travelling by railway, *Miles* 11984, 11985. 12006-12028. 12081. 12086. 12119, 12120. 12137-12145—The paramount objections to the present trucks is that there is no provision for feeding and watering upon the journey; great privations suffered by cattle upon long journeys for the want of water, *ib.* 12086, 12087—Fair condition in which the railway trucks in Scotland are kept; where they are dirty it is on account of the want of time to cleanse them, *Smith* 12353-12356.

2. Suggestions for the Adoption of an Improved System:

Expediency of the companies being required to facilitate the transit on long journeys, *Brown* 1700-1704—Approval of increased inspection in order to see that railway trucks are disinfected, *ib.* 2204-2206—Additional charge for conveyance if the railway companies be required to make better provision for the supply of water, &c., *ib.* 2234-2236—Improvement if the cattle trucks were covered over, and were open at the sides, *ib.* 2252-2254.

Concurrence in the opinion as to the want of better disinfection of railway trucks, &c.,

Report, 1873—continued.

RAILWAYS (CATTLE TRUCKS)—continued.

2. *Suggestions for the Adoption of an Improved System*—continued.

Brann 4845, 4846; *Stratton* 4513, 4516, 4578, 4630, 4698; *Verdon* 7124; *Clarke* 8559-8592; *McBride* 9105-9110; *Duckham* 9828-9831, 9913-9920.

Expediency of the railway trucks, &c. being under the inspection of the central authority, *Simonds* 3163—Avoidance of hardship to cattle in inland transit if quicker travelling could be secured, *ib.* 3234, 3235-3238, 3314—Importance of arrangements for the proper cleansing as well as the disinfection of railway trucks, *ib.* 3463-3466.

Expediency of the railway trucks being as well cleansed in Ireland as they are in Scotland, *Morrow* 5756, 5757, 5771, 5772, 5804, 5805, 5806, 5823—Suggestions as to the means to be adopted for preventing the overcrowding of cattle in railway trucks, *Garnett* 6532-6550—Advantage of a Government inspector specially charged with the duty of seeing that railway trucks are properly cleansed and disinfected, *Ridley* 8827-8831; *Smith* 10163-10165, 10329—Suggestions as to the regulations necessary for the proper cleansing and disinfecting of railway trucks, *Stewart* 11846-11851.

Preparation by witness of two models of improved railway trucks; explanation of their construction, *Milne* 12009-12068, 12080, 12092-12094, 12151-12158—Calculation as to the cost of converting the existing trucks as proposed by witness; expressed willingness to pay an increased rate to the railway companies for the use of improved trucks, *ib.* 12055, 12069-12079, 12121-12124, 12130, 12135—Obviation of all the hardships suffered by cattle in the existing trucks by the adoption of the trucks submitted by witness, *ib.* 12087-12090.

Suggestions for the better transit of cattle by railway; contention that the greatest improvement required is in the speed with which they are carried, *Smith* 12363-12392, 12397, 12398.

Suggestions by the Committee for an extended system of inspection of railway trucks, &c., *Rep.* vi.

See also *Dead Meat. Disinfection. Watering of Cattle.*

Raynest, Samuel Jones. (Analysis of his Evidence.)—Is the Inspector of the Metropolitan Cattle Market, 14163—Examination with regard to the visits paid to the market by Mr. Webb in the month of June 1872; statement that witness failed to detect foot and mouth disease in the animals pointed out by Mr. Webb, 14164-14183, 14198-14199—Detection of foot and mouth disease in the Metropolitan Market in the autumn of 1871; 14184-14191.

Read, Clive Sewell. (Member of the Committee). (Analysis of his Evidence.)—Information relative to the working of the Contagious Diseases Act in Norfolk; when the Act was passed in 1869 there was no local authority in the county, 14088-14090—Memorial sent by the county to the Privy Council with regard to foot and mouth Orders; powers given to the local authorities to issue orders for their districts, 14097-14105.

Order issued by the local authority with reference to pleuro-pneumonia, by which a license was granted for the removal of animals, 14106, 14107—Examination as to the regulations and restrictions with regard to pleuro-pneumonia; statistics of this disease in the county of Norfolk, 14108-14110, 14121-14125, 14141-14148.

Statement as to the number of prosecutions in the county since the passing of the Act; expediency of power being given to imprison in default of payment of penalties, 14111, 14143, 14149-14150—The inspectors of the county are all veterinary surgeons; assistance afforded to the inspectors by the police, 14113-14117.

Increase of foot and mouth disease during last year, 14119, 14120—Statistics of the Norfolk Farmers' Live Stock Insurance Company, 14126-14141—Uniformity of action between the county and borough local authorities, 14151-14154—Examination as to the scheme for giving compensation in the county for compulsory slaughter, 14167-14168.

Reports and Statistics (Cattle Plague). Delayed issue of the first Cattle Plague Report till 1868, in order that it might embrace the Veterinary Report, *Williams* 679-675—Professor Simonds is answerable for this delay, *ib.* 675.

Improvement effected by witness when in charge of the statistical branch of the Cattle Plague Department in 1866-67; *Clode* 9399-9403—Compilation by witness of the Statistical Report for the Cattle Plague Department in 1867 which was published as an appendix to Dr. Williams' Report, *ib.* 9404-9407—Examination in support of the statement that Dr. Williams was not justified in delaying for three years the report drawn up by witness on the subject of the cattle disease, *ib.* 10464-10468, 10481-10502—Complaint by witness as to the limitation by Dr. Williams of his duties in connection with the information to be given as to the progress and extent of the cattle plague, *ib.* 10486-10502.

Explanation as to the particular directions issued from the Privy Council Office relative to the statistical returns prepared by Mr. Clode, *Williams* 10505-10511—Desire of the Lords of the Council that the reports on the cattle plague should not be too lengthy,

Report, 1873—continued.

Reports and Statistics (Cattle Plague)—continued.

lengthy, *Williams* 10512, 10513.—Reasons for Mr. Clode's Report being printed in a different type to that in which it was prepared; this report was not delayed by witness, but by Professor Simonds, *ib.* 10514-10515.

Ridgby, Thomas. (Analysis of his Evidence.)—Is a farmer in Cheshire, and Secretary to the Chamber of Agriculture in that county; is also Secretary to the Liverpool Agricultural Society, 8744-8748.—Has considerable acquaintance with farming operations in the counties of Flint and Denbigh, 8740-8753.

Examination as to the course adopted in Cheshire in relation to the cattle plague; erroneous statements made by Mr. Vernon with reference to the farmers and farming of Cheshire, 8754-8757. 8839-8859. 8915-8933. 8995-9014. 9020-9026.—Statement that in Cheshire the cattle plague has been worse than in any county in England; calculation that the losses incurred amounted to 700,000 £ or 800,000 £; 8758-8762. 9015.

The disease first brought into the county by some Dutch cattle sent from the Metropolitan market, 8763-8766.—Decided opinion that every animal when attacked with pleuro-pneumonia should be at once slaughtered; contention that the slaughter of infected animals would in the end be the most inexpensive method of treating the disease, 8766-8769. 8773. 8784-8788.

Evidence in favour of inoculation as a means of preventing the attacks of pleuro-pneumonia; instances in which such treatment has been successful, 8770-8773. 8775. 8873-8879. 8979-8989.—Compensation should be paid for animals which have been slaughtered to the extent of two-thirds or three-fourths of their value, 8774.

Cattle which have been banded with diseased animals should be isolated for at least two months, 8776-8781.—Belief that when a diseased animal has died, the danger of contagion is in a great measure removed from the carcass, 8781.—Statement that Welsh cattle are more exempt than Irish cattle from foot and mouth disease; opinion that the disease is contracted in the transit from Ireland, 8789. 8797. 8860-8870.

Examination as to the health of Irish cattle brought over to England; suggestions as to the means which should be adopted to insure their coming in a healthy state, 8793-8809. 8819-8823. 8910-8914.—Necessity of uniformity in carrying out the Orders in Council with the view of stopping the spread of foot and mouth disease, 8810-8818.

Desirability of a Government inspector specially charged with the duty of seeing that railway trucks are properly cleansed and disinfected, 8827-8831.—Detailed statement of the average loss in Cheshire from the foot and mouth disease, and from pleuro-pneumonia, during the last three years and a half, 8832-8838. 8881-8885.

Pamphlet written by witness, in which are discussed the causes and reasons why Cheshire should have been exceptionally injured by the cattle plague, 8835-8859. 8892-8909.—Large numbers of calves born in Cheshire; ultimate destination of these, 8886-8891.

Opinion that Cheshire will always be severely visited by the cattle plague on account of being so very largely stocked with cattle; contention that the only way to make the county secure is to stamp out the disease whenever it first appears, 8902-8905.—Belief that the farmers in Cheshire would cordially agree to slaughtering the cattle if the plague were to break out again, 8931-8934.

Expediency of the county board being constituted partly of justices of the peace and partly of tenant farmers; opinion that this arrangement would give more confidence to the farmers, 8934-8938. 8950-8994.—Considerable amount of inconvenience which would result from stopping fairs or markets; opinion that such a course need not be taken if stringent measures are taken as to slaughter and isolation, 8942-8945.

Satisfactory manner in which the movement of cattle by certificate was carried out in the county; certain circumstances in which the certificate might be made use of in the future, 8946-8959.—Further statement as to the compensation to be paid to the owner of slaughtered animals; expediency of compensation in proportion to the amount of loss, 8960-8968.

Large numbers of cattle slaughtered in Cheshire for which no compensation was given; opposition to the slaughter ceased to a considerable extent upon compensation being made, 9016-9018.—Irish cattle would increase in value if they could be brought into the county in as healthy a state as Welsh cattle, 9027.

Rinderpest. See *Cattle Plague*.

Roberts, George Christopher. (Analysis of his Evidence.)—Is town clerk of Hull; was a member of the Cattle Plague Committee from its formation, 13113-13117.—Provision for the inspection of foreign cattle imported into Hull, 13118.—Statement as to the provision of lairs for scheduled and unscheduled cattle; special construction of these lairs to meet the requirements of the Privy Council, 13119. 13125. 13321.

Roberts, George Christopher. (Analysis of his Evidence).—continued.

Existing accommodation for the slaughter of cattle; statement that the value of the lairs and slaughter-houses is about £5,000*l.*; 13186-13199, 13223-13218—Absence of complaints as to the insufficiency of sheds provided by the dock company; correspondence relating to the only complaint ever made on this subject, 13130-13138, 13282-13285.

Explanation relative to a complaint by Professor Brown as to the presence of German cattle without the defined area, 13139-13141—Information as to the selection by Professor Brown of the defined area; production of plans showing its precise position, 13142-13151, 13170-13175, 13276-13279, 13321-13323—Statement that during the cattle plague the market was held in Corporation-field; description of this market, 13152-13154, 13176-13184.

Memoial presented to the corporation with a view to having the market altered, on account of its inconvenient situation; action taken by the Privy Council upon this matter, 13155-13169—Pledges and guarantees entered into by the corporation with a view to properly guarding the defined area, 13163-13169.

Examination as to the case of the "Joseph Soames;" statement that the Customs were responsible for permitting this vessel to enter the docks with infected cattle on board, 13185-13187, 13190-13209—The operation of the local authority begins only after the cattle are landed; repudiation of any responsibility with regard to the "Joseph Soames" by the local authority, 13185, 13189, 13207-13209.

Decided opinion that it would be unreasonable that Hull should be bound to pay for diseased cattle brought to the port, 13210-13214—Contention that the local circumstances do not warrant the statement that the cattle plague in the East Riding was first communicated from the Hull Market, 13215-13222.

Circumstances under which cattle would be slaughtered, or placed in quarantine, upon arriving in Hull with disease on board, 13223-13224—The slaughter-houses in Hull are the property of private individuals, but they are subject to strict sanitary regulations; favourable opinion of these slaughter-houses, 13235-13261.

Statement that the Lincolnshire and the foreign cattle are landed at two different piers; description of the position of these piers, 13266-13279—Proposed bridge over the railway at Hull, to prevent the inconvenience of a level crossing, 13278, 13279.

Belief that there is no difference of opinion between the Corporation of Hull and the Veterinary Department with reference to the duties of the local authorities, 13281—Contention that the expenses of compulsory slaughter of animals brought by the steamers to Hull should be borne by the Imperial Exchequer, 13283-13297.

Legal proceedings threatened against the Hull corporation by the owner of the cattle destroyed on board the "Joseph Soames;" refusal of the corporation to pay, on the ground that it did not order the cattle to be slaughtered, 13290, 13291—Further statement as to the loss which results from sending dead meat by rail in the hot weather, 13299-13303.

Inconsiderable traffic in cattle between Lincolnshire and Yorkshire, *viz.* Hull, 13304-13307—Additional examination as to the complaints from the large towns as to the dead meat which arrived in bad condition; contention that the complaints were chiefly against receiving slaughtered meat instead of live stock, 13308-13320.

Establishment of lairs for foreign cattle in the year 1866; 13327—Absence of any case of pleuro-pneumonia in Hull, 13332—Statement that a case of foot and mouth disease has never been reported to the local authority at Hull; character of the reports usually made with respect to cattle disease, 13333-13357.

Charges made by the corporation for the lirage of cattle, 13364-13369—Opinion that in Hull, as in most of the other large towns in England, the old market should be shifted from the centre to the outside of the town, 13371-13376.

Robinson, Anthony George. (Analysis of his Evidence).—Is largely interested in the import of foreign cattle, in which trade he has been engaged for many years, 10524-10529—Statement that, except from Russia, there will be very little increase of importation from foreign countries; reasons for this conclusion, 10530-10537, 10542-10548, 10573-10580, 10543, 10689, 10690, 10767-10770.

Opinion that without precautions Russia is not a safe country to import cattle from; constant existence of cattle plague more or less in parts of that country, 10537, 10538, 10645-10657, 10693-10698, 10712-10717, 10732-10744—Belief that the slaughter of all the foreign cattle at the water-side would have no effect in decreasing the foreign importations; fixed regulations upon this point would have the effect of making the trade healthier, 10539-10541, 10635, 10638, 10642, 10670, 10671, 10681-10685.

Prevalence of pleuro-pneumonia in Holland; large sums voted by the Government of that country in compensation for the slaughter of animals suffering from the disease, 10540-10558, 10563-10566, 10568-10572, 10730, 10731—Statement that the importa-

tion

Report, 1873—continued.

Robinson, Anthony George. (Analysis of his Evidence)—continued.

tion of cattle from Austria, which used to be very considerable, has altogether fallen off, 10578—Increase in price of cattle in Spain and Portugal; falling off in the importation for this reason, 10579, 10580, 10767-10770.

Information in regard to the weight of foreign cattle, and the loss of live weight after a sea voyage, 10581-10593—Depreciation in value to the extent of 4*l.* by the loss of two cwt. in weight, 10594-10602—Large amount of dead meat imported from the continent; statement that this trade could not be carried on with advantage where the voyage is longer than thirty-six hours, 10603-10612, 10663-10665, 10702-10705.

Considerable amount of business done by witnesses in the cattle carrying trade; countries from which cattle are carried, 10613-10619, 10675-10680—Examination as to the countries which are scheduled under the Act of 1869; expediency of the restrictions being applied to all cattle coming from abroad, 10680-10686, 10727-10729—Occasional importation of cattle into Southampton, 10688-10691.

Statement that all the cattle imported by witnesses for the London market are landed at Thames Haven; considerable loss resulting from the slaughter of animals at that place, 10694-10699, 10738-10739, 10778—Return of the numbers of cattle imported from Portugal in the years 1868 to 1873 by witness, 10679-10674, 10701—Favourable terms upon which Russian cattle could be now imported to this country, 10690, 10700, 10706-10711.

Further evidence as to the expediency of fixed regulations for the import of foreign cattle; advantage of the certainty of the animals being slaughtered over the uncertainty of not knowing what to do with them, 10718-10723—The tendency of the London trade is towards the dead meat trade; expediency, for that reason, of all the foreign cattle being sent to Deptford, 10746-10757—Statement showing the prices of meat, in the London market, per hundred weight during the past few years, 10771-10773—Relative prices of meat in Holland in the year 1847, and in the present year, 10774-10776—Cause of the sudden drop in the Portuguese trade in 1874; 10777—Reason why witness brings the cattle to Thames Haven instead of Deptford, 10778.

Royal Agricultural Society. Instructions given by the Royal Agricultural Society to witnesses with regard to inquiries as to foot and mouth disease; report on the whole subject sent in by witness, *Jenkins* 5837-5842.

General disagreement with the statements contained in Mr. Jenkins' report; opinion that the right of entry to premises, as advocated by Mr. Jenkins, is highly objectionable, *Verdon* 7888-7903, 7976.

Resolutions laid before the Vice President of the Privy Council on the 4th July 1872, by the Royal Agricultural Society of England, relative to the precautions necessary to check the spread of foot and mouth disease, *App* 574, 575.

Suggestions by the Royal Agricultural Society, submitted to the Privy Council in December 1872, for preventing the spread of cattle diseases, and for amending the Act of 1869, *App* 576-578.

Royal Dublin Society. Disagreement with the report of the Council of the Royal Dublin Society, as regards the rigid enforcement of regulations for the prevention of disease, *Garret* 6437-6440.

Queries with regard to the spread of foot and mouth disease issued by the Dublin Agricultural Society; answers by witness to these queries, *Verdon* 7173-7176.

Conclusions and recommendations of the Society in March 1872 on the subject of fairs and markets, railway transit, lairs at seaports, steamers, &c., *App* 588, 589—Strong disapproval by the Society in May 1873 of a proposal for stopping all fairs and markets, and all movements of cattle and sheep for two months, *ib.* 589.

Russia. Prohibition of import of cattle from Russia by Order in Council, 19th July 1872, *Williams* 155-158—Proposition made to the Veterinary Department for the renewal of import from Russia; refusal thereof for the present, *ib.* 164-173—Statement as to Russia never being free from cattle plague, *ib.* 175—Grounds for the opinion that England will eventually be dependent indirectly upon Russia for her foreign supply; great importance on this score of effectual quarantine regulations on the German-Russian frontier, *ib.* 199-221, 717.

Great expense of an extensive system of quarantine in Russia before export to England, *Williams* 718-721—Introduction of the cattle plague into Hamburg, and thence to England by some Russian cattle, which went in the first instance from Cronstadt to Limerick; prohibition since placed upon the export of Russian cattle into North Germany, *ib.* 702-708—Explanation that sheep in Russia are scheduled, because of the cattle plague there, *ib.* 734.

Large number of cattle proposed to be imported by certain persons from Russia, only that the conditions were not deemed satisfactory, *Williams* 888-891—Decided advantage

Russia—continued.

tage if there could be an effectual inspection under the Privy Council at the export ports in Russia, *Williams* 932-939.

Examination with further reference to witness' grounds for the conclusion that in the future England will have to depend on Russia for her foreign supplies, or rather that Germany will, under strict regulations, import from Russia, and will export to this country, *Williams* 1178-1198.

Great and growing danger of the import of cattle plague with Russian cattle, unless stringent regulations are maintained, *Simonds* 3079-3095.—Objection to import direct from Russia, even though all the cattle were slaughtered at the port of landing, *ib.* 3091-3093-3595, 3597.

Opinion that without precautions Russia is not a safe country from which to import cattle; constant existence of cattle plague more or less in parts of that country, *Holmes* 10537, 10538, 10545-10557, 10593-10598, 10712-10717, 10721-10734.—Favourable terms upon which Russian cattle could be now imported into this country, *ib.* 10699, 10700, 10706-10711.—Opinion that it is not worth while to import Russian cattle, on account of the small numbers that could be brought, *Gebhardt* 12801, 12802.

S.

Salamanca. The commission charged in Liverpool for the sale of cattle is 2½ per cent. on the gross sale, which covers a guarantee; the charges in London are about 4 s. a head, *Verdon* 7770-7776.

Salford. Statement that of the cattle supplied to the Salford market, about five-sixths are from Ireland in summer, and in winter about one-half, *Lambert* 13464, 13465.—Regulations as to foot and mouth disease in cattle apply equally to sheep in the Salford market, *ib.* 13469, 13470.—Information as to the supply of German sheep in the Salford market, *ib.* 13475-13483.—Average numbers of cattle shown in the market, *ib.* 13496-13499.—Purchases of cattle in London which are brought to the Salford market, *ib.* 13798-13799.

Large numbers of cattle purchased by witness, as butcher and cattle dealer at Salford; about one-half of these are slaughtered and sold in carcasses, *W. Brown* 13853, 13857.—Chief consumption of this meat in Stockport and the surrounding towns, *ib.* 13858, 13859.

Sanitary Inspectors. Doubt as to the advantage of the unisance inspectors under Sanitary Acts reporting upon cases of cattle diseases, *Williams* 761-764.

Scheduled Countries (Act of 1869). See *Foreign Cattle.*

Schleswig-Holstein. Particulars as to the circumstances under which an Order in Council was issued in July 1872, admitting cattle from Schleswig and Holstein under certain stringent conditions; this order is now revoked, *Williams* 131-152.—Expectation that Germany will require the Schleswig and Holstein cattle for her own consumption, *ib.* 205, 206.—Statement as to the cattle from Schleswig and Holstein being now killed at the port of landing, *ib.* 1169-1171.

Large numbers of cattle which come to England from Schleswig-Holstein; supply of these cattle to this country influenced by the demands in other countries on the Continent, *Gebhardt* 12961-12977.—Satisfactory consequences of the removal of the restrictions as regards the Schleswig-Holstein cattle, *ib.* 13075-13085.

Scotland. Distinct treatment and regulations contemplated for Scotch cattle and for Irish cattle, *Simonds* 3615-3619.—Reasons for not including Scotland in the proposed regulations as to the cattle arriving from Ireland in England, *Clarke* 8368-8372.

Proposal that there should be a central committee at Edinburgh, made up of members of the local authorities, to take action for the suppression of cattle disease in Scotland, *Stewart* 11882-11889.—Statement that there is not sufficient demand in Edinburgh to induce consignors to send fat cattle from abroad, *Smith* 12328-12344.

See also *Aberdeenshire. Forfarshire. Glasgow. Perthshire.*

SHEEP:

1. *Foot and Mouth Disease.*
2. *Sheep-pox.*
3. *Sheep Scab.*
4. *Restrictions upon Foreign Import generally.*
5. *Sheep-breeding in Ireland and Scotland.*

1. *Foot and Mouth Disease:*

Considerable mortality of sheep from foot and mouth disease in 1862, *Brown* 1383, 1384.—Statement as to the relative character of the present and former outbreaks of the disease among

SHEEP—continued.

1. Foot and Mouth Disease—continued.

among sheep; considerable fatality of an outbreak near Harrow in 1862, *Brown* 2717-2722, 2724, 2725.—Doubt as to the development of the disease in the mouth of the sheep not having been as great in former years as at present, *ib.* 2719-2721, 2883-2885.

Serious extent to which sheep have been attacked with foot and mouth disease, *Sherratt* 4501, 4555, 4619-4621, 4736-4740.—Witness has had as many as 1,000 sheep attacked with foot and mouth disease, *ib.* 4501.—Very serious losses of witness from the foot and mouth disease among his sheep; large losses throughout the East Riding, *Fisher* 5128-5145, 5199-5205.

Outbreak of foot and mouth disease among some sheep purchased by witness at Falkirk in October 1872, *Morrow* 5614-5624.—Opinion as to witness' sheep in Ireland having at one time suffered from an attack of foot and mouth disease, *ib.* 5725-5729, 5758-5803.—Relative effect of sheep rot and of foot and mouth disease in the case of witness' sheep, *ib.* 5798-5803, 5827, 5828.

2. Sheep-pox:

Sufficiency of the present precautions for preventing, by isolation, outbreaks of sheep-pox; slaughtering is not necessary, though it would be advantageous, *Williams* 356-362.—Statement to the effect that witness would not have a country scheduled with regard to sheep, owing to sheep-pox, *ib.* 1042-1054.

Want of more stringent regulations as to slaughtering in the case of sheep-pox, *Brown* 1738-1742.—Opinion that sheep-pox is a very serious disease, and that the present restrictions should be increased, *ib.* 2101-2105.—Expediency of a system of compulsory slaughter in the case of sheep-pox, *ib.* 2700, 2702.

Prevalence of sheep-pox in 1848; efficiency of strict isolation in keeping it down in that year and subsequently, *Simonds* 3050-3055.—Approval of strict regulations as to movement and isolation in the case of sheep-pox, but not of compulsory slaughter, *ib.* 3054-3056.—Several causes of the spread of sheep-pox in Norfolk in 1848; very imperfect inoculation and vaccination at that period, *ib.* 3247-3252.—Approval of inoculation (but not of vaccination) for sheep-pox under certain circumstances, *ib.* 3251-3255.—Modified system of slaughter proposed to be supplied in connection with sheep-pox; suggestions also for daily inspection and careful isolation, *ib.* 3255-3264.

Absence of sheep-pox in Ireland, *Baldwin* 3883-3885.—Admirability of slaughtering flocks that are infected with sheep-pox; inefficiency of inoculation as a preventive of sheep-pox, *McBride* 9048, 9049, 9163-9165, 9204-9210.—Means necessary to be taken to prevent the spread of sheep-pox among flocks, *Gangee* 9469, 9470.

Recommendation by the Committee that the slaughter of all sheep affected with sheep-pox should be compulsory with compensation, *Rep.* iv.

3. Sheep Scab:

Witness does not believe that scab has been introduced from abroad, every case being taken at the ports, *Williams* 335-337.—Adequacy of the present regulations as regards scab in sheep if they were only carried out, *Brown* 1583-1587.—The disease is not a fatal one, but produces much loss of condition, *ib.* 1596.—The affection is local and is cured without much difficulty, *ib.* 1597.

Very infectious character of sheep scab, so that it may well be placed under stringent restrictions, *Simonds* 3190-3198, 3239-3246.—Consideration of the powers of inspection and the powers of entry necessary in order to secure a proper treatment or dressing of scab in sheep, *ib.* 3354-3360, 3363-3368.

Information with regard to scab in sheep; statement that this disease is of a very transient character, *Verdon* 7783-7800.—Opinion that scab is of trivial consequence, *Walsh* 8074-8080, 8134-8138.—Inexpediency of including sheep-scab in the Act, *Lambert* 13471-13474, 13493-13740.—Insignificance of the disease, *W. Brown* 13859, 13900.

4. Restrictions upon Foreign Import generally:

Nature of the restrictions as to sheep and pigs imported from foreign countries, *Williams* 159-163.—Restrictions as regards sheep which come over with cattle from scheduled countries, *ib.* 715, 716.—Particulars relative to the inspection of foreign sheep as carried out at Brown's Wharf in London; opinion that the inspection does not guarantee the detection of foot and mouth disease, *Hunting* 4788-4795, 4809-4825.

5. Sheep-breeding in Ireland and Scotland:

Statement as to witness (in Ireland) having kept fewer cattle of late years and more sheep, the latter paying pretty well, *Morrow* 5793, 5797.—Information as to the reduction in the number of sheep; statement that the breeding of sheep has been largely discontinued both in Ireland and in Scotland, *Verdon* 7997-8005.

See also *Ballinacree Fair*. *Fairs and Markets*. *Weyhill Fair*.

Report, 1873—continued.

Sheffield.—Grounds for the conclusion that compulsory slaughter at the ports would be injurious to the butcher in Sheffield; also to the public by the deterioration of the meat, Woodcock 13815, 13828, 13841-13843.—Small number of sheep obtained from Hull for the Sheffield market, *ib.* 13831-13837.

Shipment and Landing of Cattle. See *Cattle Ships.* *Cruelty.*

Second, Professor James Beart. (Analysis of his Evidence.)—Is principal of the Royal Veterinary College, 2892.—Was an officer of the Privy Council Veterinary Department up to March 1873; was for many years previously employed on the part of Government in reference to the diseases of animals, and has on several occasions made official investigations on the Continent relative to cattle plague, pleuro-pneumonia, &c., 2893-2903.

First experience of witness as to the foot and mouth disease in 1839, when it was conveyed to a farm near Laleham by some suckling calves from the Metropolitan market, 2904-2910.—Proof by experiment that the disease may be conveyed by pigs, 2908.—Prevalence of the disease in 1840 and 1841; serious outbreaks also in 1845, 1862, and 1869; 2907-2910, 2916-2918.—Considerable fatality from the disease in 1840-41, owing very much to its treatment having been misunderstood, 2911-2914.

Statement as to sheep, pigs, and domestic poultry being susceptible of foot and mouth disease; belief that dogs, hares, and rabbits, and birds generally are not liable to the disease, 2919-2941.—More serious outbreak in 1872, but for the Act of 1869; 2920, 2921.—Appearance of the disease in Ireland in 1839, since which year there have been several outbreaks, 2922-2924.—Difficulty in accounting for the original introduction of the disease into England, foreign cattle not having been then imported: it probably was brought in by ship stores, 2925, 2926, 2928-2937.—Very long period for which the disease has existed in Europe, whilst at present it is spread almost over the globe, 2937, 2928.

Peculiar circumstances under which the foot and mouth disease was conveyed to New South Wales by some cattle from England, 2939-2942.—Conclusion as to human beings not being liable to the disease, 2942, 2943.—Material effect of the cattle plague restrictions in decreasing the amount of foot and mouth disease, 2944-2948.—Doubt as to the prevalence of the disease in 1872 having been chiefly owing to foreign import, 2949.—Opinion that mere isolation would not suffice to get rid of the disease, and that it would be necessary for the purpose to re-impose the same stringent regulations as to removal, &c., which were in force for the cattle plague, 2950-2956.

Evidence to the effect that witness disapproves of the prohibition of removal, and that even with extreme and stringent regulations foot and mouth disease would not be extirpated, and would again break out; nor would the farmers tolerate extreme measures on the subject, 2955-2977.—Approval of the continued prohibition upon the exposure of diseased animals in fairs and markets, 2967, 2978.—Objection to any restrictions by Orders in Council beyond those in the Act, 2967, 2977, 3000.—Opinion that animals under the disease should be removable from the farm to the slaughterhouse, or from one part of a farm to another part, 2979-2983, 3001.

Proposition that all foreign fat stock found to be the subjects of foot and mouth disease should be slaughtered on the spot, 2984, 2995-2998.—Also that all foreign store stock, if affected with the disease, should be returned to the country whence exported, 2984-2991, 2995-2998, 3002.—Also that Irish fat cattle, if diseased, should be slaughtered at the port of landing, and that Irish store cattle, when diseased, should be sent back to Ireland, 2985, 2992-2994, 3003, 3212-3214.—Proposed detention of six hours in the case of Irish cattle, 2992, 3003.

Incubation period of foot and mouth disease from forty hours to three days, 2993.—Doubt as to the disease being caught to any extent on board the vessels from Ireland, 2994.—Approval of greater stringency in dealing with imported animals than with home animals, 2996-2998.—Contemplated maintenance of the prohibition against placing upon uninclosed land any animal affected with contagious disease, 2999.

Existence of pleuro-pneumonia both in England and Ireland as early as 1841, there being no proof that it came direct from abroad, 3004-3007.—Belief that foot and mouth disease does not arise spontaneously, 3008-3010.—Nor is pleuro-pneumonia spontaneous, 3011.—Very long period of incubation in the case of pleuro-pneumonia, 3011, 3012.—Less infectious character of pleuro-pneumonia than of foot and mouth disease, the former being more easy to stamp out, 3013-3016.

Average of about 1 per cent. as the mortality from foot and mouth disease, 3017.—Belief that the average loss is nothing like 2 1/2 per head upon the total number of animals affected with the disease, 3018, 3019.—Great facility in cases of pleuro-pneumonia, 3020.—Slight value of animals attacked with this disease, unless they be at once sold for dead meat, 3021-3023.—Belief that the flesh of animals affected with the disease is not unwholesome; many thousands have been eaten, 3024.

Proposition that each county be divided into sections, and that a professional inspector be appointed for each section, to whom the local veterinary surgeons should report

Simonds, Professor James Beart. (Analysis of his Evidence)—continued.

report the occurrence of any outbreak of contagious disease, 3025-3041.—Opinion that it should be imperative at once to slaughter animals affected with pleuro-pneumonia, 3042-3044.—Approval generally of thirty days as the interval before an infected place can be declared to be uninfected, 3045.

Suggestion that all fat cattle from abroad or from Ireland, suffering from pleuro-pneumonia, should be slaughtered at the port, 3046-3049.—All store cattle so suffering should be sent back, 3046.—Prevalence of sheep-pox in 1848; efficiency of street isolation in keeping it down in that year and subsequently, 3050-3057.—Approval of strict regulations as to movement and isolation in the case of sheep-pox, but not of compulsory slaughter, 3054-3058.

Concurrence in the view that cattle plague was imported by the "Joseph Soames," 3057-3060.—Varying symptoms of cattle plague; scientific knowledge required for its detection, 3061-3065.—Enlarged powers of slaughter desirable in reference to cattle plague, 3066, 3067.—Liberal compensation suggested in cases of slaughter on account of cattle plague, 3068-3070.—Expediency of prohibiting the sale for food of any animal which has had the cattle plague, 3071.

Improvement required as regards the defined part of the port of Hull, 3072, 3073.—Very complete arrangements at Deptford, 3074, 3075.—Further provision required as to isolation, disinfection, &c., where animals are landed from scheduled countries, 3076-3078.—Great and growing danger of the import of cattle plague with Russian cattle, unless stringent regulations are maintained, 3079-3086.—Objection to import direct from Russia even though all the cattle were slaughtered at the port of landing, 3091-3093.

Expediency of maintaining the distinction between scheduled and unscheduled countries, 3094, 3095.—Doubt as to Holland continuing to export her cattle to England, 3096, 3097.—Objection to the slaughter at the port of cattle from healthy countries like Spain and Portugal, 3098.—Disapproval also of all import being confined to dead meat, 3099, 3100.—Opinion that abattoirs in London would be better than private slaughter-houses, 3101-3103.

Better provision made for foreign cattle on board ship since the issue of the transit orders of the Privy Council, 3104, 3105, 3111.—Considerable difficulty still experienced as to the ventilation of some of the vessels coming to the Thames, 3106, 3107.—Improved accommodation and ventilation in vessels used exclusively for cattle, 3107-3110.—Excellent care taken of the cattle on the voyage from Spain and Portugal, 3112-3117.—Gradual exhaustion of the supply from these countries, 3118, 3119.—Good treatment of the cattle from Denmark, 3120.—Expediency of water being supplied every eighteen or twenty hours, 3121, 3122.—Less satisfactory accommodation in the vessels to the outports than to London, 3122-3124.

Considerable overcrowding of cattle on railways; reference especially to fresh store cattle, 3127-3130.—Improved supply of water at railway stations, though the cattle are not always watered before they are trucked; this should be imperative in many cases, 3133-3138.—Circumstances of the animals from Aberdeen to London not being watered during the journey (about thirty-six hours); very good condition in which they arrive, 3139-3142.—Difficulty of watering during railway transit; suggestions on the subject, 3143-3151.

Considerable difficulty as to the disinfection of the vessels, more especially from Ireland; want of a system of central inspection for this purpose, 3152-3162.—Expediency also of the railway trucks, &c. being under the inspection of the central authority, 3163.—Explanatory statement relative to the salary of witness when an officer of the Veterinary Department, with considerations as to the remuneration generally of the office of inspector in reference to the responsible duties to be performed, 3164-3174.

Absence of any statistics at the command of Professor Brown and witness in estimating at about one per cent. the loss from imported disease between July 1842 and December 1867; 3175-3177.—Several ways in which foot and mouth disease causes loss of condition, 3178, 3179.—Belief that the disease does not tend to render pleuro-pneumonia more virulent, 3180, 3181.—Peculiarly contagious character of the disease further adverted to, 3182.—Entire failure of legislation as regards the disease, 3183.—Room for much improvement as regards inspection and movement of cattle, and as regards fairs and markets; check thereby to the disease, 3184-3186.

Further disbelief expressed as to the spontaneous origination of various cattle diseases, 3187-3189.—Very infectious character of sheep-scab, so that it may well be placed under stringent restrictions, 3190-3198. 3235-3246.—Further suggestions as to the appointment of district inspectors by Government, and as to their remuneration, 3199-3208.—Expediency of similar legislation and similar restrictions, as far as possible, for Ireland and for England, 3208-3214.

Failure of attempts to produce pleuro-pneumonia save by contagion; inference that

Sinonds, Professor James Beart. (Analysis of his Evidence)—continued.

the disease might be stamped out, 3215, 3216, 3304-3306—Approval of the hides of diseased animals being utilised if they are properly disinfectcd, 3215-3217, 3222, 3223—Belief as to the entire failure of inoculation in reference to pleuro-pneumonia, 3220, 3221, 3253, 3302—Further reference to the more infectious character of foot and mouth disease than of pleuro-pneumonia, 3220, 3221, 3302-3306—Approval of the meat being used of animals slaughtered as being headed with others which have cattle plague; necessity, however, of careful precautions, 3222, 3223—Belief that glandered horses are numerous in London, the law on the subject being entirely neglected, 3224-3226.

Carelessness of farmers in former years as to the existence of foot and mouth disease, 3227, 3228, 3232, 3233—Instances, many years ago, of the same animals having had the disease several times in succession, 3229-3231—Avoidance of hardship to cattle in inland transit if quicker travelling could be secured, 3234, 3235, 3323, 3324—Approval of limiting the number of ports for cattle from scheduled countries, and of requiring the provision of proper slaughter-houses, and means of disinfection, 3235-3238.

Several causes of the spread of sheep-pox in Norfolk in 1848; very imperfect inoculation and vaccination at that period, 3247-3252—Approval of inoculation (but not of vaccination) for sheep-pox under certain circumstances, 3251-3255—System of slaughter proposed to be applied in connection with sheep-pox; suggestions also for daily inspection and careful isolation, 3255-3264.

Conclusion, as regards the outbreak of foot and mouth disease at Langley, in Norfolk, in November 1859, that the disease was conveyed thither from London, rather than from Yarmouth or Lowestoft, 3265-3272—Examination to the effect that since 1839 the disease has never really died out in England or Ireland; difficulty, however, in accounting for the periodical violence of the disease, 3274-3291—Comment upon the want of uniformity in the treatment of the disease by the county and other local authorities, 3295-3300.

Expected willingness of owners to approve the slaughter of animals attacked with pleuro-pneumonia, 3301—Opinion that animals herded with those which have been attacked should not be slaughtered, but should be isolated and carefully watched, 3302, 3305—Conclusion as regards the import of pleuro-pneumonia, that slaughter should only apply to those animals which are infected, and that no undue restrictions should be applied to stock cattle, 3310-3315.

Further statement relative to the arrangements as to ventilation, &c., in the cattle ships coming to different ports; difficulty of improvement, 3316-3322—Inaccurate reports from local inspectors on the subject of cattle plague, 3325, 3326—Doubt as to the sending of scheduled cattle to Depford having had any effect on the price, 3327-3330.

Full employment for the clerical and other staff of the Veterinary Department, as well as for the two inspectors, 3331-3334—Requirement of a staff of inspectors throughout the country if the new transit orders are to be enforced, and if the railway arrangements are to be properly supervised, 3334-3339.

[Second Examination.] Facility desirable as regards the removal of animals under foot and mouth disease from one part of a farm to another; slight risk run, 3340, 3349, 3381—Approval also of the removal for a distance of animals which have been exposed to pleuro-pneumonia; that is, under careful restrictions, 3341-3346.

Further statement as to certain contagious diseases in cattle not being spontaneous, 3347-3349—Opinion that a non-fatal contagious disease, such as foot and mouth disease, should remain in the Act, but should not be subject to Orders in Council, 3350-3353, 3527-3529—Consideration of the powers of inspection and the powers of entry necessary in order to secure a proper treatment or dressing of scab in sheep, 3354-3360, 3363-3368—Periodical outbreaks of foot and mouth disease further adverted to in connection with the gradual decline of the disease after each outbreak, 3361, 3362, 3369-3379—Inference as to the check given to the disease by the cattle plague restrictions, 3377-3379.

Examination in dissent from the view that much danger would arise from the movement of cattle affected with foot and mouth disease along a public highway to a slaughter-house, 3383-3393—Propagation of the disease by means of the morbid matter contained in the breath, 3389-3393—Slight extent to which inspection at the port of shipment in Ireland would have a deterrent effect, 3394, 3395—Witness repeats that save in the case of milch cows, the average loss from foot and mouth disease is nothing like 2*l* a head, 3396-3399—Statement showing the danger of supplying calves with the milk of a cow affected with the disease, 3400.

Further explanations in connection with the proposed appointment and functions of the county inspectors under the Central Department; reliance to be placed upon the veterinary

Simonds, Professor James Beart. (Analysis of his Evidence)—continued.

veterinary surgeons throughout the country for giving information to the inspectors, 3401-3416.—Contemplated report by the inspectors to the local authority though they should be amenable only to the Central Department, 3401-3406.—Duty of the police (under witness' scheme) to make reports to the local authority, and to guard against the removal of animals without licenses, 3407-3413.

Proposal that orders for slaughtering should proceed from the Central Department, 3414-3416.—Several diseases proposed to be under the direct control of the Central Department; this would necessitate a very large department, 3416. 3423-3425.—Professional inspection necessary for the prompt detection of pleuro-pneumonia, 3417, 3418.—Further explanations as to the extent to which slaughtering should be resorted to, and as to the point at which isolation should come in, 3427-3431.

Circumstances under which inoculation and slaughter should, respectively, be resorted to in case of sheep-pox, 3437-3445.—Considerable advantage likely to arise from reducing the local authorities and from preventing the present conflict of interest between the county and borough authorities, 3448-3454.—Explanation that the proposed detention of Irish cattle for six hours is very different from quarantine, 3455-3459.—Objection to private lairs at the ports, it being expedient that proper lairs should be provided by the local authorities, 3460-3462.

Importance of arrangements for the proper cleansing as well as the disinfection of railway trucks, 3463-3468.—Difficulty as to the cleansing and disinfection of vessels in which cattle are only part of the cargo, 3467, 3468.—Check desirable as regards the propagation of cattle plague by running water, 3469, 3470.—Approval of more stringent regulations as regards foreign stock than home stock, 3471-3473.—Further statement in favour of sending back to Ireland any store stock found to be diseased, or in contact with diseased animals, whilst diseased hit stock should be slaughtered at the port, 3474-3478. 3501-3518. 3530, 3531. 3543-3549. 3598.

Explanation and defence of the practice as to slaughtering the whole cargo of cattle or of sheep from aboard if only one animal of the same kind has contagious disease, 3479-3490. 3532-3536.—Further reference to the transmission of foot and mouth disease to New South Wales, 3497, 3498.—Great variation in the time for which an animal under this disease would continue to throw off infection, 3499, 3500.—Improvement desirable at Deptford by bringing railway communication into the market, 3518-3526.

Grounds for the conclusion that the available supply of cattle in Spain and Portugal for export is being exhausted, 3536-3538.—Belief as to the available export supply on the Continent generally having much decreased, with the exception of Russia, 3538-3551. 3591-3597.—Attention of witnesses drawn to a certain apparatus as effectually ventilating the holds of cattle ships, 3543-3547.—Absence of any preventive to foot and mouth disease, or to its spread, 3548-3553.

Belief that the staff of the veterinary department has ample work to do, though certain statistics are no longer kept, 3554-3560.

Original outbreak of foot and mouth disease in London in 1839 further adverted to as not being positively traceable to any source, 3561-3568.—Conclusion that the disease is not merely an epidemic, 3568-3570.—Further statement as to the extremely infectious character of the disease; illustrations to this effect, 3570-3575.—Reason for the removal of existing restrictions notwithstanding the infectious nature of the disease, 3576-3581.

Reference to be placed upon Ireland to English import of cattle, 3592, 3596.—Strong disapproval of import from Russia, 3596, 3597.—Approval of Irish cattle being sent with in the same way as English cattle if the restrictions in Ireland were the same as in England, 3598-3601. 3615-3626.—Explanation that witness has not inspected any of the Irish vessels, 3602.—Proposed detention of Irish cattle for six hours for the purpose of feeding and watering them, as well as for inspecting them, 3603, 3604.—Entire inadequacy of a detention of six hours as a check upon pleuro-pneumonia, immediate slaughter being desirable, 3605-3609.

Dissent from the view that when animals have been for several hours unfed on board ships, there is an increased tendency to infectious disease, 3610-3614.—Doubt as to treatment contemplated for Scotch cattle and for Irish cattle, 3613-3619.—Explanation that witness disapproves of the immediate slaughter of animals in contact with those suffering from pleuro-pneumonia; comment thereon upon the apparently beneficial results of this system in Holland, 3619-3639.

Conclusion further expressed as to cattle plague having been imported into Hull from the "Joseph Soames," though the cattle were never landed, 3640-3646.—Statement in further explanation of witness' suggestions for improving the arrangements and landing accommodation at Hull, 3647-3651.—Particulars as to the part taken by witness and Professor Brown, and by the local authorities, in reference to the "Joseph Soames" case, 3652-3658.

Sinonds, Professor James Beart. (Analysis of his Evidence.)—continued.

Decided objection to quarantine regulations in Russia, and to direct import thence, 3659, 3660.—Strong disapproval of a plan of quarantine at Thames Haven or elsewhere, 3661.—Examination as to the grounds for witnesses' apprehensions as to Irish dealers exporting infected cattle to England, in the absence of stringent regulations on this side, 3662-3675, 3680, 3681.—Consultation of witness relative to the provisions of the Bill of 1859, on which occasion he expressed but little confidence in any regulations for the suppression of foot and mouth disease, 3676-3679.

Slaughter (Diseased Cattle). Suggestions as to the powers and duties to be vested in the local authorities relative to slaughtering in the case, respectively, of cattle plague, pleuro-pneumonia, and sheep-pox, Brown 2397-2410.—Necessity of considerable loss at time in respect of slaughtered animals, &c. 2427-2430.—Means of marking animals by cutting hair from the end of the tail, so as to identify them for slaughtering, &c. 2480-2493.

Expediency of there being facilities given to farmers for the slaughter of diseased animals by the butcher; statement that this power does not exist at the present time, Garnet 6910-6930.—Decided opinion that all cattle which are herded with diseased cattle should be slaughtered; expediency of giving the power of slaughtering to the Privy Council, McBride 9043-9047.

Recommendations by the Committee on the subject of slaughter, in the case, respectively, of cattle plague, pleuro-pneumonia, sheep-pox, glanders, and foot and mouth disease, *Rep.* iii-r.

See also *Carcasses.* *Cattle Plague.* *Compensation.* *Dead Meat.* *Deptford Market.* *Foot and Mouth Disease*, VII. *Foreign Cattle*, 7. *Ireland and Irish Cattle*, VIII. *Local Authorities.* *Pleuro-pneumonia*, 6. *Ports.* *Priests.* *Privy Council.* *West Bromwich.*

Slaughter-houses. Expediency of doing away with private slaughter-houses on account of the facility of spreading disease; instances in which disease has been transmitted from these places, Ganges 9482-9485.—Expediency of abolishing private slaughter-houses in London, Odams 10001.—See also *Abattoirs.*

Smith, David. (Analysis of his Evidence.)—Is a cattle dealer in Fife-shire; farms about 700 acres of land, 12292-12294.—Purchases made by witness of about 2,000 store cattle every year; large number of these cattle obtained from Hanover and from Holland, 12296-12304.—Healthy character of the Hanoverian cattle; unsatisfactory character of those obtained from Holland, 12305-12313.

Opinion that the cattle from Hanover could be imported at considerable advantage, 12314, 12315.—Store cattle sold by witness and purchased back when fattened; considerable scarcity of stores at present in Scotland, 12316-12319.—Difficulty of importing cattle from Tanning on account of the want of direct communication; unsuitability of Tanning for the exportation of store cattle, 12320-12327, 12335-12337.

Description of the store cattle trade between Homburg and this country previous to the cattle plague, 12328-12334.—Statement that there is not sufficient demand in Edinburgh to induce consignors to send fat cattle, 12338-12344.—Higher prices charged for meat in Glasgow than in the Metropolitan Market; the consumption of meat in Glasgow has tripled since the year 1851; 12345-12353.

Considerable advantage which would result from the removal of the prohibition to remove cattle from Leith to Glasgow to be slaughtered, 12355-12361.—Opinion that the cost of the restrictions as regards foot and mouth disease is greater than the value received from them; insignificant character of the disease, 12362-12367, 12414-12445.

Desirability of slaughtering animals that are severely affected with pleuro-pneumonia; opinion that store animals should not be removed from an infected place, 12368-12382.—Examination as to the transit of cattle by railway; contention that the greatest improvement is required in the speed with which they are carried, 12383-12392, 12397, 12398.

Fair condition in which the railway tracks are kept; where they are dirty it is on account of the want of time to cleanse them, 12393-12396.—Suggestions as to the means to be adopted for the improvement of the lairage at Glasgow, 12399-12413.

Smith, Captain John. (Analysis of his Evidence.)—Is chief constable of Cheshire; Orders in Council in regard to the cattle plague have been carried out under his superintendence, 10150, 10151.—Absence of co-operation between the boroughs in the county as to carrying out the Orders; expediency of having a county board upon which the local authorities would be represented, 10152-10154.

Strict manner in which the Act has been carried out in Cheshire; increase of foot and mouth disease in the county, notwithstanding this stringency, 10155-10158, 10394-10398.—Examination as to the means adopted by the police in carrying out the provisions of the Act; proceedings taken by the local authorities upon the discovery of cases

Smith, Captain James. (Analysis of his Evidence)—continued.

cases of disease, 10155, 10150-10151, 10160-10171, 10212-10214, 10222-10243, 10314-10323, 10424-10427.

Statement that the county of Cheshire is more free from pleuro-pneumonia at the present time than it has been at any previous period, 10158, 10159.—Inspection of railway trucks left altogether to the railway authorities; unsatisfactory state of those trucks as regards their cleanliness, 10160-10163, 10324-10329.—Desirability of there being an inspector appointed by the Privy Council to see that cattle trucks are properly cleansed and disinfected; opinion that this officer's jurisdiction should not be confined to Cheshire alone, 10163-10165, 10329.

Additional labour put upon the police in carrying out the inspection under the Act, 10172-10177.—Suggestions as to amending the existing orders; expediency of an isolation of fourteen days in the case of all newly-purchased stock, 10176-10184, 10260-10300.—Inability of stopping all fairs and markets at particular periods; this regulation counteracted by effecting private sales, 10180, 10353-10355.—Decided opinion that all animals affected with pleuro-pneumonia should be immediately slaughtered; compulsory slaughter not resorted to in Cheshire at the present time, 10183-10195, 10245-10251, 10274-10277, 10302-10304.

Considerable losses suffered by the farmers in Cheshire during the time of compulsory slaughter, for which they received no compensation from Government, 10188-10204, 10304.—Expediency of paying compensation out of the Imperial Exchequer, or out of a poll rate upon every head of cattle in Great Britain, 10204, 10304.

Unfavourable opinion of the present state of veterinary science; indefinite knowledge as to pleuro-pneumonia possessed by veterinary surgeons, 10205-10207, 10244.—Contention that the best treatment for foot and mouth disease is to let it run its course and to take care of the animal, 10209-10211.

Mysterious character of the foot and mouth disease in Cheshire as regards the suddenness with which it comes and goes; similarity of the disease to cholera in this respect, 10215-10225, 10245, 10249-10251, 10345-10351.—Considerable amount of diseased meat prepared for sale by slush butchers; punishment of those persons when detected, 10218, 10308, 10309, 10366-10376.

Examination as to the introduction of diseased animals from Ireland; opinion that though the stoppage of the import of cattle from Ireland would not give immunity from disease, it would have the effect of cutting off a main source, 10253-10263, 10330-10337, 10356-10361, 10365-10365, 10379-10393.

Expediency of a period of ten days' quarantine at the port of debarkation for the discovery of rinderpest and foot and mouth disease; opinion that for pleuro-pneumonia no time would be long enough, 10264, 10265.—Necessity for a liberal compensation for slaughtered animals, with a view to an early discovery of disease, 10266-10273.—Information as to the introduction of pleuro-pneumonia into Cheshire; difficulty of detecting the disease until it has arrived at an advanced stage, 10278-10285, 10305-10313.

Opinion that the stoppage of the importation of foreign cattle would be a serious impediment to trade, 10338-10347, 10369.—Belief in the spontaneous generation of cattle disease; contention that the exclusion of foreign cattle would not free us from those diseases, 10343-10347, 10377, 10378, 10408-10434.

Further examination as to the introduction of diseased cattle into Cheshire from Ireland; distinctive difference between the appearance of Welsh and Irish cattle, 10399-10410, 10421, 10422.—Opinion that there must be some predisposing cause for the prevalence of cattle diseases in Cheshire of which there is no positive knowledge, 10411-10416, 10423.—Statement that there is no importation of cattle into Wales, except that which is brought by landowners to their own estates, 10434-10443.

Southampton. Occasional importation of cattle (by wicker only) into Southampton, Robinson 10038-10041.

Spain and Portugal. Proportion of the cattle from Spain and Portugal which come to Liverpool and to Southampton, Williams 862-864.—Very good condition in which the Spanish cattle arrive, Brown 1815-1818.—Rare existence of disease among the Spanish cattle imported into Ireland, id. 2079-2081.

Objection to the slaughter at the port of cattle from healthy countries like Spain and Portugal, Simonds 3098.—Excellent care taken of the cattle on the voyage from Spain and Portugal, id. 3112-3117.—Gradual exhaustion of the supply from these countries, id. 3118, 3119.—Grounds for the conclusion that the available supply of cattle in Spain and Portugal for export is being exhausted, id. 3536-3538.

Grounds for the conclusion that no disease has been imported into Ireland from Spain or Portugal, Balchin 3830, 3831, 3842, 3850, 4394-4400.—Circumstance of foot and mouth disease having been recently imported to Dublin with some Spanish or Portuguese cattle; summary measures adopted in this case, Ferguson 4942, 4947, 4948, 5022, 5023.

Report, 1873—continued.

Spain and Portugal—continued.

Inutility of slaughtering Spanish and Portuguese cattle upon arrival in this country; opinion that these cattle are as healthy as our own, *Gowree* 9730-9733.—Contradiction of the statement that foot and mouth disease does not exist in Spain and Portugal; instance of the importation of 100 Spanish cattle, some of which were suffering with that disease, *Odores* 9982-9991.—Generally healthy character of the cattle of Spain and Portugal; belief that this is chiefly attributable to the favourable climate, *ib.* 10109, 10110.—Stringent regulations as to the slaughter of Spanish and Portuguese cattle adopted in Liverpool in the year 1868, *ib.* 10110-10117.

Increase of price of cattle in Spain and Portugal; falling off in the importations for this reason, *Robinson* 10379, 10382, 10767-10770.—Return of the numbers of cattle imported from Portugal in the years 1868 to 1873, *ib.* 10672-10674, 10701.—Cause of the sudden drop in the Portuguese trade in 1872, *ib.* 10777.

Instances of Spanish cattle afflicted with foot and mouth disease, *Webb* 14072-14074.—Decrease in the number of Spanish and Portuguese cattle on account of the war in France, *Gedder* 12908-12914.

Spontaneous Generation of Disease. Disbelief expressed as to the spontaneous origin of various cattle diseases, *Simonds* 3008-3011, 3187-3189, 3347-3349.—Explosion of that witness does not believe in the spontaneous generation of cattle plague, foot and mouth disease, or pleuro-pneumonia, though in the latter case the disease cannot always be traced to contagion or infection, *Ferguson* 5348-5351, 5355.—Opinion that cattle diseases are not generated spontaneously; belief that they come from abroad, *Goodell* 11688, 11689.

Belief in the spontaneous generation of cattle diseases; contention that the exclusion of foreign cattle would not free us from these diseases, *Smith* 10343-10347, 10377, 10378, 10408-10434.

See also *Foot and Mouth Disease*, I., 4.

Statistics. Improvement if certain returns to the Inland Revenue were made by the inspectors under the Act of 1869, *Williams* 360-365.—Way in which the returns of cattle for the agricultural districts might be made by veterinary inspectors throughout the country, *ib.* 813-815.—Advantage of keeping up the present statistics in witness' department, though they are done away with as regards the foot and mouth disease, *ib.* 915, 916.—Discontinuance of the statistics of foot and mouth disease further adverted to and explained, *ib.* 955-958.—Approval of statistics being kept by the Irish Veterinary Department relative to foot and mouth disease, *ib.* 1106-1108.

Approval of veterinary surgeons being required to certificate diseases on payment of a fee, *Brown* 2590.—Statistics as to foot and mouth disease are not of much use unless they are followed up by active legislation, *ib.* 2822.

Explanation on the subject of the discontinuance of the statistics of foot and mouth disease, more especially as regards the clerical labours involved, *Exonley Wilmet* 3705-3707, 3758-3765.

Witness was in charge of the statistical branch of the Cattle Plague Department in 1866-67, and found it in much confusion; he left it in better working order, *Clode* 9399-9403.—Explanation as to the special duties devolving upon Dr. Farr, the superintendent of statistics, *ib.* 10444-10448.

See also *Reports and Statistics (Cattle Plague)*.

Steamers. See *Cattle Ships*.

Stewart, George. (Analysis of his Evidence).—Is inspector for the local authority of Perthshire; is exclusively employed to look after disease in the county, 11733, 11734.—Examination as to the state of foot and mouth disease in the county; gradual extension of the disease throughout Scotland, 11736-11740, 11841-11845.—Opinion that the disease might be conveyed from field to field by hares, without their being themselves afflicted with it, 11747-11750.—Amount of loss in the year 1872 from foot and mouth disease in Perthshire, estimated at ten per cent., 11751-11758.

Decided opinion in favour of slaughtering animals affected with pleuro-pneumonia; movement of animals suffering from this disease should be restricted to three months at the most, 11759-11772, 11890-11898.—The estimated loss from pleuro-pneumonia last year in Perthshire was about 4,000 £, 11769, 11770.

Contention that the owner should be compensated for compulsory slaughter by only about one-half of the value, 11773-11778, 11890-11896.—Expediency of giving the farmers more liberty to remove their cattle, when affected with pleuro-pneumonia, to fat markets for the purposes of sale and slaughter, 11779-11793.

Examination with regard to the transit of cattle from Ireland; decided opinion in favour of inspection at the port of shipment, 11794-11831, 11838-11840, 11873-11881.—Absence of conflicting interests in Perthshire between the county and borough, 11892.

Stewart, George. (Analysis of his Evidence)—continued.

11832-11837—Prevalence of foot and mouth disease in the Irish cattle which came into the county, 11841.

Suggestions as to the regulations necessary for the proper cleansing and disinfecting of railway trucks, 11846-11851—Necessity for the separation of fat and store markets; opinion that their being together is a great source of the spread of the disease, 11852-11857—Means to be adopted for the prevention of movement of diseased animals upon public roads, 11858-11861.

Expediency of power being given under the Act for disinfecting premises and separating diseased from healthy animals, 11869-11871—Proposal that there should be a central committee at Edinburgh made up of members of the local authorities to take action for the suppression of cattle disease in Scotland, 11882-11889.

[Second Examination].—Evidence in further support of the statement that pleuro-pneumonia was imported into Scotland from Ireland; desirability of restrictions being stringently carried out in Ireland, 11954-11961. 11967-11969—Satisfactory manner in which police inspection has worked in Scotland; all the cattle are held in check by the police until examined by the inspector, 11969-11966—Decided opinion that the same stringency should be observed with pleuro-pneumonia as with foot and mouth disease, 11977.

Store Cattle. Import of disease from Ireland to England, chiefly with the small store cattle sent from Waterford and Cork, *Brown* 1772-1782—Desire of the graziers in Ireland that Irish store cattle should not get a good reputation in England, so as better to keep them at home for fattening, *ib.* 2038, 2052-2056.

Proposition that all foreign store stock, if afflicted with foot and mouth disease, should be returned to the country whence exported, *Simonds* 2982-2991, 2995-2998, 3002—All store cattle suffering from pleuro-pneumonia should also be sent back to the port whence they came, *ib.* 3046.

Objection to foreign store stock coming to the same port as fat stock, *Fisher* 5100-5111—Greater danger in the importation of store cattle into England from Ireland than the sending of fat cattle into the Metropolitan Market, *Jenkins* 6110-6114.

Belief that store cattle would become plentiful in England if foreign cattle were kept out altogether, *Clarke* 8404-8407—Dissemination of store stock in the United Kingdom, owing principally to the prevalence of contagious disease, and also to the droughts of 1868 and 1870, *ib.* 8416-8423—Conclusion that foot and mouth disease has the effect of preventing the production of store cattle, on account of its killing so many calves, and thereby deterring the farmers from breeding, *ib.* 8524-8527.

Recommendation that store animals should be only imported under special conditions, and then placed in quarantine, *Ganger* 9615-9617—Necessity for the separation of fat and store markets; opinion that their being together is a great source of the spread of the disease, *Stewart* 11852-11857—Store cattle sold by witness in Scotland, and purchased back when fattened; considerable scarcity of stores at present in Scotland, *Smith* 12316-12319.

See also *Foot and Mouth Disease.* Foreign Cattle, & Ireland and Irish Cattle.
Ports. Quarantine.

Stratton, William. (Analysis of his Evidence).—Large operations of witness as a farmer in Wiltshire, 4450, 4500, 4507-4509. 4751, 4759—Great extent to which his cattle and sheep have suffered from foot and mouth disease, 4501-4506—Liability of witness' dairy cows to the disease; estimated loss of from 3*l.* to 4*l.* per head in the summer of 1872, through dissemination of milk and other causes, 4509-4513. 4751—Serious extent to which abortion or barrenness is caused by the disease, 4513. 4751—Opinion that the losses to farmers from foot and mouth disease exceed those from all other contagious diseases, 4514-4516.

Entire inadequacy of the present Orders of the Privy Council relative to the foot and mouth disease, 4517—Proposition that the disease be treated with the same stringency as the cattle plague, that all movement be prohibited, except under license, in the months of June and July, and that any animals subsequently diseased be slaughtered, 4517-4520, 4525, 4533, 4551-4553. 4622-4629—Concurrence in the recommendations of the Central Chamber of Agriculture for dealing with cattle diseases, 4517 *et seq.*—Expediency of uniform action in counties and boroughs; grounds for the conclusion that the latter should be under the control of the former, 4521-4523. 4631, 4632. 4730-4750.

Contemplated adoption of the same stringent measures in Ireland as in England, with regard to the foot and mouth disease; otherwise Irish cattle should be treated in the same way as foreign cattle, 4524, 4525. 4633-4638. 4699-4710—Expediency of a double disinfection of railway trucks, steamboats, *ib.*, 4525, 4536. 4577, 4578, 4690, 4698—Approval of a discretionary slaughtering power in the Privy Council inspectors as regards the cattle plague, 4527-4531. 4594-4599—Explanation relative

Stratton, William. (Analysis of his Evidence)—continued.

to the proposed power in the county authorities to slaughter in the case of foot and mouth disease, 4539, 4533, 4581-4592, 4639-4646.

Strong feeling amongst agriculturists that the foot and mouth disease should be more stringently and effectually dealt with; belief that generally, as in Wiltshire, farmers would support the increased restrictions proposed, 4533, 4547, 4548, 4557, 4574, 4575, 4647-4652, 4716-4721.—Want of much improvement in the ventilation of cattle ships, 4584-4586.—Grounds for the conclusion that inspection is of very little use as a check upon foot and mouth disease, 4638-4540, 4607-4510.

Very bad accommodation and treatment of cattle in the boats from Ireland to Bristol; approval of six hours' rest on arrival, 4541-4546, 4705-4707.—More stringent measures advocated by the Wiltshire Chamber than by the Central Chamber of Agriculture, 4548, 4600-4604.—Increased virulence of foot and mouth disease; frequency of the same animals being twice attacked, 4549-4555.—Serious extent to which sheep have been attacked, 4555, 4619-4621, 4738-4740.—Freedom from the disease when the cattle plague regulations were in force, 4557-4560.—Statement showing that there is no practical difficulty in the transit of oiled when cattle are killed at a considerable distance from towns, 4563-4573.

Proposed action of the local police with a view to discovering and reporting cases of foot and mouth disease; neighbouring farmers would readily aid in such report, 4589-4590, 4653-4655, 4696, 4697, 4722, 4723.—Statement as to the action of the Wiltshire farmers in suppressing sheep-pox, 4606.—Varying loss per head upon witness' fat stock from foot and mouth disease, 4511, 4519.—Gradual increase of the disease in Wiltshire since 1869; 4513-4515.—Stringent regulations put in force in the county under the orders of the Frye Council, 4516-4518.—Advocacy of the slaughter or quarantine of all foreign imported animals 4633-4638, 4699-4704.

Explanation of witness' views as to the amount of compensation to be awarded when animals are slaughtered, as a check to the spread of cattle plague, &c., 4668-4677.—Further statement in favour of the stoppage for a time of all movement of cattle as a means of suppressing the foot and mouth disease; witness would prefer that this prohibition should last for a whole summer, but the agricultural community generally, would probably not concur therein, 4680-4695, 4711-4721.

Large import of Irish cattle to Bristol, disease being constantly picked up on board the boats, 4705-4710.—Loss chiefly by dairy farmers from foot and mouth disease in Wiltshire, 4719.—Estimated average loss of 2*l.* per head upon all classes of cattle attacked with the disease, 4724-4729.

Supply of Cattle. See the *Headings generally throughout the Index.*

Switzerland. Stringent regulations found necessary in Switzerland, in order to check the foot and mouth disease, *Williams* 408, 409, 439, 433.

T.

Thames Haven. Statement that all the cattle imported by witness for the London market are landed at Thames Haven; considerable loss resulting from the slaughter of animals at that place, *Robinson* 10664-10669, 10728-10766, 10778.—Reason why witness brings the cattle to Thames Haven instead of Deptford, &c. 10778.

Thomson, James. (Analysis of his Evidence).—Is a veterinary surgeon and principal inspector for the local authority in Aberdeenshire; statement of the duties imposed upon witness, and the salary of his office, 11169, 11170, 11369-11384.—Statistics of the Rinderpest Association of which witness is inspector; also of the cattle plague in Aberdeenshire, 11172-11186.

Method adopted in disinfecting a farm upon which cattle plague had appeared 11187-11190.—Examination as to the prevalence of foot and mouth disease in Aberdeenshire, and the loss therefrom during the last four years; present freedom from this disease is owing mainly to the stringency of the regulations which have been adopted, 11191-11211, 11217-11224, 11232-11234, 11476-11483, 11508, 11509.

Decided opinion that foot and mouth disease is entirely of foreign origin; contention that the disease has been brought into Aberdeenshire by means of Irish cattle, 11212-11216, 11247, 11471-11475, 11494-11498.—Statement as to the regulations in force in Aberdeenshire as regards foot and mouth disease; expediency of all local authorities being compelled to adopt the present regulations, and not to make regulations for themselves, 11225-11227, 11246, 11248, 11249.

Examination with regard to the presence of pleuro-pneumonia, and the regulations adopted with reference to that disease in Aberdeenshire; expediency of slaughtering the infected animals, and isolating the remainder, 11228-11231, 11250-11266, 11279-11281, 11328-11331, 11456, 11457, 11539.—Experiments made by witness upon rabbits, with

Thomson, James. (Analysis of his Evidence)—continued.

with a view to ascertain the effect of inoculation in foot and mouth disease; improbability of the disease having been spread by means of hares, 11235-11245.

Decided expediency of awarding a high rate of compensation for the purpose of inducing an early discovery of disease in the case of cattle attacked with pleuro-pneumonia, 11267-11271, 11282-11290, 11458-11460.—Return showing the numbers of cattle slaughtered upon certain farms and the results as regards the cessation of the disease, 11291-11309.

Contention that pleuro-pneumonia is a disease of foreign origin; introduction of the disease into Aberdeenshire attributable to Irish cattle, 11310-11327, 11417-11418.—Information as to the local authorities of Aberdeenshire; satisfactory manner in which the county and borough authorities work together, 11332-11339, 11430-11453.

Absence of complaints with regard to the transit of live cattle by rail from Aberdeen to London on the part of the dealers and butchers; desire for a speedier rather than an improved mode of transit, 11345-11361, 11399-11405.—German establishment in Aberdeen for the manufacture of sausages, 11361-11368.—The transit by sea of live cattle from Aberdeen to London is about one-fourth of the whole amount, 11385-11391.

Comparison between the cost of transit of live and dead meat by rail to London from Aberdeen, 11392-11398.—Considerable depreciation in the value of cattle by reason of the privations they suffer during transit by rail, 11401-11405.—The average time in which pleuro-pneumonia is latent before it shows itself is thirteen weeks, 11413-11415.

Opinion that pleuro-pneumonia infection is only conveyed by the breath, 11416.—Statement that the amount levied last year in Aberdeenshire for the purpose of working the Act was 4,000 £; return showing the expenses from 15th May 1872 to 15th May 1873, 11416-11429.—Further statement as to pleuro-pneumonia having been brought from abroad; decrease in the importation of cattle from Holland, 11431-11470.—Beneficial effect of the cattle plague regulations in getting rid of the foot and mouth disease in the year 1867; 11482-11485.—Examination to the effect that inspection would not be effectual for the detection of pleuro-pneumonia, 11490-11507.—Evidence in further support of the opinion that pleuro-pneumonia has been brought into Aberdeenshire from Ireland, 11510-11531.

[Second Examination.]—Additional examination as to the comparative cost of sending up live cattle and dead meat to London; comparison of the charges by sea and rail, 11597-11611, 11626-11634.—Large quantities of dead meat sent to London from Aberdeen by the butchers; danger of the meat suffering depreciation during very hot weather, 11612-11625.—Evidence in favour generally of sending to London dead meat instead of live animals, 11635-11647.

Tonning. Difficulty of importing cattle from Toning on account of the want of direct communication; unsuitability of Toning for the exportation of store cattle, South 12300-12327, 12335-12337.

Transit of Cattle. Conclusion of the Committee that the Orders in Council relating to the transit of animals, both as regards disinfection and the prevention of cruelty and suffering, are well adapted for their purpose, *Rep.* vi.—Necessity, however, of an inspection from time to time by the officers of the central authority of the vessels engaged in the Irish and coasting as well as in the foreign trades, and also of railways, fairs, markets and fairs, *ib.*

See also *Cattle Ships. Dead Meat. Disinfection. Foot and Mouth Disease, III. Inspection. Railways. Watering of Cattle.*

Treatment of Disease. Examination in disapproval of the Privy Council suggesting in the reports any mode of treatment of foot and mouth disease, or being responsible for any published views of the veterinary inspectors, *Williams* 690-703.—Further statement as to the central department not giving advice relative to the cure of cattle diseases, *ib.* 1068-1073.—Circumstance of Professor Brown having laid down general principles of treatment for the foot and mouth disease, *ib.* 1091-1093.

See also *Foot and Mouth Disease, II., 6. Inoculation. Pleuro-pneumonia, 4.*

U.

Uniformity of Action. Necessity of uniformity of action on the part of the inspectors or local authorities, *Clarke* 8341, 8342; *Ripby* 8810-8818; *Walker* 12167-12169.

See also *Ireland, &c., IX., XIV. Local Authorities.*

Uninclosed Land. Contemplated maintenance of the prohibition against placing upon uninclosed land any animal affected with contagious disease, *Simonds* 2999.

United States. Visit of witness to the United States and Canada on an inquiry as to cattle plague; importation of contagious diseases into those countries from Europe, *Ganges* 5472. 5710-5722.—Statement that the first introduction of the cattle diseases into America was by the importation of a cow from Holland, *ib.* 5713-5717.

V.

Verdon, Thomas. (Analysis of his Evidence.)—Is a member of the firm of Verdon & Cullen, in Liverpool, and an owner of property in Ireland; has had large experience of foot and mouth disease, 7037-7042. 7084-7093.—Expediency of removing the restrictions in Ireland as regards foot and mouth disease on account of the injury to trade; opinion that the restrictions have never been of any use, 7013-7025. 7027. 7075-7081. 7114-7116. 7122, 7123.

Statement that abutting all the fairs and markets in Ireland for six weeks, as proposed, would have the effect of ruining the greater number of the small farmers in Ireland, 7034.—Examination as to the prevalence of foot and mouth disease in Ireland; decided opinion that this disease has been brought from England into Ireland, 7026. 7033-7040. 7081-7083. 7095. 7098-7114.

Expediency of stringent regulations for the prevention of the spread of pleuro-pneumonia; necessity for severe penalties to prevent the exposure of animals affected with the disease at fairs or markets, 7028, 7029.—Approval of compulsory slaughter in the case of animals suffering from pleuro-pneumonia, 7030.

Opinion that Ireland is singularly free from pleuro-pneumonia; evidence in support of the opinion that this disease comes principally into Liverpool from Cheshire, 7031, 7032. 7095, 7097. 7178-7184. 7191-7197.—Fluctuations in the price of meat caused by the working of the Act of 1869; reasons for this, 7041-7057.

Large numbers of cattle exported into Liverpool from Ireland; excellent condition in which these cattle arrive, 7058-7069.—Statement as to the class of persons who have signed the memorial which has been handed in by witness; nearly all the graziers who have signed are Irish, and all the cattle dealers are English, 7070-7074.

Injurious effect of movement upon cattle when suffering from foot and mouth disease; contention therefore that no rational man would expose an animal so affected in a store market, 7081. 7117, 7118.—Opinion that Irish cattle are singularly healthy at the present time, 7094-7097.

Rapid recovery of fat cattle from foot and mouth disease if left alone and not disturbed; instance of an animal suffering from this disease that afterwards took the first prize at the Manchester show, and was sold for 72 *l.* 10 *s.*; 7119, 7120.—Statement that no outbreak of foot and mouth disease resulted from the exhibition of the prize animal at Manchester, 7121.

Decided opinion that railway trucks and steam vessels should be thoroughly disinfected each time that they convey cattle or sheep, 7124.—Injurious effect of lime-water when used as a disinfectant, 7125, 7128.—Examination having reference to the cattle trade of Liverpool; the estimated value of cattle imported into Liverpool in the year 1872 was over five millions sterling, 7127-7133. 7162-7170.

Belief that any interference with the Irish cattle trade would directly affect the supply of meat to the large towns which are served by Liverpool; strong prejudices against Irish cattle entertained by some of the local landowners, 7145-7153.—Injurious manner in which the magistrates of the West Derby Hundred put the powers of the Act into force; instances of this, 7154-7157.

Public meetings held in Liverpool to protest against the Act of 1869; 7158-7161.—General incoherence of certain statements made by Mr. Jenkins about Liverpool and the Irish cattle trade, 7171, 7172.—Queries with regard to the spread of foot and mouth disease sent down by the Dublin Agricultural Society; answers by witness to these queries, 7173-7176.

Statement that foot and mouth disease may be fatal among calves, when it is not so among full-grown stock, 7185.—Superiority of many of the Irish counties in agriculture and general management over Cheshire, 7187-7190.

[Second Examination.]—Opinion that foot and mouth disease does not in any way affect the price of fat cattle when the animal is to be slaughtered immediately, 7056-7064.—Large numbers of cattle shown in markets while suffering from foot and mouth disease, 7065-7069.

Statement that the price of beef is dearer in Liverpool than it is in London; reasons for this, 7070-7089.—Large amount of traffic diverted from Liverpool on account of the restrictions; difference between the regulations of the Liverpool market and those of the Metropolitan market, 7089. 7753-7759.

Increasing

Verdon, Thomas. (Analysis of his Evidence)—continued.

Increasing exportation of fat cattle from Ireland into Liverpool; purchases made in Dublin directly by Manchester dealers without the intervention of Liverpool salesmen, 7690-7698. 7763-7769—Strong objection to a fat animal being exposed in a market while suffering from pleuro-pneumonia, 7699-7703. 7737-7739.

Bye-law of the Liverpool market, which prohibits the exhibition for sale of any animal for store purposes, 7706-7714—Further examination as to the propriety of allowing the exhibition for sale of animals suffering from foot and mouth disease; belief that for their own sakes, no farmer or store dealer would expose such animals, 7715-7736.

Expediency of proceeding against any person who would knowingly sell animals affected with pleuro-pneumonia, 7737-7739. 7820, 7821—Rapid recovery of animals from foot and mouth disease if they are allowed to remain undisturbed for a few days; variable results of this disease in some cattle, 7740-7745.

Calculation as to the amount of depreciation in price of cattle suffering from a severe attack of foot and mouth disease, 7745-7752—The Commission charged in Liverpool for the sale of cattle is two-and-a-half per cent. on the gross sale, which covers a guarantee; the charges in London are about 4 s. a head, 7770-7776.

Frequent instances of foot and mouth disease in the parks in Liverpool, 7777-7782—Information with regard to scab in sheep; statement that this disease is of a very transient character, 7783-7800—Evidence in further support of the theory, that foot and mouth disease originates in the east, and travels westward in Ireland, 7801-7813.

Belief that the poor cattle exhibited in the Yorkshire markets come from Tyrone and Donegal, 7814-7817—Desirability of there being no legislation for foot and mouth disease, 7818, 7819—Contention that a herd affected with pleuro-pneumonia should be slaughtered, 7821-7823—Expediency of giving full compensation for compulsory slaughter, 7821-7824—Examination as to the course to be pursued with regard to the foreign trade in cattle, 7826-7838.

[Third Examination.]—Further evidence as to the prices of meat prevailing in Liverpool as compared with London, 7839-7849—The cost of transit between Liverpool and London is 11 s. per head, 7850-7852—Statement that all the trade at the present time is from London to the north; men-of-war in and about Liverpool are supplied with meat by London contractors, 7853-7868.

Information as to the meat contractors for Government supplies and the terms upon which they do business, 7867-7869—Statistics with reference to the increase of the Liverpool Market since the year 1831; returns of the number of animals slaughtered and consumed within nine miles of Liverpool in the year 1872; 7869-7877. 8005, 8006.

Evidence in favour of the removal of the restrictions in Liverpool; large increase, however, in the business of butchers and other salesmen since the restrictions were put in force, 7878-7887. 7993-7995—Statement that the tendency of the Liverpool high prices has been to cause more or less of a monopoly among the large salesmen; belief that the restrictions have been the chief cause of the high prices, 7884-7887.

General disagreement with the statements contained in Mr. Jenkins' report; opinion that the proposed right of entry into premises is highly objectionable, 7888-7903. 7976—Method adopted in the Liverpool Market as regards inspection of animals by the police; contention that this inspection tends more to propagate than to prevent disease, 7897-7903. 8033-8036.

Decided opinion that the foot and mouth disease has been imported into Ireland from England, 7904-7907. 8037-8040—Agreement with Mr. Jenkins in his statement that the railway companies in Ireland do not properly disinfect their trucks; superiority of water and carbolic acid over whitewash for this object, 7908-7910. 8048.

Examination as to the character of the fairs in Ireland and the treatment of the cattle exhibited; statement that English fairs would contrast very unfavourably with Ballinasloe, 7911-7922—In-trace of a black-faced ewe that was diseased when exhibited at Ballinasloe; probability of this disease having been imported from Scotland with the sheep, 7923, 7923. 8017-8023.

Inaccuracy of the statements in Mr. Jenkins' report as to Mr. Russel's cattle; letter from Mr. Russell on this subject, 7924-7928—Contradiction of Mr. Jenkins' statement that Ballinasloe is a starting point from which to trace disease to England, 7929-7961.

Satisfactory manner in which cattle are treated both in Dublin and Liverpool, as regards the supply of water upon landing, 7962-7971—Disagreement with Mr. Jenkins as to his unfavourable reports of the cattle steamers; opinion in favour of holds as compared with decks, for the carriage of cattle, 7972, 7973. 8041-8061—Statement that subdivision of pens in cattle fairs and markets would be quite impracticable, 7974, 7975. 7982-7992—Evidence in further support of the opinion that Cheshire is not remarkable for an advanced state of agriculture, 7978-7986—Entire disagreement with the majority of Professor Baldwin's recommendations, 7981, 7982.

Verdon, Thomas. (Analysis of his Evidence)—continued.

—Singularly healthy character of the cattle in the province of Connaught, 7983-7985
 —Information as to the reduction in the numbers of sheep; statement that the breeding of sheep has been largely discontinued both in Ireland and in Scotland, 7997-8005
 —Further explanation of the difference between the restrictions in the Liverpool Market and those in force in the Metropolitan Market, 8006-8014.

—Importation of dead meat into Liverpool at the present time has almost ceased, 8015, 8016
 —Additional statement as to the bye-law which prohibits store cattle from being offered for sale in Liverpool, 8024-8028—Evidence in further support of the statement that animals affected with foot and mouth disease will recover rapidly if allowed to remain quiet and undisturbed, 8029-8030.

VETERINARY DEPARTMENTS:

I. *England:*

1. Staff of the Department, and Duties discharged.
2. Salaries and Expenses.
3. Question of Transfer to the Local Government Board.

II. *Ireland:*

1. Staff of the Department, and Duties discharged.
2. Salaries and Expenses.

III. *Conclusion of the Committee adverse to any change in the Constitution of the Departments.*

I. *England.*

1. Staff of the Department, and Duties discharged.

Williams has been secretary of the Veterinary Department of the Privy Council since the Act of 1869, and was also secretary during the previous temporary establishment of the department, *Williams* 1-8—Explanation of the alterations in the constitution of the department since its first establishment; the constitution was settled by the Commission which sat in 1868, and the establishment of clerks, &c., was re-arranged and settled by another Commission in the following year, *ib.* 7-21—Statement of the present establishment of the department, and of the duties of the secretary, chief clerk, &c., *ib.* 21-28—Besides the secretary and chief clerk there are two inspectors and three clerks, *ib.* 29, 33.

Employment of a number of temporary clerks, and of writers; great inconvenience by the substitution of the latter for the former, *Williams* 29-31—Summary of the duties of the department; much more work in connection with home diseases than with foreign import, *ib.* 30-35—Undue pressure of work on witness and the office staff generally; frequent necessity of working on Sunday, *ib.* 85-89.

Evidence in detail with reference to the heavy work and large correspondence of the department, the duties of the inspectors and of the staff generally, and the amount of salaries and other charges, *Williams* 550 *et seq.*—In 1870 the inward letters and papers numbered 5,558, and the outward letters 3,043, *ib.* 552.

Duties of the department as to giving legal advice to the local authorities relative to the interpretation of the Acts of Parliament, *Williams* 563-569—Heavy duties of the statistical branch as regards the accounts of expenditure; great detail necessary as to vouchers, *ib.* 570-583—Large work of the statistical department in connection with the returns relating to diseases, and the correspondence arising therefrom; laborious work also in other ways, *ib.* 583-585, 589-597—Doubts as to the accuracy of a certain estimate of the staff and salaries for 1873-74, *ib.* 595-599—Circumstances of the department having published only one report since 1868; supply, however, of various returns, *ib.* 590-593, 676, 677.

Further statement as to the staff being sometimes required to work on Sundays, as during the late outbreak of rattle disease plague; examination hereon as to the regular office hours of the department being only from eleven to five, *Williams* 598-606, 1010-1041—Origin of witness' connection with the department further adverted to; he at first gave his services gratuitously, but on appointment as secretary was to receive six guineas for a portion only of his time, *ib.* 650-656—Position of medical superintendent and adviser filled by witness when Colonel Harnes was at the department; subsequent abolition of this office on witness' recommendation, he again becoming secretary, *ib.* 657-665—Claims of the permanent staff to superannuation; disadvantage of the liability of the rest of the staff to dismissal at any time, *ib.* 668-671.

Information furnished by the Veterinary Department in England to that in Ireland, but not by the latter to the former, unless asked for, *Williams* 1087, 1094, 1317-1321—Further explanation as to the numerous duties and heavy work of witness' department; large amount of extra work required from the clerks, 1320-1323.

Witness,

VETERINARY DEPARTMENTS—continued.

I. England—continued.

1. Staff of the Department, and Duties discharged—continued.

Witness, who is Professor in the Veterinary Department, has been connected with the department since its formation, *Brown* 1371-1373.—Responsible duties of the chief clerk, *ib.* 2874-2876.—Rare absence of the secretary from the office, *ib.* 2877-2879.

Full employment for the clerical and other staff of the Veterinary Department, as well as for the two inspectors, *Sinclair* 3331-3334.—Several diseases proposed to be under the direct control of the central department; this would necessitate a very large department, *ib.* 3416. 3423-3425.—Belief that the staff of the Veterinary Department has ample work to do, though certain statistics are no longer kept, *ib.* 3554-3556.

Witness has been chief clerk to the Veterinary Department since December 1866; he had previously held various appointments in the public service, *Eardley Wilton*, 3682-3684.—Particulars relative to witness' duties in the matter of correspondence, Orders in Council, &c., whilst he is in fact responsible (under the secretary) for the whole work of the office, *ib.* 3690-3722.

Discontinuance at the end of 1871 of the statistics of foot and mouth disease, five clerks having been dispensed with in consequence; particulars hereon to the effect that these statistics were not so laborious as they may appear to be, *Eardley Wilton*, 3705-3707. 3738-3745.—Considerable labour involved in the preparation of the "Handbook" of the department, *ib.* 3709-3715.—Process pursued in the office as regards all papers of any importance; receipt of over 5,000 papers or letters yearly, *ib.* 3710, 3721.

Necessity of the clerks frequently working beyond the regular office hours without receiving extra pay; testimony, moreover, to their efficiency, *Eardley Wilton* 3723-3734.—Reflection in the work of the department by a reduction in the number of local authorities, and by the substitution of a small number of superior inspectors for the inferior class now in communication with the department, *ib.* 3750-3757.

The staff of the department is altogether inadequate, *Baldwin* 4054.—Strong expression of opinion against the Veterinary Department being placed under any supervision but that of a veterinary surgeon, *Ganger* 9492.

Further explanation of the position and functions of witness in the Privy Council Office, *Williams* 10505, 10506, 10520-10523.

Summary of the papers which were registered and especially treated in the Veterinary Department during 1872, *App.* 585.

2. Salaries and Expenses.

Practical settlement by the Treasury of the salaries of the officials, *Williams* 607-610.

Explanation relative to the salaries of the secretary, chief clerk, Professor Brown, and other officers, and as to the amounts paid not agreeing with the Estimates, *ib.* 611-633.—Total of 10,823 *l.* as the estimate for salaries of inspectors and officials for the present year, *ib.* 634-636.

Salary of witness adverted to; relative duties and salary of the chief clerk, *Brown* 2729-2736.—Limited salary of witness as compared with the income of many men in the profession, *ib.* 2871-2873.

Explanation of the circumstances under which witness' salary has been fixed at 500 *l.* a year, *Eardley Wilton* 3685-3691.—Explanations relative to the expenses of the department on the score, respectively, of postage, legal expenses, and stationery, *ib.* 3735-3749.—Expenditure of Professor Ferguson being well paid, and of his devoting all his time to the duties of the Veterinary Department, *Baldwin* 4251.

Comparison drawn between the salaries of the officers of the Veterinary Department and those of the Registrar General's Department; contention that the salaries of the latter department are not so high as those of the former, *Clode* 10449-10463, 10469-10480, 10502, 10504.

Extracts from the Estimates for Civil Services for 1868-69 and 1869-70, showing the amounts paid out of the Civil Contingencies Fund for expenses connected with cattle plague, and with the Veterinary Department, *App.* 585.—Expenses of the Veterinary Department on account of salaries, incidental expenses, and travelling expenses, subsequent to the 31st March 1868; after which date the sums necessary to defray such expenses were usually provided for by separate votes, *ib.* 586.

Estimated total cost of the Veterinary Department for the year 1872; aggregate of 12,662 *l.* 19 *s.* 7 *d.*, *App.* 586.

3. Question of Transfer to the Local Government Board.

Opinion that the Veterinary Department would not work well if transferred to the Local Government Board, *Williams* 646-649.—Opinion that the Veterinary Department might with advantage be transferred to the Local Government Board; reasons for this conclusion, *Clode* 9411-9417. 9424.

VETERINARY DEPARTMENTS—continued.

II. Ireland:

1. Staff of the Department and Duties discharged.

Approval of the central supervision in Ireland, there being, however, a great paucity of officers, *Brown* 2791-2796.

Witness is Director General of the Veterinary Department of Ireland, and has conducted the department since its institution, *Ferguson* 4837-4840.—Statement of the staff of the office, *ib.* 4841.—Explanation as to witness having continued the employment of three clerks, without the authority of the Treasury; deal lock if these had been discharged, *ib.* 4841, 4842, 4870.—Description of the duties of the department, and the amount and character of the work performed, *ib.* 4842-4853.

Summary details in further explanation of the staff and duties of the Veterinary Department in Dublin, and the remuneration of the several employes, *Ferguson* 5272; *et seq.*—Considerable increase of clerical staff really required, the Treasury now allowing witness only three clerks, and two more being kept on at his own risk, *ib.* 5277-5283, 5305, 5306, 5599.—Comment upon the disallowance of a messenger, *ib.* 5302.—Explanation on the subject of communication between witness' department, and the department in London, *ib.* 5595-5598.—With sufficient staff, witness would soon apply an effectual check to the spread of contagious diseases, *ib.* 5598, 5545-5547.

Examination with reference to the position held, and the pay received by Professor Ferguson, staff of clerks assisting this officer, *Murray* 12456-12485, 12511-12531, 12541-12549, 12560-12575.—Economy resulting from the employment of police clerks; opinion that the present staff of clerks is sufficient to carry on the duties of the department, *ib.* 12490, 12491.—The only alteration necessary in the Irish Veterinary Department, is the addition of one clerk, and one or two more hollydays, *ib.* 12492, 12493.

Summary of the papers treated in the Irish Veterinary Department in the year 1872; in witness number in the aggregate, *App.* 602.

2. Salaries and Expenses:

Defrayment of the office expenses by the Treasury, a general rate in aid being liable for outside expenses, such as inspection, compensation, &c., *Ferguson* 5284-5291.—Reduced salary of witness, whereas his present duties are onerous in the extreme; moreover he was without salary for about two years, *ib.* 5293-5298, 5557.—Total cost of salaries, incidental expenses, tent, &c., *ib.* 5299-5304.

Comparison between the cost of the Veterinary Department in Ireland and in England; large amount of the work of the department executed by the Irish constabulary, *Murray* 12486-12491, 12532-12539.—Possibility of the difference between the amount expended on the English and the Irish veterinary departments being considered as an Irish grievance, *ib.* 12540-12545.

Abstract showing the yearly expenses now (1872) allowed for the office of the Irish veterinary department; total of £,988*l.* 10*s.*, *App.* 635.

III. Conclusion of the Committee adverse to any change in the Constitution of the Departments:

The Committee recommend no change in the Veterinary Departments of Great Britain and Ireland, *Rep.* vi.

See also *Annual Reports*, *Inspection*, *Law Expenses*, *Privy Council Reports and Statistics* (*Cattle Plague*), *Statistics*, *Treatment of Diseases*.

Veterinary Surgeons. Arrangement for the temporary employment of veterinary surgeons by the Privy Council in the event of extensive outbreaks of disease in England, *Brown* 2796-2798.—Very few veterinary surgeons throughout Ireland; use made of their services by witness department, *Ferguson* 4861-4865, 4978-4981.

Opinion that veterinary surgeons are decidedly useful in preventing loss to stock-owners, *McBride* 9277-9287.—Unfavourable opinion of the present state of veterinary science; indefinite knowledge as to pleuro-pneumonia possessed by veterinary surgeons, *Smith* 10205-10207, 10244.

W.

Wales. Conclusion that Welsh cattle are more exempt than Irish cattle from foot and mouth disease; opinion that the disease is contracted in the transit from Ireland, *Rigby* 8789-

Wales—continued.

8789-8797. 8860-8870—Statement that there is no importation of cattle into Wales except that which is brought by landowners to their own estates, *Smith* 10434-10443.

Walker, William Stuart. (Analysis of his Evidence.)—Is chairman of the local authority for the county of Mid-Lothian, and is a landed proprietor in the county; has also been chairman of the Highland Society, 12148-12151.—The views of witnesses on the subject of dealing with cattle diseases are the same as those of the other members of the local authority of the county, 12152.

Strong opinion in favour of uniformity of action in the different counties for the purpose of dealing with the disease; desirability of an amalgamation of the local authorities of counties and towns, 12153-12160, 12164-12167. 12263-12278.—Inexpediency of leaving much discretionary power with the local authority as to issuing regulations; opinion that the rules and regulations should be imperative throughout under Act of Parliament, 12161-12163.—Desirability of appointing inspectors at the cost of the county to see that the provisions of the Act are carried out with uniformity and efficiency, 12167-12169.

Examination as to the enforcement of penalties under the Act; necessity for a minimum as well as a maximum fine which should be rigidly enforced, 12170, 12171. 12286-12291.—The tribunals before whom cases are brought are generally the magistrates in the towns and the justices of the peace in the country, 12172-12175.

Quarantine for seven or ten days necessary in the case of store cattle brought from abroad, 12176-12179.—Decided opinion that all foreign fat cattle should be slaughtered at the port of debarkation or taken by rail to the slaughterhouse, 12180-12185. 12279-12284.

Expediency of all markets and stock fairs being placed under Government inspection; belief that the local inspector has not sufficient authority to regulate the markets, 12186-12194.—Examination as to the propriety of having separate markets for fat and store cattle; contention that cattle, though quite fit for the butcher, may be very dangerous to put with store animals, 12195-12195.

Suggestions as to the means to be taken to prevent the spread of foot and mouth disease; necessity for a system of heavy penalties for moving cattle, 12207. 12209. 12228-12233. 12237-12242.—Doubtful expediency in slaughtering the cattle which are affected with pleuro-pneumonia, unless it be extended to all the animals in the same farm, 12241-12246.

Information with regard to cases of penalties for not reporting the existence of pleuro-pneumonia in the neighbourhood of Edinburgh; difficulty of discovering the disease, 12244-12251.—Advisability of the regulations with regard to cattle diseases being as stringently carried out in Ireland as they are in Great Britain, 12253-12258.—Resolutions submitted by the Highland Society to the Privy Council on the subject of transit of cattle by railway, 12259-12261.

Welf, Richard. (Analysis of his Evidence.)—Carnes on the business of a cattle salesman in Dublin, and is a large landowner, 8068-8068.—Advocates non-restriction as regards foot and mouth disease in Ireland; approval of the agriculturist being left entirely to himself to do as he thinks proper as regards the disease, 8067-8071. 8080. 8132, 8133. 8158, 8159. 8171.

Inappropriety of moving cattle which are suffering from foot and mouth disease to any considerable distance, 8072, 8073. 8091-8095. 8103-8109. 8127-8131. 8133-8151.—Opinion that such is sheep is of great consequence, 8074-8080. 8134-8138.—Necessity of the immediate destruction of animals suffering from pleuro-pneumonia; compensation for animals slaughtered should be made to the farmer, 8081-8083. 8089. 8110-8113.

Desirability of uniform legislation for England and Ireland, 8085. 8165-8171.—Absence of foreign importation into Ireland with the single exception of fat Spanish cattle, 8086-8095.—Advisability of English graziers coming over to Ireland to make their own purchases instead of employing middlemen; opinion that such a course would prevent the importation of wretched cattle as at present, 8097-8101.

Inutility of inspection as a preventive measure, 8113. 8160-8164.—Satisfactory condition of the cattle business between England and Ireland, 8114.—Mysterious character of the foot and mouth disease as regards infection, 8100-8106.—Statement that Connought is the principal rearing place for stock in Ireland, 8152, 8153.—Fattening of cattle is principally carried on in the province of Leinster, 8154, 8157.—Information as to the present state of the cattle trade between England and Ireland, 8172-8185.

Watering of Cattle (Railway Transit). Steps taken in order to insure supplies of water at railway stations, and to prevent overcrowding and undue delay on railways, *Williams* 519-541.—Advantage if the railway companies were directly responsible for administering proper supplies of water, *id.* 523-541.

Consideration of the arrangements as to the transit by railway, more especially as regards

Report, 1873—continued.

Watering of Cattle (Railway Transit)—continued.

regards the supply of water during the journey; difficulties on this score, *Brown* 1639-1656. 1679-1697. 1727-1737.—Opinion that in winter cattle might comfortably go for twenty-four hours without water; long period for which they would live without water, *ib.* 1681-1686. 2048-2051.

Further statement as regards the watering of cattle on railways, that it is better not to detain for the purpose if the journey does not exceed thirty-six hours, *Professor Brown* 2257-2251.—Reference to the obstacles to watering the cattle during railway transit, *ib.* 2741-2743.—Reference to the watering of cattle on railways as not attended with nearly so much cruelty as is represented, *ib.* 2838-2842.

Expediency of water being supplied every eighteen or twenty hours, *Shewell*, 3121, 3122.—Improved supply of water at railway stations, though the cattle are not always watered before they are trucked; this should be imperative in many cases, *ib.* 3133-3138.—Circumstance of the animals from Aberdeen to London not being watered during the journey (about thirty-six hours); very good condition in which they arrive, *ib.* 3139-3142.—Difficulty of watering during railway transit; suggestions on the subject, *ib.* 3143-3151.

Contemplated watering of Irish cattle on arrival in England, but not on the railway, *Fisher* 5264, 5265.—Suggestions relative to the watering and feeding of Irish cattle; approval of this being done at Liverpool or Holyhead, *Ferguson* 5382-5374.—Risk of injury to health by watering before the sea voyage, *ib.* 5382-5364.

Satisfactory manner in which cattle are treated both in Dublin and Liverpool as regards the supply of water upon landing, *Verdon* 7926-7971.—Privations suffered by cattle upon long journeys as regards food and water; instance of show cattle, belonging to Mr. Walter Gabley, being without food or water for more than twenty hours, *Clarke* 8516-8531.—Great privations on long journeys for want of water; arrangement proposed for remedying this, *Miles* 11984 at seq.

See also *Railways*.

Wells, Henry. (Analysis of his Evidence.)—Is a Veterinary Surgeon, practising at Freshwell, in Essex, 10911. 10929.—Statement as to the importation of Dutch cattle into the district in the year 1871 with foot and mouth disease; severe form in which foreign cattle have this disease, 10912-10918. 10924. 10930-10930.—Desirability of stamping out pleuro-pneumonia by means of slaughter; necessity of identifying those which have been healed with the diseased animals, 10915-10928. 10965-10987.—Question as to the requirement of more stringent regulations as regards the inspection of markets and the prohibition of removal, 10951-10961.

Wells, James. (Analysis of his Evidence.)—Is a Member of the Royal Veterinary College, and practices at Bishop's Cleeve, 13996-14001.—Visits paid by witness to the Metropolitan Market in May and June 1872 with a view to discovering whether there was disease amongst the foreign cattle, 14002-14007.—Discovery upon the 10th June 1872 of upwards of thirty animals suffering from foot and mouth disease; all these cattle were newly-imported, 14008-14033. 14065-14070.—Attention of the inspector (Mr. Rayment) called to these cattle; unsatisfactory result of Mr. Rayment's examination into these cases, 14022-14027. 14048-14054. 14075-14085.

Discovery by witness of foreign sheep in the market affected with the scab, on the 10th June, 14034-14042.—Statement that the cattle affected with foot and mouth disease were chiefly Dutch, 14071.—Instances of Spanish cattle affected with foot and mouth disease, 14072-14074.

Weight of Cattle. Information in regard to the weight of foreign cattle and the loss of live weight after a sea voyage, *Robinson* 10581-10593.—Depreciation in value to the extent of 4*l.* by the loss of 2 cwt. in weight, *ib.* 10594-10602.

West Bromwich. Considerable fluctuation and rise in the price of meat for many years past at West Bromwich; opinion that the compulsory slaughter of foreign cattle at the ports is the chief cause of the increase in the price, *Hodgetts* 12588-12591.—Grounds of objection to the dead meat trade by the West Bromwich butchers, *ib.* 12598-12666. 12712-12716.—Information as to the retail prices of meat sold by witness, *ib.* 12717-12723.

West Derby. Injudicious manner in which the magistrates of the West Derby hundred put the powers of the Act into force; instances of this, *Verdon* 7154-7157.

Weyhill Fair. Doubt as to there having been much foot and mouth disease in an active form among sheep at the fair in October 1872, *Stratton* 4736-4740.

Williams, Alexander. (Analysis of his Evidence.)—Has been Secretary of the Veterinary Department of the Privy Council since the Act of 1869; was also secretary during the previous temporary establishment of the department, 1-8.—Explains the alterations in the constitution of the department since its first establishment; the constitution was settled

Williams, Alexander. (Analysis of his Evidence)—continued.

settled by the commission which sat in 1868, and the establishment of clerks, &c. was rearranged and settled by another commission in the following year, 7-21.

Statement of the present establishment of the department, and of the duties of the secretary, chief clerk, &c., 21-28.—Employment also of a number of temporary clerks and of writers; great inconvenience by the substitution of the latter for the former, 29-31.—Summary of the duties of the department; much more work in connection with home diseases than with foreign import, 31-36.—Several functions of the two inspectors attached to the central office, 37-41.

Particulars relative to the mode of appointment and payment, and the duties of the inspectors of foreign animals at the ports, the greater number being now paid by salary instead of by fees; necessity of an increase of staff in order that the duties may be properly discharged, 42-57.—Business of the inspector to deal with the animals after they are landed, the landing being in the hands of the Customs, 58-62.—Difficulty in supplying a complete return of the expenses of the local authorities as well as of the central department on the score of inspection, &c., 78-84.—Undue pressure of work on witnesses and the office staff generally; frequent necessity of working on Sunday, 85-89.

Information relative to the state of the law as regards foreign import previously to the passing of the Act of 1869; numerous Acts and Orders in Council which the measure of that year had to deal with and to consolidate 90-112.—Statement as to the foreign countries placed in 1869 under the regulations in the schedule of the Act as to slaughter at the landing place, 112-118.—Several alterations made in the schedule in 1870 and 1871; 117-123.—Explanation of the grounds upon which Holland was removed from the schedule in April 1871, 123-131.

Particulars as to the circumstances under which an Order was issued in July 1872 admitting cattle from Schleswig and Holstein under certain stringent conditions; this Order is now revoked, 132-132.—Order in July 1872 relaxing the restrictions on cattle from Belgium and France, 153, 154.—Prohibition of import of cattle from Russia by Order on 19th July 1872; 155-158.—Several foreign countries now in the schedule with reference to slaughter at the port of landing, 159.—Nature of the restrictions as to sheep, goats, and pigs, 159-163.

Proposition made to the veterinary department for the renewal of the import from Russia; refusal thereof for the present, 164-179.—Statement as to Russia never being free from cattle plague, 175.—Importance of some united action on the part of European countries with a view to the prevention of cattle diseases, and their prompt suppression when discovered; difficulties in the matter, 180-191.—Constant liability to cattle plague in Austria, though it is less indigenous than in Russia, 185-189.

Advantage if Germany were as careful about the through transit of cattle as she is on the Russian frontier, 191-195.—Greater distribution of cattle plague on the continent during the last few years, partly in consequence of the war, 196-198, 218-220.—Grounds for the opinion that England will, eventually, be dependent indirectly upon Russia for her foreign supply; great importance on this score of effectual quarantine regulations on the Germano-Russian frontier, 199-221.

Evidence to the effect that the system of slaughtering all scheduled animals at the port of landing does not give immunity against danger, 222-238.—Larger proportion of diseased animals sent to England from scheduled countries than from other countries; experience at Deptford adverted to hereon, 232-238.—Room for improvement in the fittings and ventilation of the cattle ships, 239.—Expediency of all the ports being required to make as good provision for landing, slaughtering, isolation, &c., as is made at Deptford; difficulties experienced on this subject by the central department, 239-277.—Inability of the department to enforce proper regulations at the port of Hull, 243-249, 256, 257, 269-271.

Importance of the number of cattle ports being reduced as much as possible; large disinfection already, 257-266.—Decided improvement if cattle were not mixed with other cargo, 272-277.—Concurrence in the view of Professor Brown as to the cattle plague having been introduced last year from the "Joseph Soames," at the port of Hull, 278-280.—Statement of the prompt and summary measures taken by the central department for preventing the spread of the disease, 281-295.

Proposition, as regards cattle plague, that in addition to existing precautions, there should be power in the central department, through its inspectors, to compel the slaughter of animals headed with infected ones; difficulty and delay at present on this point, 295-314.—Opinion that the full value should not be paid as compensation in all cases where animals are slaughtered, 318-317.

Belief that pleuro-pneumonia has not been largely introduced from abroad during the last few years, 318-323.—Belief also that the pressure of foot and mouth disease in this country is not largely owing to foreign import; practice as to inspection and slaugh-

Williams, Alexander. (Analysis of his Evidence)—continued.

tering at the ports adverted to hereon, 321-344.—Nor does witness believe that scab has been introduced from abroad, every case being taken at the ports, 335-337.—Conviction of witness that wholesale slaughtering of all foreign animals at the ports would not prevent disease in England, 338-342.

Calculation as to the large proportion of the supply of live meat which comes from abroad and from Ireland, 343-349.—Improvement if certain returns to the Inland Revenue were made by the inspectors under the Act of 1869, 350-355.—Sufficiency of the present precautions for preventing, by isolation, outbreaks of sheep-pox; slaughtering is not necessary, though it would be advantageous, 356-360.—Doubt as to pleuro-pneumonia having increased in the country, though more cases are brought to light, 360-369.

Importance of the movement of cattle being at once stopped in any district or "infected place" where an infectious or contagious disease is discovered, 370, 418, 419.—Limited number of counties and boroughs which have applied the orders of the central department as to the slaughter of animals having pleuro-pneumonia, 374-380, 385.—Statement as to the local demands on the department for the issue of stringent orders relative to the foot and mouth disease, and as to the action of the department and of the local authorities in the matter, 381-414.—Stringent regulations found necessary in Switzerland in order to check the disease, 408, 409, 432, 433.—Slight effect of the Act of 1869 in stopping the disease, 410-414, 449.

Means of stamping out the foot and mouth disease if, in addition to other precautions, there were compulsory isolation, 415-417.—Evidence in support of the proposal for preventing transit in places declared to be infected, and for applying a system of licenses through Government inspectors before movement is allowed, 418-456.—Conclusion as to the necessity of the proposed restrictions being carried out and enforced by the central department, instead of being left to local authorities with different jurisdictions, 420-456.—Contemplated appointment of a large body of Government inspectors, who should report any case of disease on farms, 444-454.—Advantage in working the Act if there were only one local authority to deal with, 457-459.

Large import of foot and mouth disease from Ireland at the ports of Bristol and Liverpool, though the disease is said to have been first introduced into Ireland from England, 460-469.—Doubt as to much pleuro-pneumonia coming from Ireland, 461.—Entire inadequacy of the Government Inspector at Bristol or at Liverpool to properly inspect the large imports from Ireland, 470-478.—Absence of any check to the movement of Irish cattle from the ports into the interior, so that foot and mouth disease is easily spread in England; expediency of the diseased animals being detained and isolated at the place of landing, 479-490.—Injustice of the restrictions as regards foreign cattle, if there are no restrictions upon Irish cattle, 481, 499, 500.

Improvement as regards the disinfecting, ventilation, space, &c., in the case of cattle vessels from abroad, owing to the transit regulations of the veterinary department, 501-509.—Steps taken, also, with a view to the disinfecting, ventilation, &c. of Irish vessels, 510-518.—Difficulties owing to the want of staff for carrying out the regulations as to transit by vessel or by railway, 510, 511, 518, 528, 530.

Steps taken in order to insure supplies of water at railway stations, and to prevent overcrowding and undue delay on railways, 519-541.—Advantage if the railway companies were directly responsible for administering proper supplies of water, 533-541.—Possibility of foot and mouth disease being caught on board the vessels from Ireland if they have not been disinfected, 542, 543.

[Second Examination].—Paper submitted showing the expenses of witness' department, 549.—Evidence in detail, with reference to the heavy work and large correspondence of the department, the duties of the inspectors and other staff employed, and the amount of salaries and other charges, 550 *et seq.*—Total of between 1,500 and 1,700 inspectors in 1872, including police officers who acted in that capacity; practice as to these sending weekly returns to the Privy Council Office, 553-563.—Duties of the department as to giving legal advice to the local authorities relative to the interpretation of the Acts of Parliament, 563-569.

Heavy duties of the statistical branch, as regards the accounts of expenditure; great detail necessary as to vouchers, 570-583.—Large work of the statistical department in connection with the returns relating to diseases, and the correspondence arising therefrom; laborious work also in other ways, 583-585, 589-597.—Doubt as to the accuracy of a certain estimate of the staff and salaries for 1873-74; 586-589.—Circumstances of witness' department having published only one report since 1868; supply, however, of various returns, 590-593, 676, 677.—Further statement as to the staff being sometimes required to work on Sundays, as during the late outbreak of cattle plague; examination hereon as to the regular office hours of the department, being only from eleven to five, 598-606, 1010-1041.

Practical settlement by the Treasury of the salaries of the officials, 607-610.—Explanation

Williams, Alexander. (Analysis of his Evidence)—continued.

motion relative to the salaries of the secretary, chief clerk, Professor Brown, and other officers, and as to the amounts paid not agreeing with the Estimates, 611-633.—Total of 10,893*l.* as the estimate for salaries of inspectors and officials for the present year, 634-636.—Information to be obtained from the Treasury as to the low expenses of witness' department; he cannot supply any particulars whatever, 637-640.—Nor can he give any information as to the cost of postage or stationery, 641-645.

Opinion that the veterinary department would not work well if transferred to the Local Government Board, 646-649.—Origin of witness' connection with the department further adverted to; he at first gave his services gratuitously, but on appointment as secretary was to receive six guineas a week for a portion only of his time, 650-656.—Position of medical superintendent and adviser filled by witness when Colonel Harness was at the department; subsequent abolition of this office on witness' recommendation, he again becoming secretary, 657-665.—Claim of the permanent staff to superannuation; disadvantage of the liability of the rest of the staff to dismissal at any time, 666-671.

Delayed issue of the first Cattle Plague Report till 1868, in order that it might embrace the Veterinary Report, 672-675.—Obstacle to a year's report being issued before the month of March, 678, 679.—Advantage of the annual report including the veterinary inspectors' reports, 679-681.—Difficulty as to the annual report on the score of expense; witness has long been desirous for an annual report, 681, 701-703.

Explanation in connection with a statement by witness in the Report of 1873, that the origin of the foot and mouth disease in England remained to be proved; belief, however, that it does not arise spontaneously, and is propagated by contagion, 686-689.—Examination in disapproval of the Privy Council suggesting in the reports any mode of treatment of foot and mouth disease, or being responsible for any published views of the veterinary inspectors, 690-703.

Advantage of the inspectors, under the Privy Council, had power to go on board the cattle ships and see to the stowage, &c., 704-707.—Impression as to foot and mouth disease having increased by extension from the centres which existed after the cessation of the cattle plague regulations, 708-713.—Restriction as regards sheep which come over with cattle from scheduled countries, 715, 716.—Further reference to the prospect of dependence, directly or indirectly, upon Russian supplies, 717.—Great expense of an extensive system of quarantine in Russia before export to England, 718-721.—Introduction of the cattle plague into Hamburg, and thence to England, by some Russian cattle which went in the first instance from Cronstadt to Lübeck; prohibition since placed upon the export of Russian cattle into North Germany, 722-728.

Importance of facilities near the ports for the burial of carcasses of infected animals, 729-733.—Further statement as to countries not being scheduled for pleuro-pneumonia or foot and mouth disease; valuable check, however, through the liability of the whole of the cargo to be killed at the port of landing, 734-739.—Slight use in the police reporting cases of foot and mouth disease to the local authority, the latter not exercising their power of stopping the movement of cattle from markets, &c., 740-749.—Inadequacy of the present home regulations for extinguishing pleuro-pneumonia, though they prevent its further increase, 750-754.

Doubt as to the advantage of the nuisance inspectors, under Sanitary Acts, reporting upon cases of cattle disease, 761-764.—Regulations as to import from scheduled and unscheduled countries respectively, further adverted to as requiring amendment in several respects; suggestions on the subject, 765 *et seq.*—Recommendations relative to the limitation to be applied to the number of importing ports, 773, 790-795.—Slight advantage of compulsory notice to the local veterinary inspector upon the arrival of each cargo; duties of the customs officers adverted to hereon, 774-788, 917.

Question considered whether there should not be some better regulations for the disinfecting of drovers who come with cattle from dangerous countries, 784-789.—Belief that an attempt was made to disinfect the persons who were in contact with the "Joseph Seames" cargo, 789.—Importance of sufficient lairage accommodation at the port of landing, and of facilities for slaughter, and for burial of the carcasses; explanation as to existing regulations on these points, 795-812.

Way in which the returns of cattle for the agricultural statistics might be made by veterinary inspectors throughout the country, 813-815.—Enormous expense in carrying out the scheme for the appointment of a large number of veterinary inspectors, witness submitting, however, that this is the most effectual mode of preventing the spread of disease, 816-826.—Comparatively small number of deaths from foot and mouth disease, 827, 828.—Effect of compensation in inducing owners of infected cattle to report the cases of disease, 830.

Dissent from the view that foot and mouth disease was extinct in England before the cattle plague regulations were removed, 831-834.—Less strict regulations proposed as to licenses than when the cattle plague was in the country, 835-838.—Contemplated

Williams, Alexander. (Analysis of his Evidence)—continued.

central control of the inspectors if these be appointed by the local authorities, 830-842
 —Doubt as to the expediency of the inspectors of the central authority visiting the markets in order to enforce the regulations, 843-845—Oasis thrown eventually upon the local authority as to enforcing the cleansing of cattle boats, 846-849.

Less difficulty as to boats for cattle exclusively, if the number of ports be reduced, 850-853—Inspection duly applied to the cleansing of the boats in the foreign trade, 854, 855—Useful reports from the consuls abroad as to the existence of cattle plague; check thereby upon infected cargoes, as in the case of Russia, 856-861—Proportion of the cattle from Spain and Portugal which come to Liverpool and to Southampton, 862-864.

Absence of control over Irish cattle until they are landed in England, 865-867—Power of the local authority as to buying land for the isolation of cattle from the markets, 868, 869—Want of actual proof of any instance of the introduction of foot and mouth disease or pleuro-pneumonia into the country through the medium of foreign cattle, 870-872, 1005, 1006—Immense expense involved in applying quarantine regulations to foreign store cattle, 873-876.

Policy of ample compensation of farmers for slaughtered animals, as otherwise the cases of infection will probably not be reported, 877-887—Large number of cattle proposed to be imported by certain persons from Russia, only that the conditions were not deemed satisfactory, 888-891—Much larger import than export of cattle by Belgium in 1870; 892-895—Much larger import than export in the case also of Austria, 896-900.

Explanation of the data upon which witness has estimated the relative per centage of Irish cattle and of foreign cattle imported into England, 901-908—Statement of the advances within the last three years in the price of beef, mutton, &c., in the Metropolitan Market, 909-914—Advantage of keeping up the present statistics in witness' department, though they are done away with as regards foot and mouth disease, 915, 916—Doubt as to the expediency of infected foreign cattle being transferred from the ships to barges, and of the carcasses being destroyed on board the latter, 918.

Obstacles to a distinction between fat cattle and store cattle from abroad, with a view to the latter being quarantined, 919-923—Facility to the central department if there were only one local authority for each county, 924, 925—Advantage if the local or county inspectors were required to devote their whole time to the duties of their office, 926-931—Tendency to an increase of prices if all imported cattle were slaughtered at the ports, 931.

Decided advantage if there could be an effectual inspection under the Privy Council at the export ports in Russia, 932-939—Statement as to the decreased import of foreign cattle into the London market in the last few years having been more than compensated by the increased horse supply, 940-952, 959—Increased protection if the regulations as to Deptford were applied to Hull and other ports; obstacles on the score of expense, 953-958—Conclusion as to Deptford not paying well as an investment, 959, 966-968.

Expediency of a check upon the movement of infected animals to fairs rather than upon the number of fairs, though there would doubtless be less danger if the latter could be reduced, 970-972—Great difficulty in levying a license upon middlemen who trade in cattle for profit, 973-976—Further suggestions relative to the issue of licenses by the inspectors before removal from districts declared to be infected, 977-984.

Discontinuance of the statistics of foot and mouth disease further adverted to and explained, 985-988—Increased benefit of the regulations of witness' department if they were properly carried out by the local authorities, 989-992—Valuable check, through the veterinary inspectors and through the customs officers, upon diseased animals being passed into the country from the out-ports, 993-1001—Impracticability of disinfecting all the sides of cattle ships, 1002—Practice as to disinfecting the landing places where diseased cattle have been disembarked, 1003, 1004.

Diminution of the Government inspecting staff by diminishing the number of ports, 1007-1009—Statement to the effect that witness would not have a country scheduled with regard to sheep-pox, 1042-1056—Question further considered whether foot and mouth disease may not arise spontaneously, 1055-1057—Circumstances of there having been a very malignant attack of the disease in 1849 and 1851, before foreign cattle were imported, 1058-1063—Non-interference with the disease previously to 1869; increasing price of meat adverted to hereon, 1064-1067.

Further statement as to the central department not giving advice relative to the cure of cattle diseases, 1068-1071—Doubt as to the supply from Germany being seriously interfered with by that country being scheduled, 1072-1080—Little, if any, interference with the freedom of trade by the proposed diminution in the number of ports, 1081-1083—Reduced price of work owing in the large increase of import, 1084, 1085.

Williams, Alexander. (Analysis of his Evidence)—continued.

[Third Examination.] Respect in which the estimate of twenty-seven and a-half per cent. as the English import from Ireland is probably excessive, 1085, 1089.—Information furnished by the Veterinary Department in England to that in Ireland, but not by the latter to the former unless asked for, 1087, 1094, 1317-1321.—Circumstances of Professor Brown having laid down general principles of treatment for the foot and mouth disease, 1091-1093.—Grounds for the conclusion that there is a larger proportion of disease imported from Ireland than from foreign countries, 1095-1102, 1153-1151.

Expediency of an efficient inspection at the port of embarkation in Ireland rather than at the port of embarkation in England, 1098, 1099, 1112-1116, 1122-1125, 1131-1135.—Decided objection to the slaughtering of all animals affected with foot and mouth disease, 1103, 1104.—Advantage of the regulations in England being applied compulsorily to Irish cattle, 1105, 1126-1137.—Approval of statistics being kept by the Irish Veterinary Department relative to foot and mouth disease, 1106-1108.—Payment of the numerous local inspectors in England out of the local rates, 1109-1111.

Injuries effect upon imports from abroad and from Ireland if the regulation imposed an additional charge of from 5*d.* to 10*d.* a head, 1117-1125.—Importance further attached to the non-removal from "infected places" without a license; this should apply to Ireland as well as to England, 1125-1137.—Efficacy of isolation both for pleuro-pneumonia and foot and mouth disease, 1138, 1146-1151.—Statement in further support of the view that foot and mouth disease does not arise spontaneously, 1139-1146.—Impression that the disease does not render the meat unfit for food, 1152.

Belief that pleuro-pneumonia is frequently introduced from Ireland, though there are no statistics on the subject, 1153-1155, 1158-1161, 1167, 1168.—Explanation that the Privy Council inspectors do not examine Irish cattle; duty and action of the local authorities on the subject, 1159, 1321-1335.—Approval of contrabandation so far as seeing that the regulations are carried out, 1162-1166.—Statement as to the cattle from Schleswig and Holstein being now killed at the port of landing, 1169-1171.—Large district of country whence cattle come to the port of Geestermunde, 1171-1173.—Doubt further expressed as to the cattle plague being indigenous in Galicia, 1174-1177.

Examination with further reference to witness' grounds for the conclusion that in the future England will have to depend on Russia for her foreign supplies, or rather, that Germany will, under strict regulations, import from Russia, and will export to this country, 1178-1198.—Belief that there would be more liability than at present to the import and spread of disease if all foreign cattle were slaughtered at the place of landing, 1199-1202.—Witness considers, in fact, that the present regulations are effectual in keeping out disease, and that non-detection is very improbable, 1203-1208, 1222, 1223.

Impression as to the foreign cattle going chiefly to the wholesale butchers, 1209-1213.—Probable tendency to reduction of price if dead meat were imported instead of the live animal, 1213.—Reference to certain statistics as to the immense losses from contagious diseases from 1842 to 1877; 1914-1918.—Small per-centage of foreign live meat consumed in England; this proportion is, however, on the increase, and the risk of contagion is not (in witness' opinion) sufficient to call for prohibition of import, 1219-1227, 1268.—Insufficient interest of the local authority in ports for the prevention of contagion, 1228-1230.

Explanation that in advocating the Deptford system at other ports, witness has in view the cattle only from scheduled countries, 1231-1233.—Examination as regards the port of Hull to the effect that witness fully believes there are grounds for complaint as to the action of the local authorities, but that Professor Brown is conversant with all the local circumstances, and is best able to give evidence as to the shortcomings of the port, 1234-1255, 1285.—Information generally in relation to the cargo of the "Joseph Soames," and the action of the Government Inspector in the matter, witness referring, however, to Professor Brown as competent to explain the circumstances in detail, 1256-1275.

Serious increase of glanders in horses, improved regulations being required for checking this disease, 1276-1285, 1287.—Immense sum represented by the deterioration in value through foot and mouth disease, as estimated at 2*d.* per head, 1289-1294, 1357-1358.—Explanation that in the case of pleuro-pneumonia slaughter is not compulsory, 1295, 1296.—Consideration of the statistics as to the import of dead meat of different kinds; large increase of Australian preserved meat, 1297-1314.

Good ground for a certain complaint from Cheshire as to the want of improved regulations in regard to cattle from Ireland, 1336-1339.—Obstacles hitherto to the successful import of American or other beef in a preserved state, 1340-1344.—Exception taken to the view that there is any direct neglect of duty on the part of the local authorities at Bristol or Liverpool in regard to the inspection of Irish cattle, 1345-1349, 1351-1355.—More effective machinery in Ireland than in England for applying the regulations of the central department, 1350, 1351.

Report, 1873—continued.

Williams, Alexander. (Analysis of his Evidence)—continued.

Further explanation as to the numerous duties and heavy work of witness' department; large amount of extra work required from the clerks, 1359-1363.—Opinion that unless much more be done for the prevention of foot and mouth disease, the present regulations may as well be withdrawn altogether, 1364-1367.

[Fourth Examination.]—Further explanation of the position and functions of witness in the Privy Council Office, 10505, 10506, 10520-10523.—Examination as to the particular directions issued from the Privy Council Office relative to the statistical return prepared by Mr. Clode, 10505-10511.—Duties of the Lords of the Council that the reports on the cattle plague should not be too lengthy, 10572, 10573.—Reasons for Mr. Clode's report being printed in a different type to that in which it was prepared; the report was not delayed by witness, but by Professor Simonds, 10514-10519.

Wiltshire. Great extent to which witness' cattle and sheep have suffered from foot and mouth disease, *Stratton* 4501-4506.—Strong feeling in Wiltshire in favour of stringent measures in order to stamp out the disease, *ib.* 4533, 4547, 4548.—More stringent measures advocated by the Wilt Chamber than by the Central Chamber of Agriculture, *ib.* 4548, 4600-4604.

Statement as to the action of the Wiltshire farmers in suppressing sheep-pox, *Stratton* 4606.—Gradual increase of the foot and mouth disease in Wiltshire since 1869; *ib.* 4613-4615.—Stringent regulations put in force in the county under the orders of the Privy Council, *ib.* 4616-4618.—Very little pleuro-pneumonia in the county at any time, *ib.* 4677-4679.—Loss chiefly by dairy farmers from foot and mouth disease in Wiltshire, *ib.* 4719.

Resolutions passed unanimously at the meeting of the South Wilt Chamber of Agriculture, 20th July 1872, with reference to the measures necessary for preventing the spread of foot and mouth disease, *App.* 600.

Resolutions submitted by Mr. Stratton to the leading members of the South Wilt Chamber of Agriculture, and thoroughly approved by them in January 1873; sundry measures proposed for the better prevention of diseases, *App.* 600, 601.

Woodcock, George. (Analysis of his Evidence).—Is a butcher and cattle dealer at Sheffield, 13800-13803.—Desirability of free trade in cattle, 13804.—Disapproval of slaughtering cattle at the ports; reasons for this objection, 13804-13812, 13829, 13830, 13841-13846.—Statement that it costs twice as much to transport a beast dead by rail, as it does when alive, 13806-13809, 13838.

Opinion that compulsory slaughter at the ports would be injurious to the butchers in Sheffield; deterioration of dead meat by reason of its transmission by rail, 13815, 13828, 13841-13843.—Small number of sheep obtained from Hull; reason for this, 13831-13837.—Irregular character of the cattle market at Hull, 13841-13843.—Contention that it is not so necessary to adopt restrictions with regard to pleuro-pneumonia as it is with reference to rinderpest, 13848, 13849.

Y.

Yorkshire. Statement as to cattle plague having been introduced through Hull to Beckington and Bridlington, and as to the local authorities at those places having done all that was possible to stamp out the disease, *Fisher* 5071-5080, 5105-5109.

See also *Cattle Plague*, 3. *Hull.*

I N D E X

TO THE

R E P O R T

FROM THE

SELECT COMMITTEE

ON

CONTAGIOUS DISEASES (ANIMALS).

*Ordered, by The House of Commons, to be Printed,
25 July 1873.*

[*Price 1s. 3d.*]

353.

Under 12 os.

M A P

or

ALBERT MODEL FARMS, GLASNEVIN.

REFERRED TO IN QUESTION 5982.

Reference.

<input type="checkbox"/>	Large Farm.	140.0.38
<input type="checkbox"/>	Intermediate Farm.	22.3.7
<input type="checkbox"/>	Small Farm.	5.2.57
<input type="checkbox"/>	Gardens &c.	30.0.22

